**Appendix C – Assessment of requirement for Strategic Environmental Assessment**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Policy H2 – BUILDING A BALANCED COMMUNITY -** *All new residential development should maintain, provide or contribute to a mix of housing tenures, types and sizes to help support the creation of mixed, balanced and inclusive communities in the Frome Neighbourhood Plan area. Planning applications for 10 or more homes should*  *• Address affordable housing need and housing demand in line with Mendip District Local Plan 2006-2028 Policy*  *DP11: Affordable Housing.*  *• Contribute to the diversity of housing in the local area and help to redress any housing imbalance that exists.*  *• Employ design solutions that promote strong neighbourhoods.*  *• Enable future flexibility and adaptability* | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Assessment Criteria** | | | **Assessment of Significant Effect** | | | | | | | | | | **Justification** | **Amendments to Policy** | | | |
| Criteria 1 from Schedule 1 of 2004 SEA Regulations – The characteristics of plans and programmes having regard, in particular, to: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| The degree to which the plan or programme sets a framework for projects and other activities, either with regard to the location, nature, size and operating conditions or by allocating resources | | | Not significant | | | | | | | | | | The policy requires applicants to justify the development mix they are putting forward and how it relates to the local need. This is not considered likely to have any significant environmental impacts. | None | | | |
| The degree to which the plan or programme influences other plans and programmes including those in a hierarchy | | | Not significant | | | | | | | | | | The policy is broadly compliant with the overarching housing policies in the emerging Local Plan which has itself been subject to SA and SEA, consequently there are no significant effects anticipated. | None | | | |
| The relevance of the plan or programme for the integration of environmental considerations in particular with a view to promoting sustainable development | | | Not significant | | | | | | | | | | Development proposals will have to be in sustainable locations to comply with the overarching policies of the emerging Local Plan. | None | | | |
| Environmental problems relevant to the plan or programme | | | Not significant | | | | | | | | | | As the main thrust of this policy is to deal with housing mix, there are not anticipated to be any environmental problems arising from it. | None | | | |
| The relevance of the plan or programme for the implementation of Community legislation on the environment | | | Not significant | | | | | | | | | | Any application submitted would be required to consider the impact upon Community Environmental legislation. | None | | | |
| Criteria 2 from Schedule 1 of 2004 SEA Regulations – Characteristics of the effects and of the area likely to be affected, having regard, in particular, to: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| The probability, duration, frequency and reversibility of the effects | | | Not significant | | | | | | | | | | Redressing housing imbalance is considered to be a positive impact but one which is unlikely to have significant environmental impacts. | None | | | |
| The cumulative nature of the effects | | | Not significant | | | | | | | | | | The cumulative impacts of redressing housing imbalance are considered likely to be positive and reduce overall housing need, however this is unlikely to have any significant environmental impacts. | None | | | |
| The transboundary nature of the effects | | | Not significant | | | | | | | | | | Redressing housing imbalances and addressing current and future housing needs could help prevent the outward migration of younger people to more affordable areas which is a beneficial impact, but not considered to be of sufficient significance with regard to SEA. | None | | | |
| The risks to human health or the environment (for example, due to accidents) | | | Not significant | | | | | | | | | | The policy is not considered likely to raise any risks to human health as it merely requires justification for the housing mix, types and tenures proposed. | None | | | |
| The magnitude and spatial extent of the effects (geographical area and size of the population likely to be affected) | | | Not significant | | | | | | | | | | The policy does not allocate specific sites for development, it merely requires justification for the housing mix, types and tenures proposed. | None | | | |
| The value and vulnerability of the area likely to be affected due to special natural characteristics or cultural heritage | | | Not significant | | | | | | | | | | The policy does not allocate specific sites for development, it merely requires justification for the housing mix, types and tenures proposed. | None | | | |
| The value and vulnerability of the area likely to be affected due to exceeded environmental quality standards or limit values | | | Not significant | | | | | | | | | | The policy does not allocate specific sites for development, it merely requires justification for the housing mix, types and tenures proposed. | None | | | |
| The value and vulnerability of the area likely to be affected due to intensive land-use | | | Not significant | | | | | | | | | | The policy does not allocate specific sites for development, it merely requires justification for the housing mix, types and tenures proposed. | None | | | |
| The effects on areas or landscapes which have a recognised national, community of international protection status. | | | Not significant | | | | | | | | | | The policy does not allocate specific sites for development, it merely requires justification for the housing mix, types and tenures proposed. | None | | | |
| **HRA Assessment** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Potential impact** | | | **Assessment of significant effect** | | | | | | | | | | **Justification** | **Amendments to Policy** | | | |
| Impact on bat foraging areas | | | Not significant | | | | | | | | | | The policy will not lead to the loss of any foraging areas for bats. | None | | | |
| Air and dust pollution impact on SAC | | | Not significant | | | | | | | | | | The policy is not considered to have any significant impact upon air and dust pollution levels. | None | | | |
| **Policy H3 – Building By Design:** *Quality of design is a key consideration for residential development. Proposals which fail to take opportunities available to enhance the local character and quality of the area and the way it functions or fails to comply with the Town Design Statement will be refused.* | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Assessment Criteria** | | | | **Assessment of Significant Effect** | | | | | | | | | **Justification** | **Amendments to Policy** | | | |
| Criteria 1 from Schedule 1 of 2004 SEA Regulations – The characteristics of plans and programmes having regard, in particular, to: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| The degree to which the plan or programme sets a framework for projects and other activities, either with regard to the location, nature, size and operating conditions or by allocating resources | | | | Not significant | | | | | | | | | The policy supplements and supports the emerging Local Plan policies relating to design and requiring design to respond to local character. | None | | | |
| The degree to which the plan or programme influences other plans and programmes including those in a hierarchy | | | | Not significant | | | | | | | | | The policy supplements and supports the emerging Local Plan policies relating to design requiring design to respond to local character whilst also requiring compliance with the Town Design Statement. | None | | | |
| The relevance of the plan or programme for the integration of environmental considerations in particular with a view to promoting sustainable development | | | | Non significant | | | | | | | | | The policy requires the enhancement and quality of the area with those that fail to do so liable for refusal. This is considered to be a positive impact but one that is non-significant in terms of likely environmental impacts. | None | | | |
| Environmental problems relevant to the plan or programme | | | | Non significant | | | | | | | | | The policy is not considered to have any impact upon environmental problems as it deals with the general principles of design. | None | | | |
| The relevance of the plan or programme for the implementation of Community legislation on the environment | | | | Non significant | | | | | | | | | Development proposals will have to demonstrate that they meet the requirements of Community Legislation. | None | | | |
| Criteria 2 from Schedule 1 of 2004 SEA Regulations – Characteristics of the effects and of the area likely to be affected, having regard, in particular, to: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| The probability, duration, frequency and reversibility of the effects | | | | Non significant | | | | | | | | | Good design will ensure greater longevity so the policy will have long term positive impacts. These are not however anticipated to be significant in terms of environmental impact. | None | | | |
| The cumulative nature of the effects | | | | Not significant | | | | | | | | | The cumulative impacts of good design could be that it encourages increased levels of quality design in the longer term. Whilst positive, this is not considered to be a significant impact. | None | | | |
| The transboundary nature of the effects | | | | Not significant | | | | | | | | | There are not considered to be any transboundary impacts arising from the design policy. | None | | | |
| The risks to human health or the environment (for example, due to accidents) | | | | Not significant | | | | | | | | | Any design work undertaken will have to take account of the risk of accidents and other risks to human health through health and safety legislation, therefore there is not considered to be a significant impact arising from the policy. | None | | | |
| The magnitude and spatial extent of the effects (geographical area and size of the population likely to be affected) | | | | Not significant | | | | | | | | | Whist the policy is anticipated to have positive impacts through increased design quality, these are difficult to quantify to a specific geographic area. | None | | | |
| The value and vulnerability of the area likely to be affected due to special natural characteristics or cultural heritage | | | | Not significant | | | | | | | | | Quality design will take account of special natural characteristics and cultural heritage. | None | | | |
| The value and vulnerability of the area likely to be affected due to exceeded environmental quality standards or limit values | | | | Not significant | | | | | | | | | Quality design will take account of environmental standards and limit values. | None | | | |
| The value and vulnerability of the area likely to be affected due to intensive land-use | | | | Not significant | | | | | | | | | Quality design will take account of the value and vulnerability of an area where more intensive land-uses are proposed. | None | | | |
| The effects on areas or landscapes which have a recognised national, community of international protection status. | | | | Not significant | | | | | | | | | Quality design will take account of landscape of recognised protection status. | None | | | |
| **HRA Assessment** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Potential impact** | **Assessment of significant effect** | | | | | | | | | | | | **Justification** | **Amendments to Policy** | | | |
| Impact on bat foraging areas | Not significant | | | | | | | | | | | | The policy will not lead to the loss of any foraging areas for bats. | None | | | |
| Air and dust pollution impact on SAC | Not significant | | | | | | | | | | | | The policy is not considered to have any significant impact upon air and dust pollution levels. | None | | | |
| **Policy H4 – Delivering Major Projects:** *Any development which, as a whole or by the sum of parts provides over 100 houses are essentially creating a new community and as such shall be regarded as a community development, and as such developers will be required to set out a management plan detailing how members of that community will interact with each other and the wider Frome population. Planning applications will be expected to include:*   * *A clear statement of the intended composition of the proposed community and a future asset management plan* * *Clear and deliverable objectives in terms of meeting the Town’s sustainable objectives of One Planet Living (as outlined in VCO3 of this Plan)* * *A variety of housing in terms of size, form and tenures including provision for home working* * *A statement on access and integration that shall include pedestrian and cycle links between the new development and the existing Town community and neighbourhood facilities (in the case of Southfield Farm, this must include a pedestrian link across the river to Adderwell)* * *Provision for serviced plots to be made available for self build or custom build housing\*1 equivalent in number to at least 5% of the total housing numbers*   *\*1 (as defined as a development where the future owner or occupier has a direct or indirect influence on the design, planning and construction of the property).* | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Assessment Criteria** | | | **Assessment of Significant Effect** | | | | | | | | | | **Justification** | **Amendments to Policy** | | | |
| Criteria 1 from Schedule 1 of 2004 SEA Regulations – The characteristics of plans and programmes having regard, in particular, to: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| The degree to which the plan or programme sets a framework for projects and other activities, either with regard to the location, nature, size and operating conditions or by allocating resources | | | Not significant | | | | | | | | | | The policy provides a framework for large developments of 100 dwellings or more which supplements the policies of the emerging Local Plan and is not considered likely to lead to significant environmental impacts. | None | | | |
| The degree to which the plan or programme influences other plans and programmes including those in a hierarchy | | | Not significant | | | | | | | | | | The policy provides a framework for large developments of 100 dwellings or more which supplements the policies of the emerging Local Plan. The requirement to adhere to ‘One Planet Living’ principles is considered to be appropriate in terms of reducing any potential environmental effects. | None | | | |
| The relevance of the plan or programme for the integration of environmental considerations in particular with a view to promoting sustainable development | | | Not significant | | | | | | | | | | The policy requires development to demonstrate how it will meet the Towns ‘One Planet Living’ principles which promote sustainable development objectives. | None | | | |
| Environmental problems relevant to the plan or programme | | | Not significant | | | | | | | | | | Sites of 100 dwellings or more would be required to mitigate against any environmental problems through the overarching policies of the emerging Local Plan. | None | | | |
| The relevance of the plan or programme for the implementation of Community legislation on the environment | | | Not significant | | | | | | | | | | The development of site of 100 dwellings or more will be required to take account of impacts on Community Environmental legislation anyway, and the self-build plots will also fall under this jurisdiction. | None | | | |
| Criteria 2 from Schedule 1 of 2004 SEA Regulations – Characteristics of the effects and of the area likely to be affected, having regard, in particular, to: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| The probability, duration, frequency and reversibility of the effects | | | Not significant | | | | | | | | | | The policy is considered likely to deliver a longer term increase in the level of self-build properties in Frome which will be a positive, albeit not significant impact. | None | | | |
| The cumulative nature of the effects | | | Not significant | | | | | | | | | | The cumulative nature of the policy could lead to an increased level of self-build properties in Frome which is considered to be a positive, yet not significant impact. | None | | | |
| The transboundary nature of the effects | | | Not significant | | | | | | | | | | There are not considered to be any trans boundary impacts arising from this policy. | None | | | |
| The risks to human health or the environment (for example, due to accidents) | | | Not significant | | | | | | | | | | There is the potential for a greater degree of accidents on a self-build project where the owners are carrying out the work themselves, but this is not considered to be a significant impact as health and safety regulations will be applicable. | None | | | |
| The magnitude and spatial extent of the effects (geographical area and size of the population likely to be affected) | | | Not significant | | | | | | | | | | Sites of 100 dwellings or more have the potential to have a significant impact upon a relatively large geographical area and segment of the population, however mitigatory requirements of the overarching policies of the emerging Local Plan mean that there are not anticipated to be significant effects. | None | | | |
| The value and vulnerability of the area likely to be affected due to special natural characteristics or cultural heritage | | | Not significant | | | | | | | | | | Sites of 100 dwellings or more would be required to mitigate against any effects upon special natural characteristics or cultural heritage through the overarching policies of the emerging Local Plan. | None | | | |
| The value and vulnerability of the area likely to be affected due to exceeded environmental quality standards or limit values | | | Not significant | | | | | | | | | | Sites of 100 dwellings or more would be required to mitigate against any effects upon environmental quality standards or limit values through the overarching policies of the emerging Local Plan. | None | | | |
| The value and vulnerability of the area likely to be affected due to intensive land-use | | | Not significant | | | | | | | | | | Sites of 100 dwellings or more would be required to mitigate against any effects of intensification of land use through the overarching policies of the emerging Local Plan. | None | | | |
| The effects on areas or landscapes which have a recognised national, community of international protection status. | | | Not significant | | | | | | | | | | Sites of 100 dwellings or more would be required to mitigate against any effects on protected areas or landscape through the overarching policies of the emerging Local Plan. | None | | | |
| **HRA Assessment** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Potential impact** | | | **Assessment of significant effect** | | | | | | | | | | **Justification** | **Amendments to Policy** | | | |
| Impact on bat foraging areas | | | Not significant | | | | | | | | | | The policy will not lead to the loss of any foraging areas for bats. | None | | | |
| Air and dust pollution impact on SAC | | | Not significant | | | | | | | | | | The policy is not considered to have any significant impact upon air and dust pollution levels. | None | | | |
| **Policy H5 – Energy Efficient Homes:** *The Town Council encourages the development of homes*  *that exceed the minimum Code for Sustainable Homes requirements from the development plan*  *Where it can be verified that new residential developments will exceed the requirements of Building Regulations part L1A (conservation of heat and power, new dwellings) Frome Town Council will provide a an appropriate refund of Community Infrastructure Levy based on the funds it receives through that process from that development* | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Assessment Criteria** | | | | | | **Assessment of Significant Effect** | | | | | | | **Justification** | **Amendments to Policy** | | | |
| Criteria 1 from Schedule 1 of 2004 SEA Regulations – The characteristics of plans and programmes having regard, in particular, to: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| The degree to which the plan or programme sets a framework for projects and other activities, either with regard to the location, nature, size and operating conditions or by allocating resources | | | | | | Not significant | | | | | | | The policy allows the Plan to encourage energy efficiency and other sustainbility measures supported by local and national policy. | None. | | | |
| The degree to which the plan or programme influences other plans and programmes including those in a hierarchy | | | | | | Not significant | | | | | | | The policy only comes into force should CIL become adopted. | None. | | | |
| The relevance of the plan or programme for the integration of environmental considerations in particular with a view to promoting sustainable development | | | | | | Not significant | | | | | | | The purpose of the policy is to encourage the provision of more energy efficient and sustainable homes. | None | | | |
| Environmental problems relevant to the plan or programme | | | | | | Not significant | | | | | | | The policy seeks to improve the levels of energy efficiency in new development which whilst beneficial, is not considered to be significant. | None | | | |
| The relevance of the plan or programme for the implementation of Community legislation on the environment | | | | | | Not significant | | | | | | | The policy is not considered relevant to Community Environmental legislation. | None | | | |
| Criteria 2 from Schedule 1 of 2004 SEA Regulations – Characteristics of the effects and of the area likely to be affected, having regard, in particular, to: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| The probability, duration, frequency and reversibility of the effects | | | | | | Not significant | | | | | | | The policy is intended to help to reduce the impacts of climate change over the longer term through improved energy efficiency which whilst beneficial, is not considered to be significant. | None | | | |
| The cumulative nature of the effects | | | | | | Not significant | | | | | | | The cumulative effects of the policy could be an overall improvement in energy efficiency in Frome which whilst positive, is not considered to be significant in the overall context of the district. | None | | | |
| The transboundary nature of the effects | | | | | | Not significant | | | | | | | There are not considered to be any transboundary effects arising from this policy. | None | | | |
| The risks to human health or the environment (for example, due to accidents) | | | | | | Not significant | | | | | | | The policy does not have any impacts upon risks to human health or the environment. | None | | | |
| The magnitude and spatial extent of the effects (geographical area and size of the population likely to be affected) | | | | | | Not significant | | | | | | | Whilst improvements in energy efficiency may contribute to mitigating the impacts of climate change which would be a positive impact over a wider geographic area, the scale of likely provision is considered to be non-significant. | None | | | |
| The value and vulnerability of the area likely to be affected due to special natural characteristics or cultural heritage | | | | | | Not significant | | | | | | | The policy relates to improvements in energy efficiency so is not considered to impact upon the value of areas of special natural characteristics of cultural heritage. | None | | | |
| The value and vulnerability of the area likely to be affected due to exceeded environmental quality standards or limit values | | | | | | Not significant | | | | | | | The policy relates to improvements in energy efficiency so is not considered to impact upon the value of areas due to exceeded environmental quality standards or limit values | None | | | |
| The value and vulnerability of the area likely to be affected due to intensive land-use | | | | | | Not significant | | | | | | | The policy relates to improvements in energy efficiency so is not considered to impact upon the value of areas as a result of intensification of land use. | None | | | |
| The effects on areas or landscapes which have a recognised national, community of international protection status. | | | | | | Not significant | | | | | | | The policy relates to improvements in energy efficiency so is not considered to impact upon the value of protected areas or landscapes. | None | | | |
| **HRA Assessment** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Potential impact** | **Assessment of significant effect** | | | | | | | | | | | | **Justification** | **Amendments to Policy** | | | |
| Impact on bat foraging areas | Not significant | | | | | | | | | | | | The policy will not lead to the loss of any foraging areas for bats. | None | | | |
| Air and dust pollution impact on SAC | Not significant | | | | | | | | | | | | The policy is not considered to have any significant impact upon air and dust pollution levels. | None | | | |
| **Policy H6 – Community Housing:** *As an exception to normal policy for the provision of housing set out in Core Policies 1 and 2 of the Mendip District draft Local Plan, Community Housing may be permitted adjoining the existing development boundary of the town on sites where development would not otherwise be permitted providing:*   1. *The development will provide collective land ownership and shared management responsibility* 2. *The development provides an appropriate mix of dwelling types and sizes, reflecting identified local need and meets demand based on the current Local Housing Needs Assessment or evidence from local Community Housing Groups and the Town Council* 3. *The development is energy efficient, and will not have an significant adverse impact on the character of the area and local landscape setting* 4. *Such proposals should not have an adverse or harmful impact on statutorily protected species or habitats* 5. *Prospective residents can demonstrate, through a development management plan, professional and financial capacity and competency in undertaking and completing the development* 6. *The land is held in trust as a community asset in perpetuity* 7. *Housing costs are made affordable by reference to capital costs or rent being no more than 80% of open market value and such discount is protected through succession.* | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Assessment Criteria** | | | **Assessment of Significant Effect** | | | | | | | | | | **Justification** | **Amendments to Policy** | | | |
| Criteria 1 from Schedule 1 of 2004 SEA Regulations – The characteristics of plans and programmes having regard, in particular, to: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| The degree to which the plan or programme sets a framework for projects and other activities, either with regard to the location, nature, size and operating conditions or by allocating resources | | | Not  significant | | | | | | | | | | The Frome Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) policies do not seek to alter the town’s functional role within the District and reinforce Frome’s role as an important market town, there is some conflict however with the proposal under  Policy H6: Community Housing, to allow a development outside of, but adjacent to, the settlement boundary for Frome provided that a range of requirements can be met. This has a potential conflict with CP1 which states that development outside of settlement boundaries will be strictly controlled and only permitted where it benefits economic activity or extends the range of facilities available to local communities.  However the CP1 states that *“In identifying land for development the Local Plan’s emphasis is on maximising the re-use of appropriate previously developed sites and other land within existing settlement limits as defined on the Policies Map, and then at the most sustainable locations on the edge of the identified settlements”.*  The Plan also says that the plan supports self build and is supported in this by the NPPF. When this is combined with the desire for self build, the identified lack of supply and that CP1 says that development can take place where appropriate at “*most sustainable locations on the edge of the identified settlements”* then there is compliance with this policy. | None | | | |
| The degree to which the plan or programme influences other plans and programmes including those in a hierarchy | | | Not  significant | | | | | | | | | | The policy proposes an exception to normal policy set out in Core Policy 1 but for justifiable reasons that are supported by the Local Plan, the community, national policy and a lack of alternatives. | None | | | |
| The relevance of the plan or programme for the integration of environmental considerations in particular with a view to promoting sustainable development | | | Not  significant | | | | | | | | | | Emerging Local Plan Core Policy 1 seeks to strictly control development outside of the development boundary. The policy proposes an exception to normal policy set out in Core Policy 1 but for justifiable reasons that are supported by the Local Plan, the community, national policy and a lack of alternatives. Criteria are worded to protect adverse effects on environmental matters. | None | | | |
| Environmental problems relevant to the plan or programme | | | Not  significant | | | | | | | | | | Criteria are worded to protect adverse effects on environmental matters. | None | | | |
| The relevance of the plan or programme for the implementation of Community legislation on the environment | | | Not significant | | | | | | | | | | Any proposed sites outside of the settlement boundary would have to consider their potential impact upon Community Environmental legislation. | None | | | |
| Criteria 2 from Schedule 1 of 2004 SEA Regulations – Characteristics of the effects and of the area likely to be affected, having regard, in particular, to: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| The probability, duration, frequency and reversibility of the effects | | | Not  Significant | | | | | | | | | | The effects of the policy will not be reversible but would not take place subject to compliance with strict criteria on landscape and biodiversity. | None | | | |
| The cumulative nature of the effects | | | Not  Significant | | | | | | | | | | The cumulative impact of permitting development outside the development boundary could lead to significant intrusion into the countryside surrounding Frome. However the policy contains criteria to prevent a cumulative impact causing harm to environmental matters. The individual proposals themselves would be assessed under EIA if meeting the criteria. | None | | | |
| The transboundary nature of the effects | | | Not  significant | | | | | | | | | | There are no transboundary effects | None | | | |
| The risks to human health or the environment (for example, due to accidents) | | | Not significant | | | | | | | | | | There are no significant risks to human health anticipated from this policy. | None | | | |
| The magnitude and spatial extent of the effects (geographical area and size of the population likely to be affected) | | | Not  Significant | | | | | | | | | | The development of sites outside the settlement boundary has the potential to impact upon both the population within Frome itself and the surrounding countryside. The policy only allows such development adjoin the settlement boundary and as such impacts on travel to work times will not be significantly affected. The policy will not exempt from complying with the recommended housing numbers of the Local Plan or causing an oversupply of housing when controls exist to comply with the numbers in the Local Plan | None | | | |
| The value and vulnerability of the area likely to be affected due to special natural characteristics or cultural heritage | | | Not  Significant | | | | | | | | | | The policy seeks to enable development outside of development boundary but are subject to criteria that will impact on what individual sites are suitable and it is those away from high landscape impact or impact on biodiversity/protected species that will be most suitable. Such safeguards will mean that the impacts are not significant. | None | | | |
| The value and vulnerability of the area likely to be affected due to exceeded environmental quality standards or limit values | | | Not  Significant | | | | | | | | | | The policy seeks to enable development outside of development boundary but are subject to criteria that will impact on what individual sites are suitable and it is those away from high landscape impact or impact on biodiversity/protected species that will be most suitable. Such safeguards will mean that the impacts are not significant. | None | | | |
| The value and vulnerability of the area likely to be affected due to intensive land-use | | | Not  significant | | | | | | | | | | The sites will abut the settlement boundary where more intensive land use will be anticipated. Such sites will need to link to existing infrastructure. The full impacts will be dependent on the location in which such ‘exception site’ proposals come forward. The criteria of the policy will prevent significant impacts. | None | | | |
| The effects on areas or landscapes which have a recognised national, community of international protection status. | | | Not  Significant | | | | | | | | | | Sites outside of the settlement boundary are unlikely to impact upon the Conservation Area although development outside of the development boundary, much of which is identified as being good quality land, and therefore has the potential to impact upon important areas or landscapes subject to the location of such development however the criteria of the policy will direct such development away from those areas with designated status. |  | | | |
| **HRA Assessment** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Potential impact** | | | **Assessment of significant effect** | | | | | | | | | | **Justification** | **Amendments to Policy** | | | |
| Impact on bat foraging areas | | | No  significant impacts | | | | | | | | | | Any sites brought forward through this policy will be located away from the Environmental Zone of Influence of the Mells Valley SAC due to policy criteria. The sites are likely to be relatively small, any required mitigation should be able to be appropriately provided. Any sites proposed will have to comply with the policy requirement to prevent impact on protected species and habitats.  the policy makes provision for appropriate protection by stating that proposals should not have an adverse or harmful impact on statutorily protected species or habitats. | None | | | |
| Air and dust pollution impact on SAC | | | No  significant impacts | | | | | | | | | | Any sites brought forward through this policy should be located away from the Environmental Zone of Influence of the Mells Valley SAC and given that the sites are likely to be relatively small, any required mitigation should be able to be appropriately provided. Any sites proposed will have to comply with the policy requirement to prevent impact on protected species and habitats.  The nature of the proposed use does not have a high potential to cause air and dust pollution when in operation.  The construction phase can be controlled and will be limited in time.c | None | | | |
| **Policy BE1 – Employment Land Allocation:** *In collaboration with Mendip District Council, through the*  *Local Plan Part II - Site Allocations allocate an additional 5ha of Employment land over the Plan period.* | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Assessment Criteria** | | | | | **Assessment of Significant Effect** | | | | | | | | **Justification** | **Amendment to Policy** | | | |
| Criteria 1 from Schedule 1 of 2004 SEA Regulations – The characteristics of plans and programmes having regard, in particular, to: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| The degree to which the plan or programme sets a framework for projects and other activities, either with regard to the location, nature, size and operating conditions or by allocating resources | | | | | Not significant | | | | | | | | The plan sets a broad requirement for the provision of additional employment land in excess of emerging Local Plan requirements but does not seek to allocate specific sites to fulfil this requirement. This would only be done through a development plan document subject to its own assessment procedure. | None | | | |
| The degree to which the plan or programme influences other plans and programmes including those in a hierarchy | | | | | Not significant | | | | | | | | The policy sets size requirements for additional employment provision of 5 ha which it is assumed is in addition to the 20.2 ha already identified as required for Frome in the emerging Local Plan. The level of employment land for Frome has been identified in the emerging Local Plan through detailed studies into employment projections and anticipated land requirements to fulfil this need. This is an identified local requirement to address issues such as out commuting. | None | | | |
| The relevance of the plan or programme for the integration of environmental considerations in particular with a view to promoting sustainable development | | | | | Not significant | | | | | | | | The proposed policy will help to encourage employment generating uses in the town, potentially reducing the need commute to other towns. Impacts upon amenity will be assessed through the planning application process and unacceptable uses would not be permitted. | None | | | |
| Environmental problems relevant to the plan or programme | | | | | Not significant | | | | | | | | Carbon emissions arising from out commuting is considered to be a problem in Frome, but it is not considered that the effect will be significant when viewed in the overall context of travel patterns in the district. | None | | | |
| The relevance of the plan or programme for the implementation of Community legislation on the environment | | | | | Not significant | | | | | | | | Community Environmental legislation is considered to be a relevant issue, particularly as the policy does not contain provisions to protect neighbourhood amenity in terms of noise, air quality etc. However the overarching policies of the emerging Local Plan, particularly policy DP7 dealing with design and amenity of new development, make appropriate provision for this not to be significant. | None | | | |
| Criteria 2 from Schedule 1 of 2004 SEA Regulations – Characteristics of the effects and of the area likely to be affected, having regard, in particular, to: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| The probability, duration, frequency and reversibility of the effects | | | | | Not significant | | | | | | | | Effects would vary from site to site and reflect cycle of economic growth and demand, however the overall effect is not considered to be significant. | None | | | |
| The cumulative nature of the effects | | | | | Not significant | | | | | | | | It is difficult to predict how much of the additional employment land proposed will be taken up given that the emerging Local Plan already makes provision for a significant level of employment land across the Plan period. | None | | | |
| The transboundary nature of the effects | | | | | Not significant | | | | | | | | The policy should assist in reducing the need to commute to other towns for employment purposes, however given that travel behaviour is affected by a wide range of influences the effect is not considered significant. | None | | | |
| The risks to human health or the environment (for example, due to accidents) | | | | | Not significant | | | | | | | | The provision of more employment land could lead to increased levels of accidents at work, however given that health and safety legislation will cover the protection of workers this is not likely to be considered a significant risk. | None | | | |
| The magnitude and spatial extent of the effects (geographical area and size of the population likely to be affected) | | | | | Not significant | | | | | | | | It is difficult to predict how much of the additional employment land proposed will be taken up given that the emerging Local Plan already makes provision for a significant level of employment land across the Plan period. | None | | | |
| The value and vulnerability of the area likely to be affected due to special natural characteristics or cultural heritage | | | | | Not significant | | | | | | | | The Plan does not allocate the sites, however all development that may fall within the Conservation Area or impact upon its setting and appearance would have to give due regard to such matters through the overarching policies of the emerging Local Plan. | None | | | |
| The value and vulnerability of the area likely to be affected due to exceeded environmental quality standards or limit values | | | | | Not significant | | | | | | | | The policy does not contain provisions to protect neighbourhood amenity in terms of noise, air quality etc. However the overarching policies of the emerging Local Plan, particularly policy DP7 dealing with design and amenity of new development, make appropriate provision for this not to be significant. | None | | | |
| The value and vulnerability of the area likely to be affected due to intensive land-use | | | | | Not significant | | | | | | | | In some cases land use may become more intensive through allocation for employment use, however the impacts are difficult to assess as the site are as yet unallocated. However the overarching policies of the emerging Local Plan make appropriate provision for this not to be significant. | None | | | |
| The effects on areas or landscapes which have a recognised national, community of international protection status. | | | | | Not significant | | | | | | | | The Plan does not allocate the sites, however all development that may fall within the Conservation Area or impact upon its setting and appearance would have to give due regard to such matters through the overarching policies of the emerging Local Plan. | None | | | |
| **HRA Assessment** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Potential impact** | | | | | | | | | **Assessment of significant effect** | | | | **Justification** | **Amendments to Policy** | | | |
| Impact on bat foraging areas | | | | | | | | | Not significant | | | | The policy is not considered likely to lead to the loss of any foraging areas for bats as any identified new employment sites would be required to undertake environmental studies. | None | | | |
| Air and dust pollution impact on SAC | | | | | | | | | Not significant | | | | The policy is not considered likely to have any significant impact upon air and dust pollution levels. | None | | | |
| **Policy BE2 – Protection of Employment Land:** *In addition to Local Plan Policy DP20, the redevelopment of ‘Valuable Employment Sites’ shown on the map on pg 21 for non-employment uses will be restricted. Such development would only be granted in exceptional circumstances where it can be clearly demonstrated that no demand exists within this area for B1, B2 or B8 uses and an alternative and equal provision is made elsewhere in Frome unless it can be*  *clearly demonstrated that this is not possible or viable.* | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Assessment Criteria** | | | | | | **Assessment of Significant Effect** | | | | | | | **Justification** | **Amendments to Policy** | | | |
| Criteria 1 from Schedule 1 of 2004 SEA Regulations – The characteristics of plans and programmes having regard, in particular, to: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| The degree to which the plan or programme sets a framework for projects and other activities, either with regard to the location, nature, size and operating conditions or by allocating resources | | | | | | Not significant | | | | | | | The policy seeks to protect the most valuable and viable ‘B’ use employment sites, although it is precautionary and only seeks protection where there is a viable long term future for the use in the town. | None | | | |
| The degree to which the plan or programme influences other plans and programmes including those in a hierarchy | | | | | | Not significant | | | | | | | The policy complements the emerging Local Plan policy on employment land protection and adds a local dimension to it. The policy has been developed so as to ensure that it does not frustrate the delivery of the housing target set out in the Local Plan. | None | | | |
| The relevance of the plan or programme for the integration of environmental considerations in particular with a view to promoting sustainable development | | | | | | Not significant | | | | | | | Protection of valuable employment sites may reduce out commuting and whilst beneficial, this is not considered significant when viewed in the overall context of district wide travel patterns. | None | | | |
| Environmental problems relevant to the plan or programme | | | | | | Not significant | | | | | | | Carbon emissions as a result of out-commuting are considered to be a problem relevant to the plan, although this is not considered significant when viewed in the overall context of district wide travel patterns. | None | | | |
| The relevance of the plan or programme for the implementation of Community legislation on the environment | | | | | | Not significant | | | | | | | The retention of employment sites rather than allowing their redevelopment for housing ensures that the existing situation remains unchanged and consequently it is considered that there is unlikely to be implications on Community Environmental legislation. | None | | | |
| Criteria 2 from Schedule 1 of 2004 SEA Regulations – Characteristics of the effects and of the area likely to be affected, having regard, in particular, to: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| The probability, duration, frequency and reversibility of the effects | | | | | | Not significant | | | | | | | As the policy seeks the protection of sites from redevelopment effects would arise from reducing the need to commute out of town for employment. However these effects would fluctuate as travel behaviour is affected by a wide range of influences and so the effect is not considered significant. | None | | | |
| The cumulative nature of the effects | | | | | | Not significant | | | | | | | The cumulative impact of the policy would result in retained employment sites across Frome and a reduced need to out commute. However these effects are unlikely to be significant as the policy does allow the development of employment site subject to appropriate justification to meet the criteria. | None | | | |
| The transboundary nature of the effects | | | | | | Not significant | | | | | | | The policy has the potential to reduce out commuting, however travel behaviour is affected by a wide range of influences and therefore the effect is not considered significant. | None | | | |
| The risks to human health or the environment (for example, due to accidents) | | | | | | Not significant | | | | | | | Health and Safety legislation will cover any increased risks to human health. | None | | | |
| The magnitude and spatial extent of the effects (geographical area and size of the population likely to be affected) | | | | | | Not significant | | | | | | | The effect of increased levels of sustainable transport movements is difficult to quantify to a specific geographic area. | None | | | |
| The value and vulnerability of the area likely to be affected due to special natural characteristics or cultural heritage | | | | | | Not significant | | | | | | | The policy does not protect disused sites that might provide habitat for protected species. It is considered that there may be sites in and around the Conservation Area which may be more appropriately developed for housing, however the number of sites in the Conservation Area likely to be affected is not considered likely to be sufficient to classify this as a significant effect. | None | | | |
| The value and vulnerability of the area likely to be affected due to exceeded environmental quality standards or limit values | | | | | | Not significant | | | | | | | The policy is not considered likely to have any adverse impact upon the exceedance of environmental quality standards or limit values. | None | | | |
| The value and vulnerability of the area likely to be affected due to intensive land-use | | | | | | Not significant | | | | | | | Given that the policy seeks to ensure the continuation of the existing use on the sites there is unlikely to be any significant effects. | None | | | |
| The effects on areas or landscapes which have a recognised national, community of international protection status. | | | | | | Not significant | | | | | | | The policy does not protect disused sites that might provide habitat for protected species. It is considered that there may be sites in and around the Conservation Area which may be more appropriately developed for housing, however the number of sites in the Conservation Area likely to be affected is not considered likely to be sufficient to classify this as a significant effect. | None | | | |
| **HRA Assessment** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Potential impact** | **Assessment of significant effect** | | | | | | | | | | | | **Justification** | **Amendments to Policy** | | | |
| Impact on bat foraging areas | Not significant | | | | | | | | | | | | The policy is not considered likely to lead to the loss of any foraging areas for bats. | None | | | |
| Air and dust pollution impact on SAC | Not significant | | | | | | | | | | | | The policy is not considered likely to have any significant impact upon air and dust pollution levels. | None | | | |
| **Policy BE3 - Sustainable Development:** The Town Council encourages development that exceeds the BREEAM  standards, where it can be verified that new development will exceed the requirements of Building Regulations part L2a (conservation of heat and power, new buildings other than dwellings ) Frome Town Council is considering an incentive scheme, details of the scheme are available on the Town Council website http://www.frometowncouncil.  gov.uk willing to negotiate an appropriate reduction in Community Infrastructure Levy  Note: The policy approach to sustainable construction is currently under review by the Government and all or some elements of this policy may be superseded by the changes. In this eventuality the application of this policy would be assessed in accordance with the latest Government policy. But the aim of the policy will continue that proposals that exceed the minimum requirements will be eligible for the refund in line with the incentive scheme by the Town Council in  response to the proposal*.* | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Assessment Criteria** | | | | | **Assessment of Significant Effect** | | | | | | | | **Justification** | **Amendments to Policy** | | | |
| Criteria 1 from Schedule 1 of 2004 SEA Regulations – The characteristics of plans and programmes having regard, in particular, to: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| The degree to which the plan or programme sets a framework for projects and other activities, either with regard to the location, nature, size and operating conditions or by allocating resources | | | | | Not significant | | | | | | | | The policy seeks to ensure that large employment developments are as sustainable and energy efficient as possible by complying with the core principles of the NDP. These requirements are broadly compliant with the overarching policies of the emerging Local Plan and are therefore not considered likely to have significant impacts. | None | | | |
| The degree to which the plan or programme influences other plans and programmes including those in a hierarchy | | | | | Not significant | | | | | | | | The policy is broadly compliant with the principles of encouraging sustainable development as set out in the emerging Local Plan. | None | | | |
| The relevance of the plan or programme for the integration of environmental considerations in particular with a view to promoting sustainable development | | | | | Not significant | | | | | | | | The policy is supportive of encouraging more energy efficient and sustainable development and whilst this is a positive effect, it is not considered significant. | None | | | |
| Environmental problems relevant to the plan or programme | | | | | Not significant | | | | | | | | The requirements of the policy would help to reduce energy usage and therefore help to mitigate the impacts of climate change, although there are not considered to be significant effects in the overall context of development within the district. | None | | | |
| The relevance of the plan or programme for the implementation of Community legislation on the environment | | | | | Not significant | | | | | | | | There is the potential for new development to impact upon Community Environmental legislation however new development would be required to mitigate such impacts through the planning system. | None | | | |
| Criteria 2 from Schedule 1 of 2004 SEA Regulations – Characteristics of the effects and of the area likely to be affected, having regard, in particular, to: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| The probability, duration, frequency and reversibility of the effects | | | | | Not significant | | | | | | | | The policy when viewed in the context of supporting sustainable employment space could help to reduce the level of out commuting to other settlements. However in the overall context these effects would fluctuate as travel behaviour is affected by a wide range of influences and so the effect is not considered likely to be significant. | None | | | |
| The cumulative nature of the effects | | | | | Not significant | | | | | | | | Cumulatively the requirement for large employment development to meet the broad sustainable development principles of ‘One Planet Living’ should have a positive impact upon the environment, however this is not expected to be significant in the overall context of development in the district. | None | | | |
| The transboundary nature of the effects | | | | | Not significant | | | | | | | | There are not considered to be any transboundary effects likely to arise from the implementation of this policy. | None | | | |
| The risks to human health or the environment (for example, due to accidents) | | | | | Not significant | | | | | | | | The policy has the potential to bring positive benefits through mitigating the impacts of climate change through sustainable development principles, however in the overall context this is not considered significant. | None | | | |
| The magnitude and spatial extent of the effects (geographical area and size of the population likely to be affected) | | | | | Not significant | | | | | | | | As stated above, when viewed in the context of supporting sustainable employment space, the policy could help to reduce the level of out commuting to other settlements. However in the overall context these effects would fluctuate as travel behaviour is affected by a wide range of influences and so the effect is not considered significant. | None | | | |
| The value and vulnerability of the area likely to be affected due to special natural characteristics or cultural heritage | | | | | Not significant | | | | | | | | Employment development of all sizes will be required to ensure that it does not impact upon special natural characteristics or cultural heritage through the overarching emerging Local Plan policies. | None | | | |
| The value and vulnerability of the area likely to be affected due to exceeded environmental quality standards or limit values | | | | | Not significant | | | | | | | | Employment development of all sizes will be required to ensure that it does exceed environmental quality standards or limit values through the overarching emerging Local Plan policies. | None | | | |
| The value and vulnerability of the area likely to be affected due to intensive land-use | | | | | Not significant | | | | | | | | Employment development of all sizes will be required to ensure that any intensification of use will mitigated through the overarching emerging Local Plan policies. | None | | | |
| The effects on areas or landscapes which have a recognised national, community of international protection status. | | | | | Not significant | | | | | | | | Employment development of all sizes will be required to ensure that it does not impact upon areas or landscapes which are protected through the overarching emerging Local Plan policies. | None | | | |
| **HRA Assessment** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Potential impact** | **Assessment of significant effect** | | | | | | | | | | | | **Justification** | **Amendments to Policy** | | | |
| Impact on bat foraging areas | Not significant | | | | | | | | | | | | The policy is not considered likely to lead to the loss of any foraging areas for bats. | None | | | |
| Air and dust pollution impact on SAC | Not significant | | | | | | | | | | | | The policy is not considered likely to have any significant impact upon air and dust pollution levels. | None | | | |
| **Policy TC1 – Town Centre Remodelling:** *The Town Council, in collaboration with Mendip District Council and Somerset County Council, will, as a priority, seek to implement the scheme identified by the Frome Town Centre Remodelling Feasibility Study subject to funding.*  *Remodelling the Town Centre should provide improvements to the public realm. Proposals should be based on significant*  *levels of community involvement which will contribute to the final design. Remodelling of the Town Centre within the*  *area shown on the map which accords with the following principles will be permitted:*  *• Improve the town centre environment for pedestrians.*  *• Reduce the impact of traffic movement from vehicles and re-order the priorities between motorised vehicles, cycles and pedestrians.*  *• Remodelling proposals that alter flows or speeds of traffic will be assessed for their impact on air quality*  *• Enhance the character and appearance of the town centre, taking into account the principles of the Town*  *Design Statement relating to this area*  *• Provide an improved setting and location for the markets*  *• Demonstrate that it will cause no deterioration in air quality* | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Assessment Criteria** | **Assessment of Significant Effect** | | | | | | | | | | | | **Justification** | **Amendments to Policy** | | | |
| Criteria 1 from Schedule 1 of 2004 SEA Regulations – The characteristics of plans and programmes having regard, in particular, to: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| The degree to which the plan or programme sets a framework for projects and other activities, either with regard to the location, nature, size and operating conditions or by allocating resources | Not significant | | | | | | | | | | | | The policy offers broad support to the remodelling of the public realm of the town centre. These works concentrate on improving the public realm rather than the construction of any new buildings. A framework is set for the town centre remodelling through the NDP as it identifies which streets remodelling should be concentrated upon and the principles that should be applied in doing so. | None | | | |
| The degree to which the plan or programme influences other plans and programmes including those in a hierarchy | Not significant | | | | | | | | | | | | The emerging Local Plan makes reference to delivering initiatives such as remodelling the Market Place through the NDP, with the NDP policy providing more detail on the parameters and principles of these works. The two policies broadly complement one another. | None | | | |
| The relevance of the plan or programme for the integration of environmental considerations in particular with a view to promoting sustainable development | Not  significant | | | | | | | | | | | | The remodelling would improve the town centre environment and help increase trading opportunities for local businesses by providing a more attractive pedestrian environment. This in turn may reduce the number of shopping trips to other settlements, however this is not significant when viewed in the context of district-wide travel patterns. The impact of housing numbers and employment land provision is considered to be of far greater significance.  Any applications will be subject to environmental consideration and the policy also requires significant levels of community involvement to contribute to the final design.  The criteria of the policy would ensure any such works did not cause significant impacts on air quality doe to altered traffic flows. | None  None | | | |
| Environmental problems relevant to the plan or programme | Not significant | | | | | | | | | | | | Despite the proximity to the River Frome, the remodelling should not have any impact on flooding from the river. Somerset County Council has asked for a detailed assessment of the impact on surface water runoff due to the topography of the site. Clearly any scheme that would result in flooding from surface water run-off would not be permitted and the Town Council would need to resolve this prior to submitting an application for the remodelling works. The final design will take account of the impact on the historic environment. | None | | | |
| The relevance of the plan or programme for the implementation of Community legislation on the environment | Not significant | | | | | | | | | | | | The town centre remodelling is considered to cause a slight reduction in town centre vehicular traffic which may have a positive impact on air quality in the town centre. The impact is not likely to be significant though as the reduced standard of air quality in the town is influenced by the topography of the town. Noise impacts are not considered to be significant given the size of the project and the small number of town centre residential properties. | None | | | |
| Criteria 2 from Schedule 1 of 2004 SEA Regulations – Characteristics of the effects and of the area likely to be affected, having regard, in particular, to: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| The probability, duration, frequency and reversibility of the effects | Not significant | | | | | | | | | | | | Whilst the remodelling work could be reversible, it is considered likely to be permanent. During the construction phase there could be some disruption to the town centre and main road, but this is unlikely to be for a long period and alternative arrangements can be made for vehicular and pedestrian access. | None | | | |
| The cumulative nature of the effects | Not significant | | | | | | | | | | | | The effects will be limited to the town centre. | None | | | |
| The transboundary nature of the effects | Not significant | | | | | | | | | | | | The remodelling of the town centre will make it more attractive for shopping and tourism but the effects are not considered to be significant when compared to overall travel patterns around the district. | None | | | |
| The risks to human health or the environment (for example, due to accidents) | Not significant | | | | | | | | | | | | The aim of the policy is to reduce the impact of traffic movements and re-order the priorities between vehicles and pedestrians, consequently the effects are considered to be positive. | None | | | |
| The magnitude and spatial extent of the effects (geographical area and size of the population likely to be affected) | Not significant | | | | | | | | | | | | Although this area of the town centre is one of the busiest, the overall affected area is comparatively small relative to the type of development. | None | | | |
| The value and vulnerability of the area likely to be affected due to special natural characteristics or cultural heritage | Not significant | | | | | | | | | | | | The town centre forms part of the Frome Conservation Area which contains many listed buildings within the town centre. The remodelling will have to take account of its sensitivity in relation to the conservation area, with the policy requiring account to be taken of the Frome Town Design Statement. The works only concern changes to the public realm rather than redeveloping buildings, although the impact upon their setting will be a matter for consideration. | None | | | |
| The value and vulnerability of the area likely to be affected due to exceeded environmental quality standards or limit values | Not  significant | | | | | | | | | | | | Air quality is an issue in the town centre with the Market Place and Bath Street areas identified in the Air Quality Updating and Screening Assessment 2012. As the proposed scheme will potentially reduce speeds through the town centre from an average of 15 mph to 11 mph there is likely to be increased decelerating and accelerating on the approach and exit to the remodelled area. However the policy itself which requires that proposals must be proven to cause no deterioration in air quality. Those that do not would be contrary to policy. | None. | | | |
| The value and vulnerability of the area likely to be affected due to intensive land-use | Not significant | | | | | | | | | | | | By their nature town centres are intensively used for a range of purposes, however the proposals are intended to allow the intensive use of the town centre in a more effective manner through giving higher priority to pedestrians. | None | | | |
| The effects on areas or landscapes which have a recognised national, community of international protection status. | Not significant | | | | | | | | | | | | There are no European sites or landscape designations affected by this policy. The town centre forms part of the Conservation Area and there are a number of Listed Buildings whose setting may be affected by the proposals, but these impacts are likely to be positive and the remodelling will be required to take into account the design principles of the Frome Town Design Statement. | None | | | |
| **HRA Assessment** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Potential impact** | **Assessment of significant effect** | | | | | | | | | | | | **Justification** | **Amendments to Policy** | | | |
| Impact on bat foraging areas | Not significant | | | | | | | | | | | | The remodelling will not lead to the loss of any foraging areas for bats. It is located in the centre of the town, does not involve the demolition of any buildings and any impacts of increased lighting are considered minimal within the town centre context. | None | | | |
| Air and dust pollution impact on SAC | Not significant | | | | | | | | | | | | The policy may reduce the impact of vehicular traffic on pedestrians within the town centre, but it is not considered likely to being about any increased air or dust pollution impacts on the SAC. | None | | | |
| **Policy TC3 – Westway Centre:** *Redevelopment or expansion of Westway Shopping Centre will be permitted subject to:*   * *Public realm improvements including access to the Frome River and tree planting* * *Sufficient car parking and space for buses being included within the redevelopment to ensure there is no detrimental impact on the viability of the town centre* * *The design reflects the aims and objectives of the Town Design Statement and policy BE3 relating to any scheme in excess of 1000 sqm* * *There will be no harmful or adverse impact on the biodiversity or protected species.* | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Assessment Criteria** | | | **Assessment of Significant Effect** | | | | | | | | | | **Justification** | **Amendments to Policy** | | | |
| Criteria 1 from Schedule 1 of 2004 SEA Regulations – The characteristics of plans and programmes having regard, in particular, to: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| The degree to which the plan or programme sets a framework for projects and other activities, either with regard to the location, nature, size and operating conditions or by allocating resources | | | Not significant | | | | | | | | | | Whilst the site is comparatively large in the context of Frome, the policy focus is upon improving the retail offer, public realm and access to the River Frome. The policy sets out a broad framework for the future redevelopment or expansion of the Westway Centre. The policy seeks to improve the setting of the Westway rather than alter the nature and operating conditions. The proposed effects of the policy are therefore not considered to be significant. | None | | | |
| The degree to which the plan or programme influences other plans and programmes including those in a hierarchy | | | Not significant | | | | | | | | | | Emerging Local Plan Core Policy 6 identifies overarching policy requirements for the delivery of an improved Westway Centre in the longer term, the policy in the NDP supplements and supports this. | None | | | |
| The relevance of the plan or programme for the integration of environmental considerations in particular with a view to promoting sustainable development | | | Not significant | | | | | | | | | | The redevelopment and expansion of the Westway Centre could help to increase Frome as a retail location and secure a broader retail offer for the town. | None | | | |
| Environmental problems relevant to the plan or programme | | | Not significant | | | | | | | | | | Any environmental problems on site will be considered through the normal planning process. Whilst the site is located close to the River Frome where there is the potential for flooding, given that redevelopment is likely to consist of retail uses on hard standing there is not considered to be a significantly increased risk of flooding to the site. This will be assessed and controlled through the usual planning processes. | None | | | |
| The relevance of the plan or programme for the implementation of Community legislation on the environment | | | Not significant | | | | | | | | | | It is not considered that there will be any impact on Environmental Community Legislation and that air quality will not be adversely impacted upon by this development. Noise impacts are not considered significant given the scale of the proposal and the limited number of residential dwellings in the town centre. There are not considered to be any likely impacts upon water quality in the River Frome, although this can be measured and controlled through the planning process. Retail uses are already established in this location. | None | | | |
| Criteria 2 from Schedule 1 of 2004 SEA Regulations – Characteristics of the effects and of the area likely to be affected, having regard, in particular, to: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| The probability, duration, frequency and reversibility of the effects | | | Not significant | | | | | | | | | | The redevelopment of the Westway Centre is considered to be in the longer term and will require private financing. Significant environmental effects in this context are not anticipated. | None | | | |
| The cumulative nature of the effects | | | Not significant | | | | | | | | | | The cumulative nature of redeveloping the centre is not considered to be significant with the main focus being to improve both the retail offer and physical appearance of the Westway Shopping Centre. Such redevelopment will not radically alter the function of the site. | None | | | |
| The transboundary nature of the effects | | | Not significant | | | | | | | | | | Whilst there may be some impact on the volume of trips made to other towns, this is not considered to be significant in the overall context of trip movements between other settlements in the area. | None | | | |
| The risks to human health or the environment (for example, due to accidents) | | | Not significant | | | | | | | | | | Improvements to the public realm and river access would be beneficial to human health with any risks associated with the use of this space able to be managed and therefore not considered significant. | None | | | |
| The magnitude and spatial extent of the effects (geographical area and size of the population likely to be affected) | | | Not significant | | | | | | | | | | Although the geographical area affected is fairly large relative to the size of the town centre, the policy does not intend to change the function of the site or its role within the town. | None | | | |
| The value and vulnerability of the area likely to be affected due to special natural characteristics or cultural heritage | | | Not significant | | | | | | | | | | The area adjacent to the river would be improved through redevelopment of the centre and given that the buildings on the site are generally incongruous with the rest of the town centre and Conservation Area, sensitive redevelopment of this area is considered likely to have a positive impact on the conservation area. | None | | | |
| The value and vulnerability of the area likely to be affected due to exceeded environmental quality standards or limit values | | | Not significant | | | | | | | | | | Given that the site is currently largely hard standing there is unlikely to be an increased flood risk arising from redevelopment of the site. Air quality is not considered likely to be adversely affected and although there will be positive benefits to the river corridor, these are not considered to be significant in the context of SEA. | None | | | |
| The value and vulnerability of the area likely to be affected due to intensive land-use | | | Not significant | | | | | | | | | | The area is mainly hard standing at present and although the site may be more intensively used through its redevelopment, this is not considered to be a significant issue given the existing setting. | None | | | |
| The effects on areas or landscapes which have a recognised national, community of international protection status. | | | Not significant | | | | | | | | | | There are no known protected landscape areas relating to this site, although opening up access to the River Frome would be a community benefit this is not considered to be significant in terms of environmental impacts. | None | | | |
| **HRA Assessment** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Potential impact** | | | **Assessment of significant effect** | | | | | | | | | | **Justification** | **Amendments to Policy** | | | |
| Impact on bat foraging areas | | | Not significant | | | | | | | | | | The policy intends to redevelop The Westway Centre, it is considered unlikely that the premises would be used for roosting or foraging.  The Mells Valley EZI does not extend into the town centre. | None | | | |
| Air and dust pollution impact on SAC | | | Not significant | | | | | | | | | | The policy is not anticipated to have any significant effects upon air or dust pollution levels. | None | | | |
| **Policy TC4 – The Cattle Market Car Park :** *Landscape and infrastructure improvements to the Cattle Market Car Park that improve this arrival point and enable this area to develop as a cultural destination will be supported.* | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Assessment Criteria** | | | | | | | **Assessment of Significant Effect** | | | | | | **Justification** | **Amendments to Policy** | | | |
| Criteria 1 from Schedule 1 of 2004 SEA Regulations – The characteristics of plans and programmes having regard, in particular, to: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| The degree to which the plan or programme sets a framework for projects and other activities, either with regard to the location, nature, size and operating conditions or by allocating resources | | | | | | | Not significant | | | | | | The policy seeks to ensure short term improvements in the operation of the site for car parking, with a longer term ambition for development of the site. A broad framework is set for the site on the basis of enhancing the arrival point and developing it as a cultural destination. | None | | | |
| The degree to which the plan or programme influences other plans and programmes including those in a hierarchy | | | | | | | Not significant | | | | | | The proposed policy is broadly compliant with emerging Local Plan Core Policy 6 for Frome which supports creative and imaginative public realm improvements. | None | | | |
| The relevance of the plan or programme for the integration of environmental considerations in particular with a view to promoting sustainable development | | | | | | | Not significant | | | | | | The policy seeks public realm and parking management improvements in the short term which may encourage more intensive use of the parking facilities, although there is no proposal for additional capacity and therefore it is unlikely to have significant impacts. The longer term aspirations for development of the site would be required to be in line with sustainable design principles. | None | | | |
| Environmental problems relevant to the plan or programme | | | | | | | Not significant | | | | | | The longer term redevelopment of the car park for other uses may bring about an improvement in air quality, whilst in the short term there are no proposals for extending the use of the car park and therefore it is unlikely to lead to any significant detrimental effect upon air quality. | None | | | |
| The relevance of the plan or programme for the implementation of Community legislation on the environment | | | | | | | Not significant | | | | | | Community legislation on the environment is unlikely to be impacted upon in the short term with the car park continuing in use albeit with improved management of traffic. In the longer term development proposals for the Cattle Market site would be required to consider the impact of development upon water protection in the River Frome. This is not considered likely to be a matter which would significantly impact upon the environment as appropriate mitigation could be implemented. | None | | | |
| Criteria 2 from Schedule 1 of 2004 SEA Regulations – Characteristics of the effects and of the area likely to be affected, having regard, in particular, to: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| The probability, duration, frequency and reversibility of the effects | | | | | | | Not significant | | | | | | Development of the site would be in the longer term but is considered to be irreversible. There may be positive impacts from the development of the site on the towns built environment. Whilst the site is relatively large, in the overall context of Frome it is not considered to be likely to have a significant impact, particularly given the likely timescales involved. | None | | | |
| The cumulative nature of the effects | | | | | | | Not significant | | | | | | If the site were to be brought forward for development then the cumulative impact alongside other development in the town would be that it would have a positive impact upon the towns built environment. | None | | | |
| The transboundary nature of the effects | | | | | | | Not significant | | | | | | There are not considered likely to be any transboundary issues arising from this development. | None | | | |
| The risks to human health or the environment (for example, due to accidents) | | | | | | | Not significant | | | | | | The development of this site for alternative uses than car parking in the longer term could have positive impacts upon human health by opening access to the River Frome whilst also decreasing the level of car travel in this particular part of the town. | None | | | |
| The magnitude and spatial extent of the effects (geographical area and size of the population likely to be affected) | | | | | | | Not significant | | | | | | There is a limited amount of residential development to the western and eastern boundaries of the site which may be impacted upon by longer term redevelopment of the site. Development proposals are considered likely to be formed of appropriate neighbouring uses and therefore there is not anticipated to be any significant impacts. | None | | | |
| The value and vulnerability of the area likely to be affected due to special natural characteristics or cultural heritage | | | | | | | Not significant | | | | | | The site is located adjacent to the Conservation Area and as a result any development of the site could potentially impact upon the setting and character. It is considered that development of the site would be controlled by overarching emerging Local Plan policies and would therefore not be of significant impact. | None | | | |
| The value and vulnerability of the area likely to be affected due to exceeded environmental quality standards or limit values | | | | | | | Not significant | | | | | | Any development of the site for uses other than car parking is likely to lead to an improvement in air quality in this part of the town. However this is a longer term proposal and will depend upon an appropriate scheme being developed in conjunction with Mendip District Council. | None | | | |
| The value and vulnerability of the area likely to be affected due to intensive land-use | | | | | | | Not significant | | | | | | The short term management of the car park is unlikely to lead to an intensification of use as no additional capacity is being proposed. In the longer term the development of the site for alternative uses will see an intensification of use in terms of development density. | None | | | |
| The effects on areas or landscapes which have a recognised national, community of international protection status. | | | | | | | Not significant | | | | | | The site is located adjacent to the Conservation Area and as a result any development of the site could potentially impact upon the setting and character. It is considered that development of the site would be controlled by overarching emerging Local Plan policies and would therefore not be of significant impact. | None | | | |
| **HRA Assessment** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Potential impact** | | | | | | | | | **Assessment of significant effect** | | | **Justification** | | **Amendments to Policy** | | | |
| Impact on bat foraging areas | | | | | | | | | Not significant | | | The policy intends to redevelop the Cattle Market area but it is considered unlikely that the existing uses on site would be used for roosting or foraging. The Mells Valley EZI does not extend into the town centre. | | None | | | |
| Air and dust pollution impact on SAC | | | | | | | | | Not significant | | | The policy is not anticipated to have any significant effects upon air or dust pollution levels. | | None | | | |
| **Policy TC5 – Saxonvale:** *Plans for the redevelopment of Saxonvale should seek to achieve the overall vision for the redevelopment of the site based on the 2005 Planning Brief.*  *The development of Saxondale is expected to deliver:*   * *An exemplar model of low impact and low carbon living.* * *300+ new energy efficient homes of mixed price and tenure* * *New incubator and grow on space for small and medium sized businesses* * *Integrated retail, hotel and leisure facilities* * *Replacement training facilities for Somerset Skills and Learning* * *Artisan workshops and creative studio space* * *An urban park alongside the River* * *Improved traffic management in Vicarage Street, Christchurch Street East and the surrounding road network.*   *Plans for the development of this site will meet the requirements of the Neighbourhood Plan policy for major development.* | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Assessment Criteria** | | | | **Assessment of Significant Effect** | | | | | | | | **Justification** | | **Amendments to Policy** | | | |
| Criteria 1 from Schedule 1 of 2004 SEA Regulations – The characteristics of plans and programmes having regard, in particular, to: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| The degree to which the plan or programme sets a framework for projects and other activities, either with regard to the location, nature, size and operating conditions or by allocating resources | | | | Not significant | | | | | | | | The policy does not allocate the site but seeks to influence the mix of uses to be achieved through development of the area. | | None | | | |
| The degree to which the plan or programme influences other plans and programmes including those in a hierarchy | | | | Not significant. | | | | | | | | Emerging Local Plan Policy 6 for Frome encourages the redevelopment of Saxonvale. The NDP supplements this by providing a local view on what the community wish to see included on the site. | | None | | | |
| The relevance of the plan or programme for the integration of environmental considerations in particular with a view to promoting sustainable development | | | | Not significant | | | | | | | | The policy encourages the delivery of an exemplar model of energy efficient homes of mixed price and tenure. In addition to which the policy seeks replacement training facilities for Somerset Skills and Learning. Failure to provide this replacement facility would lead to local people having to travel further for further education courses. Improved traffic management in Vicarage Street, Christchurch Street East and the surrounding road network could assist in improvements to air quality. | | None | | | |
| Environmental problems relevant to the plan or programme | | | | Not significant | | | | | | | | The majority of the site is currently disused and any environmental problems would be a matter for consideration through the normal planning process when applications for development of the site are brought forward. | | None | | | |
| The relevance of the plan or programme for the implementation of Community legislation on the environment | | | | Not significant | | | | | | | | An outline planning application has been submitted to Mendip Council for around 35,000 sqft of retail floorspace and leisure uses and is awaiting validation (November 2013). This application will have to have regard to the relevant Community Environmental legislation as will future phases of the Saxonvale scheme. | | None | | | |
| Criteria 2 from Schedule 1 of 2004 SEA Regulations – Characteristics of the effects and of the area likely to be affected, having regard, in particular, to: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| The probability, duration, frequency and reversibility of the effects | | | | Not significant | | | | | | | | The effects of development are irreversible and permanent but are considered to be positive impacts in terms of providing new employment space and dwellings, including self build plots. The site is considered likely to come forward once funding and planning consent are secured. | | None | | | |
| The cumulative nature of the effects | | | | Not significant | | | | | | | | Whilst the site is large within the context of Frome town centre, the nature of the mix of uses encouraged through both the Planning Brief and the NDP are not considered likely to cause significant cumulative effects. | | None | | | |
| The transboundary nature of the effects | | | | Not significant | | | | | | | | There may be a reduction in terms of trips made to other towns, but this is not considered to be significant in the context of the overall trip movement between settlements in the district. | | None | | | |
| The risks to human health or the environment (for example, due to accidents) | | | | Not significant | | | | | | | | There are not considered to be any significant effects upon human health. Issues relating to air quality are unlikely to be significantly impacted upon by the nature of the mix of uses on this site and improved traffic management could lead to improvements in air quality. The proposal for an urban park alongside the River Frome would have health benefits with any risks associated with the use of this space able to be adequately managed. | | None | | | |
| The magnitude and spatial extent of the effects (geographical area and size of the population likely to be affected) | | | | Not significant | | | | | | | | Whilst the site is large in the context of Frome town centre, the policy seeks to influence the mix of uses with the proposed facilities likely to be brought forward unlikely to have a significant impact upon the population. Positive benefits may be derived from the provision of new employment opportunities and new dwellings to help address housing need. | | None | | | |
| The value and vulnerability of the area likely to be affected due to special natural characteristics or cultural heritage | | | | Not significant | | | | | | | | The site largely consists of disused buildings. The previous application on the site assessed the vulnerability of the site as being of low environmental value with the planning process sufficiently able to mitigate any effects. The Planning Brief encourages access to and improvement of the River Frome corridor which would have a positive impact but would not in itself be significant. | | None | | | |
| The value and vulnerability of the area likely to be affected due to exceeded environmental quality standards or limit values | | | | Not significant | | | | | | | | Development on the site is not considered likely to have a significant impacts upon air quality around Bath Street where there are existing areas of concern. The development is not anticipated to have any adverse impacts upon the water quality of the River Frome. The construction phase of development may have some impact on air quality, but this could be appropriately mitigated through building regulations. | | None | | | |
| The value and vulnerability of the area likely to be affected due to intensive land-use | | | | Not significant | | | | | | | | The town centre is already an area of intensive land use and the site has previously been intensively used for employment uses. There may be an increase in usage of the River corridor but the overall impacts of this are not considered to be significant. | | None | | | |
| The effects on areas or landscapes which have a recognised national, community of international protection status. | | | | Not significant | | | | | | | | There are no European sites of landscape designations affected by this policy. Whilst the town centre forms part of the Conservation Area and there are a number of Listed Buildings whose setting would be affected by the proposal, the impacts are considered likely to be positive and non significant. | | None | | | |
| **HRA Assessment** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Potential impact** | | | | **Assessment of significant effect** | | | | | | | | **Justification** | | **Amendments to Policy** | | | |
| Impact on bat foraging areas | | | | Not significant | | | | | | | | The previous planning application on the site identified that there were a small number of bats on site. Provision for replacement habitat can be mitigated through the provision of bat boxes. The emerging Local Plan contains a bat protection policy. Policy TC5 seeks to influence the final uses on site and any development proposals coming forward would be required to appropriately address bat habitats. The Mells Valley EZI does not extend in to the town centre. | | None | | | |
| Air and dust pollution impact on SAC | | | | Not significant | | | | | | | | There is the potential for air and dust pollution to arise from the construction stage, however this could be strictly controlled by Building Regulations and therefore is unlikely to impact upon the SAC. | | None | | | |
| **Policy POS1 – The River Corridor:** *Otherwise acceptable planning applications that are closely related to the River Corridor environment and approaches to it will be supported where they take advantage of opportunities to improve the River Corridor environment, including access, subject to suitable ecological assessment. Development proposals that fail to take advantage of opportunities to improve the River Corridor environment, including access, will be refused.* | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Assessment Criteria** | | | | | | | **Assessment of Significant Effect** | | | | | **Justification** | | **Amendments to Policy** | | | |
| Criteria 1 from Schedule 1 of 2004 SEA Regulations – The characteristics of plans and programmes having regard, in particular, to: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| The degree to which the plan or programme sets a framework for projects and other activities, either with regard to the location, nature, size and operating conditions or by allocating resources | | | | | | | Not significant | | | | | The policy seeks to bring forward formal open spaces along the River Frome, it does not seek to allocate site but instead provides support for their delivery. The River Corridor is a relatively sensitive site and the policy makes provision for the limitation of environmental damage by qualifying that development could only occur subject to suitable ecological assessment. | | None | | | |
| The degree to which the plan or programme influences other plans and programmes including those in a hierarchy | | | | | | | Not significant | | | | | The emerging Local Plan identifies a requirement for a Green Infrastructure Strategy for the town which will identify 8 ha of new open space and improve access, recreation and wildlife opportunities along the River Frome. The policy supplements and supports this ambition. | | None | | | |
| The relevance of the plan or programme for the integration of environmental considerations in particular with a view to promoting sustainable development | | | | | | | Not significant | | | | | Any development that proposes new open space provision along the River would be subject to the normal planning application considerations. The provision of appropriate infrastructure such as green space is an essential requirement of delivering sustainable development. A number of potential sites for redevelopment along the River are located within or adjacent to the town centre which is a sustainable location for development. | | None | | | |
| Environmental problems relevant to the plan or programme | | | | | | | Not significant | | | | | The River Corridor is an area of high flood risk although open space is typically considered to be an acceptable use of otherwise constrained land. | | None | | | |
| The relevance of the plan or programme for the implementation of Community legislation on the environment | | | | | | | Not significant | | | | | The River Corridor is an area of high flood risk although open space is typically considered to be an acceptable use of otherwise constrained land. Whilst providing improved access may increase the risk of illegal waste disposal in the River, this is not considered likely to occur to a significant degree. | | None | | | |
| Criteria 2 from Schedule 1 of 2004 SEA Regulations – Characteristics of the effects and of the area likely to be affected, having regard, in particular, to: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| The probability, duration, frequency and reversibility of the effects | | | | | | | Not significant | | | | | The provision of improved access to the River through the delivery of open space will be a long term process which will occur in stages as development sites come forward. | | None | | | |
| The cumulative nature of the effects | | | | | | | Not significant | | | | | The cumulative impacts are difficult to predict as the policy looks to take advantage of development proposals to gain improved River access yet there are only a limited number of development sites anticipated to come forward along the River, consequently the overall increase in open space and River access is unlikely to be significant.  Improved access to the River Corridor will increase the number of pedestrians and cyclists which has the potential to adversely impact upon environmentally sensitive areas, however the policy makes it clear that improved river corridor access will only be appropriate subject to suitable ecological assessment and therefore it is not considered likely that there will be any significant environmental impacts arising from this policy. | | None | | | |
| The transboundary nature of the effects | | | | | | | Not significant | | | | | There are not considered to be any transboundary impacts arising from this policy as the encouragement to provide open space along the river is unlikely to adversely impact upon flood risk downstream. | | None | | | |
| The risks to human health or the environment (for example, due to accidents) | | | | | | | Not significant | | | | | It is recognised that increased access also increases the potential for accidents to occur in the River, however this is likely to be covered by Health and Safety legislation and can be carefully managed, therefore the risks to human health are low. | | None | | | |
| The magnitude and spatial extent of the effects (geographical area and size of the population likely to be affected) | | | | | | | Not significant | | | | | Whilst the River Corridor improvement works would provide a high quality pedestrian link through the town centre, this is unlikely to see the overall function of this area change as a result the impacts are not considered to be significant. | | None | | | |
| The value and vulnerability of the area likely to be affected due to special natural characteristics or cultural heritage | | | | | | | Not significant | | | | | Part of the River Corridor runs through the Conservation Area, but the effects are considered to be positive and as the River Corridor does not forma significant element of the character of the Conservation the impacts are not likely to be significant. Any development proposals will be assessed at the planning application stage to determine the potential impacts upon natural characteristics or cultural heritage. | | None | | | |
| The value and vulnerability of the area likely to be affected due to exceeded environmental quality standards or limit values | | | | | | | Not significant | | | | | Although the River Corridor falls within an area of flood risk the use of open space is considered to be an acceptable use of such land. | | None | | | |
| The value and vulnerability of the area likely to be affected due to intensive land-use | | | | | | | Not significant | | | | | Whilst the footpaths and cycleways along the River Corridor would be more frequently used following improvements, this is considered unlikely to be significantly more intensive. | | None | | | |
| The effects on areas or landscapes which have a recognised national, community of international protection status. | | | | | | | Not significant | | | | | The site is not known to be subject to any national or international protection status and although it falls within the Conservation Area, the effects are considered to be positive and the River Corridor does not forma significant element of the character of the Conservation Area. | | None | | | |
| **HRA Assessment** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Potential impact** | **Assessment of significant effect** | | | | | | | | | | | **Justification** | | **Amendments to Policy** | | | |
| Impact on bat foraging areas | Not significant | | | | | | | | | | | As required by the policy any application would need to undertake suitable ecological assessments and therefore any potential impacts would be picked up at this stage. The Mells Valley EZI does not extend in to the town centre. | | None | | | |
| Air and dust pollution impact on SAC | Not significant | | | | | | | | | | | Air and dust pollution is considered unlikely to arise from improvements being made to access along the River. | | None | | | |
| **Policy HPOS2 – Public Open Space:**   * *Development of public open space will not be permitted unless it is to promote access, use and enjoyment of public land and buildings* * *Development that would materially harm the contribution of the distinctive local character or accessibility of identified areas of open space/areas of visual significance or cause the loss of such areas will be refused* * *Plans for Major Developments (over 100 homes or 1000 sqm of commercial floorspace) will be required to include details of plans to safeguard the future management and maintenance of open space and the protection of wildlife habitats within and adjoining the development site* * *Frome Town Council will work with Mendip District Council and other partners to produce a Supplementary Planning Document on Green Infrastructure that will identify and address deficiencies in Park, sports, leisure and open space provision that will be a significant material consideration in the determination of planning applications and the funding raised from development.* | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Assessment Criteria** | | | | | | | **Assessment of Significant Effect** | | | | | **Justification** | | **Amendments to Policy** | | | |
| Criteria 1 from Schedule 1 of 2004 SEA Regulations – The characteristics of plans and programmes having regard, in particular, to: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| The degree to which the plan or programme sets a framework for projects and other activities, either with regard to the location, nature, size and operating conditions or by allocating resources | | | | | | | Not significant | | | | | The policy provides a localised focus to supplement emerging Local Plan Policy DP16 which deals with Open Space and Green Infrastructure, it provides an expansion of the existing framework set out in Policy DP16. It also requires the development of a Green Infrastructure SPD for Frome to identify and address deficiencies in provision. There are not anticipated to be any adverse environmental impacts in this regard. | | None | | | |
| The degree to which the plan or programme influences other plans and programmes including those in a hierarchy | | | | | | | Not significant | | | | | The policy provides a localised focus to supplement emerging Local Plan Policy DP16 which deals with Open Space and Green Infrastructure, it provides an expansion of the existing framework set out in Policy DP16. | | None | | | |
| The relevance of the plan or programme for the integration of environmental considerations in particular with a view to promoting sustainable development | | | | | | | Not significant | | | | | The policy seeks to consider the impacts of loss of open space to development and the provision of new open space and its ongoing maintenance. | | None | | | |
| Environmental problems relevant to the plan or programme | | | | | | | Not significant | | | | | The provision of an appropriate amount of open space is an important element of the NDP, however lack of open space is not considered to be a significant issue in Frome. | | None | | | |
| The relevance of the plan or programme for the implementation of Community legislation on the environment | | | | | | | Not significant | | | | | The policy is not considered likely to have any significant impacts upon community environmental legislation. Any new areas of open space would be appropriately covered through both the overarching policies of the emerging Local Plan, and any new open space with the potential to impact upon the river environment are sufficiently covered through the proposed River Corridor policy. | | None | | | |
| Criteria 2 from Schedule 1 of 2004 SEA Regulations – Characteristics of the effects and of the area likely to be affected, having regard, in particular, to: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| The probability, duration, frequency and reversibility of the effects | | | | | | | Not significant | | | | | The policy seeks to prevent the development of public open space and where new open space is provided, secure its future maintenance and management in perpetuity. Whilst the effects would be beneficial, this is not considered likely to have significant impacts. | | None | | | |
| The cumulative nature of the effects | | | | | | | Not significant | | | | | The cumulative nature of the effects would be to ensure greater protection for public open space, and through the development of a Green Infrastructure SPD enable linkages to be established and defined between these spaces. Whilst the effects will be beneficial, there are not considered to be any significant environmental impacts. | | None | | | |
| The transboundary nature of the effects | | | | | | | Not significant | | | | | There are not considered to be any transboundary effects. | | None | | | |
| The risks to human health or the environment (for example, due to accidents) | | | | | | | Not significant | | | | | There are unlikely to be any increased risks to human health or the environment arising from this policy. Any new areas of open space would be appropriately protected through both the overarching policies of the emerging Local Plan, and any new open space with the potential to impact upon the River Frome environment are sufficiently covered through the proposed River Corridor policy. | | None | | | |
| The magnitude and spatial extent of the effects (geographical area and size of the population likely to be affected) | | | | | | | Not significant | | | | | The policy seeks to ensure protection of existing open space and secure the future management of new open space, this is unlikely to see the overall function of these areas change and as a result the impacts are not considered to be significant. | | None | | | |
| The value and vulnerability of the area likely to be affected due to special natural characteristics or cultural heritage | | | | | | | Not significant | | | | | Any proposals for the development of open space, or for development which provides new open spaces, will be assessed at the planning application stage to determine the potential impacts upon natural characteristics or cultural heritage. | | None | | | |
| The value and vulnerability of the area likely to be affected due to exceeded environmental quality standards or limit values | | | | | | | Not significant | | | | | The protection of existing open spaces and securing the future management of new open space are considered to have a beneficial impact upon air quality, although in the context of their overall impact within the district this is considered not to be significant. | | None | | | |
| The value and vulnerability of the area likely to be affected due to intensive land-use | | | | | | | Not significant | | | | | The policy largely seeks to prevent intensification of land-use through preventing the redevelopment of open space, whilst it is acknowledged that the policy encourages increased access to open space and this in itself would lead to some intensification of use, this is not considered sufficient to be significant in the overall context. | | None | | | |
| The effects on areas or landscapes which have a recognised national, community of international protection status. | | | | | | | Not significant | | | | | The protection of existing open space and securing the management of future open space is considered likely to have beneficial impacts on protected areas and landscapes although in the wider context these are unlikely to be significant. | | None | | | |
| **HRA Assessment** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Potential impact** | **Assessment of significant effect** | | | | | | | | | | | **Justification** | | **Amendments to Policy** | | | |
| Impact on bat foraging areas | Not significant | | | | | | | | | | | Protection of existing open spaces and securing the future management of new open space would be unlikely to have any significant impact upon bat foraging areas as their function would not significantly change. | | None | | | |
| Air and dust pollution impact on SAC | Not significant | | | | | | | | | | | The policy is not considered likely to lead to any air and dust pollution impacts. | | None | | | |
| **Policy T1 – Integrated Transport Strategy:** *The delivery of integrated sustainable transport options is a key aim of the Frome Neighbourhood Development Plan. The priorities for delivering these are:*   * *Completing Frome’s Missing Links in the National Cycle Network (Any detrimental impact through extension to Frome’s ‘Missing Links’ in the National Cycle Network will be appropriately mitigated to prevent any impacts upon the Mells Valley EZI and foraging areas for bats.)* * *Improving access to and along the River Corridor, in line with the Frome River Strategy* * *Enhancing the environment around and access to Frome Railway Station* * *Providing safe and accessible bus and coach stops* * *Identifying clear and safe routes for pedestrians and cycling as part of the remodelling of Frome Town Centre and residential developments over 10 units.* | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Assessment Criteria** | | | | | | **Assessment of Significant Effect** | | | | | | **Justification** | | **Amendments to Policy** | | | |
| Criteria 1 from Schedule 1 of 2004 SEA Regulations – The characteristics of plans and programmes having regard, in particular, to: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| The degree to which the plan or programme sets a framework for projects and other activities, either with regard to the location, nature, size and operating conditions or by allocating resources | | | | | | Not  significant | | | | | | The policy sets out in principle support for a number of projects which would help to improve sustainable transport linkages. It is considered that each project would assist in decreasing the number of car trips taken, but in the overall context of Frome these impacts are not considered to be significant. The emerging Local Plan HRA Screening Report states that the completion of the Frome ‘Missing Link’ cycle path could have a detrimental impact on foraging areas for bats from the Mells Valley SAC, although not the SAC itself. The policy has a clear criterion to ensure that any detrimental impact should be mitigated. | | None | | | |
| The degree to which the plan or programme influences other plans and programmes including those in a hierarchy | | | | | | Not significant | | | | | | The policy supports and supplements the emerging Local Plan policies and the Local Transport Plan in encouraging the number of trips by means other than the private car. | | None | | | |
| The relevance of the plan or programme for the integration of environmental considerations in particular with a view to promoting sustainable development | | | | | | Not significant | | | | | | Whilst the policy supports and promotes sustainable transport movements the overall effect is not considered significant in the context of the level of trips generated through the level of housing growth proposed for Frome. | | None | | | |
| Environmental problems relevant to the plan or programme | | | | | | Not significant | | | | | | The policy will assist in reducing carbon emissions from commuting by offering sustainable travel alternatives. | | None | | | |
| The relevance of the plan or programme for the implementation of Community legislation on the environment | | | | | | Not  significant | | | | | | The policy does contain criteria to ensure that detrimental effects upon species sensitive environmental areas are mitigated. | | None. | | | |
| Criteria 2 from Schedule 1 of 2004 SEA Regulations – Characteristics of the effects and of the area likely to be affected, having regard, in particular, to: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| The probability, duration, frequency and reversibility of the effects | | | | | | Not significant | | | | | | The reduction in trips by means other than the private car would occur over a long period of time as projects come forward. As transport choices are dependent on a range of factors, the provision and enhancement of these facilities can only assist people to travel by means other than the private car. Consequently it can be said that the effects could be reversible and may fluctuate over time. Any environmental effects would not be specific to one area. | | None | | | |
| The cumulative nature of the effects | | | | | | Not significant | | | | | | Cumulatively the provision of the enhancements proposed should have a positive impact, however this is not considered to be significant when viewed in the context of the level of trips generated by the housing requirement for Frome. Consideration of the overall impact on bat foraging would also need to be covered through the Green Infrastructure SPD. | | None | | | |
| The transboundary nature of the effects | | | | | | Not significant | | | | | | The train station enhancements and bus and coach stop improvements could increase the number of trips by train and bus to other towns and districts, although this is not considered likely to have a significant impact. | | None | | | |
| The risks to human health or the environment (for example, due to accidents) | | | | | | Not significant | | | | | | There may be small positive impacts through increased trips on safer means of transport, however this is not considered likely to be significant. | | None | | | |
| The magnitude and spatial extent of the effects (geographical area and size of the population likely to be affected) | | | | | | Not significant | | | | | | It is difficult to quantify the effect of any increased level of sustainable transport movements to a specific geographical area. Impacts upon bat feeing habitat will be limited to very specific areas which can be mitigated. | | None | | | |
| The value and vulnerability of the area likely to be affected due to special natural characteristics or cultural heritage | | | | | | Not  significant | | | | | | The fact that the Mells Valley has been designated as a European site underlines that the bat population needs to be supported. The impacts on bat foraging areas need to be given careful consideration. Whilst the ‘Missing Link’ section of the National Cycle Network would not run through the SAC, it has the potential to impact upon foraging areas. The impact can be mitigated through the planning system and the policy sets out a requirement for such mitigation to be undertaken. | | None | | | |
| The value and vulnerability of the area likely to be affected due to exceeded environmental quality standards or limit values | | | | | | Not  significant | | | | | | Lighting of the cycle path through sensitive areas would need to be carefully designed or not permitted in certain sections. The policy does not permit lighting per se. Any planning application would need to demonstrate that there would be no detrimental impact on the foraging areas and the policy sets a requirement for mitigation of such potential impacts. | | None | | | |
| The value and vulnerability of the area likely to be affected due to intensive land-use | | | | | | Not significant | | | | | | There may be increased use of specific sites although it is not considered that this would be significant compared to the context or frequency of increased use. The train station is not an area considered vulnerable to more intensive use, but parts of the cycle path outside of the town are considered more susceptible to intensive use, although the completion of the cycle path is not considered likely to bring about significantly more intensive use. | | None | | | |
| The effects on areas or landscapes which have a recognised national, community of international protection status. | | | | | | Not  significant | | | | | | Impacts upon foraging areas of bats from the Mells Valley SAC should be considered through the planning application process and would require appropriate mitigation in order for consent to be achieved. The policy sets a requirement for mitigation of potential impacts. | | None | | | |
| **HRA Assessment** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Potential impact** | **Assessment of significant effect** | | | | | | | | | | | **Justification** | | **Amendments to Policy** | | | |
| Impact on bat foraging areas | Not  significant | | | | | | | | | | | The policy seeks to improve sustainable transport links in and around Frome. The majority of these would have no effect on the foraging or roosting areas of bats, however part of the ‘Missing Link’ of the National Cycle Network falls within the EZI of the Mells Valley SAC. The Local Plan Screening Report notes the issue and states that the completion of the cycle path in this location will have to ensure that it does not introduce any new hedgerow gaps of more than 15 metres. Any lighting on this section of the path would need to be carefully considered. The policy contains criteria and the planning applications will r assess impacts upon bat foraging areas and avoidance of detrimental impacts. | | None | | | |
| Air and dust pollution impact on SAC | Not significant | | | | | | | | | | | There is not considered likely to be any increase in air or dust pollution from this policy. | | None | | | |
| **Policy T2 – Travel Plans:** *Residential schemes of more than 10 units, new employment and mixed use developments over 1 ha, schools and colleges, health centres, leisure centres and public buildings will be expected to provide a travel plan with their application explaining how their developments will encourage the use of integrated sustainable transport options and (where appropriate) safe routes to schools.* | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Assessment Criteria** | | | | | | | **Assessment of Significant Effect** | | | | **Justification** | | | **Amendments to Policy** | | | |
| Criteria 1 from Schedule 1 of 2004 SEA Regulations – The characteristics of plans and programmes having regard, in particular, to: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| The degree to which the plan or programme sets a framework for projects and other activities, either with regard to the location, nature, size and operating conditions or by allocating resources | | | | | | | Not significant | | | | | The policy seeks developments to justify how they will encourage sustainable modes of travel for occupants through Travel Plans. Whilst this should help to decrease the number of trips taken by car, the overall impact is not considered likely to be significant in the overall context of the town. | | None | | | |
| The degree to which the plan or programme influences other plans and programmes including those in a hierarchy | | | | | | | Not significant | | | | | The policy is broadly compliant with the emerging Local Plan policies and the Local Transport Plan in that it encourages sustainable transport alternatives. | | None | | | |
| The relevance of the plan or programme for the integration of environmental considerations in particular with a view to promoting sustainable development | | | | | | | Not significant | | | | | The policy will promote sustainable transport through new development, however this is not considered likely to be significant in the overall context of the town both in terms of existing trips and the level of housing growth promoted. | | None | | | |
| Environmental problems relevant to the plan or programme | | | | | | | Not significant | | | | | The policy may assist in reducing the level of carbon emissions by encouraging the use of other forms of transport than the private car. | | None | | | |
| The relevance of the plan or programme for the implementation of Community legislation on the environment | | | | | | | Not significant | | | | | The policy is not considered relevant in relation to any Community Environmental legislation. | | None | | | |
| Criteria 2 from Schedule 1 of 2004 SEA Regulations – Characteristics of the effects and of the area likely to be affected, having regard, in particular, to: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| The probability, duration, frequency and reversibility of the effects | | | | | | | Not significant | | | | | Any reduction in trips as a result of the policy would occur over a long period of time as developments come forward and the policy is implemented. However transport choice depends on a range of factors and therefore the travel plan outcomes may fluctuate over time. | | None | | | |
| The cumulative nature of the effects | | | | | | | Not significant | | | | | Cumulatively the requirement for new developments to demonstrate how sustainable transport would be encouraged should have a beneficial effect in reducing the level of trip generation from new developments. However the overall impacts are not considered to be significant when compared to the overall scale of growth proposed in Frome and therefore the impacts will not be significant. | | None | | | |
| The transboundary nature of the effects | | | | | | | Not significant | | | | | Any sustainable travel improvements are likely to be on a local level and therefore there are not considered to be any transboundary impacts arising from this policy. | | None | | | |
| The risks to human health or the environment (for example, due to accidents) | | | | | | | Not significant | | | | | Encouraging modal shift to more sustainable modes of transport is considered to represent a beneficial impact on human health but not significant enough with regard to environmental effects in the context of SEA. | | None | | | |
| The magnitude and spatial extent of the effects (geographical area and size of the population likely to be affected) | | | | | | | Not significant | | | | | The potential impact of the policy in terms of reducing trip movements from new development is difficult to quantify to a specific geographical area when the Plan has not allocated sites within Frome. | | None | | | |
| The value and vulnerability of the area likely to be affected due to special natural characteristics or cultural heritage | | | | | | | Not significant | | | | | There are not considered to be any likely impacts on areas of natural characteristics or cultural heritage arising from this policy. | | None | | | |
| The value and vulnerability of the area likely to be affected due to exceeded environmental quality standards or limit values | | | | | | | Not significant | | | | | There is the potential for no further reductions in air quality through the encouragement of sustainable travel alternatives, however in the overall context of the level of growth for Frome this is not considered to be significant in terms of impact. | | None | | | |
| The value and vulnerability of the area likely to be affected due to intensive land-use | | | | | | | Not significant | | | | | Whilst development would lead to intensification of the use of sites, the policy seeks to reduce the transport impact of this through the utilisation of sustainable travel alternatives. | | None | | | |
| The effects on areas or landscapes which have a recognised national, community of international protection status. | | | | | | | Not significant | | | | | There are not considered to be any likely impacts on areas which have protected status arising from this policy. | | None | | | |
| **HRA Assessment** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Potential impact** | **Assessment of significant effect** | | | | | | | | | | **Justification** | | | **Amendments to Policy** | | | |
| Impact on bat foraging areas | Not significant | | | | | | | | | | The encouragement of sustainable transport alternatives through Travel Planning is not considered to have any significant impact upon bat foraging areas. | | | None | | | |
| Air and dust pollution impact on SAC | Not significant | | | | | | | | | | The policy may assist in attempting to secure no further reduction in air quality, but there are not anticipated to be any significant effects. | | | None | | | |
| **Policy D1 – Design in Urban Landscapes:** *Development that fails to take account of the design recommendation of the Town Design Statement or Conservation Area Character Appraisal will be refused.* | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Assessment Criteria** | | | | | | **Assessment of Significant Effect** | | | | | **Justification** | | | **Amendments to Policy** | | | |
| Criteria 1 from Schedule 1 of 2004 SEA Regulations – The characteristics of plans and programmes having regard, in particular, to: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| The degree to which the plan or programme sets a framework for projects and other activities, either with regard to the location, nature, size and operating conditions or by allocating resources | | | | | | Not significant | | | | | The policy would affect all new development proposals as it seeks to implement the guidance in the Town Design Statement as a framework to what forms acceptable design standards in Frome. The policy does not propose the allocation of any sites, it merely seeks to ensure new development is of a high standard. | | | None | | | |
| The degree to which the plan or programme influences other plans and programmes including those in a hierarchy | | | | | | Not significant | | | | | The policy requires compliance with the design recommendations of the Town Design Statement and Conservation Area Character Appraisal as well as complementing the policies of the emerging Local Plan. | | | None | | | |
| The relevance of the plan or programme for the integration of environmental considerations in particular with a view to promoting sustainable development | | | | | | Not significant | | | | | The policy requires development to reflect the principles of the Frome Town Design Statement which is considered to broadly adhere to the principles of sustainable development. | | | None | | | |
| Environmental problems relevant to the plan or programme | | | | | | Not significant | | | | | The implementation of the policy should improve the overall standard of design of new development in Frome which whilst beneficial, is not considered to be a significant environmental impact. | | | None | | | |
| The relevance of the plan or programme for the implementation of Community legislation on the environment | | | | | | Not significant | | | | | The policy is not considered relevant to the implementation of Community Environmental legislation. | | | None | | | |
| Criteria 2 from Schedule 1 of 2004 SEA Regulations – Characteristics of the effects and of the area likely to be affected, having regard, in particular, to: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| The probability, duration, frequency and reversibility of the effects | | | | | | Not significant | | | | | The effect of higher quality design will be town wide and occur over the plan period as schemes are brought forward. Effects will not be reversible but are considered likely to be positive. Given that the aim of the policy is to encourage a step change improvement in design without prescribing specific designs for each site/area it is not considered to be significant in environmental impact terms. | | | None | | | |
| The cumulative nature of the effects | | | | | | Not significant | | | | | Better quality design would be encouraged across the town with the cumulative effect of this considered to be positive. Given that the aim of the policy is to encourage a step change improvement in design without prescribing specific designs for each site/area it is not considered to be significant in environmental impact terms. | | | None | | | |
| The transboundary nature of the effects | | | | | | Not significant | | | | | There are not considered to be any transboundary effects likely to arise from this policy as it only applies to sites within Frome. | | | None | | | |
| The risks to human health or the environment (for example, due to accidents) | | | | | | Not significant | | | | | There are not considered to be any effects on human health likely to arise from this policy and all new development will still be required to accord with Building Regulations. | | | None | | | |
| The magnitude and spatial extent of the effects (geographical area and size of the population likely to be affected) | | | | | | Not significant | | | | | The policy is applicable to the entire town and would therefore affect all schemes brought forward. Whilst development is expected in all areas of the town, the aim of the policy is to encourage a step change improvement in design without prescribing specific designs for each site/area so it is not considered to be significant in environmental impact terms. | | | None | | | |
| The value and vulnerability of the area likely to be affected due to special natural characteristics or cultural heritage | | | | | | Not significant | | | | | The policy could help to further improve the quality of design and enhance the setting of the Conservation Area through requiring conformity with the Town Design Statement. | | | None | | | |
| The value and vulnerability of the area likely to be affected due to exceeded environmental quality standards or limit values | | | | | | Not significant | | | | | There are not considered to be any significant impacts upon environmental quality standards or limit values arising from this policy. | | | None | | | |
| The value and vulnerability of the area likely to be affected due to intensive land-use | | | | | | Not significant | | | | | The policy is considered likely to help ensure better quality design in more intensively used areas such as the town centre. | | | None | | | |
| The effects on areas or landscapes which have a recognised national, community of international protection status. | | | | | | Not significant | | | | | The policy could help to further improve the quality of design and enhance the setting of the Conservation Area through requiring conformity with the Town Design Statement. | | | None | | | |
| **HRA Assessment** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Potential impact** | | | | | | | | | | **Assessment of significant effect** | **Justification** | | | **Amendments to Policy** | | |
| Impact on bat foraging areas | | | | | | | | | | Not significant | The individual design of new dwellings is not considered likely to have a significant effect. | | | None | | |
| Air and dust pollution impact on SAC | | | | | | | | | | Not significant | There are not considered likely to be any impacts upon air and dust pollution from the implementation of this policy. | | | None | | |
| **Policy D2 – Gateway Site Improvements:** *Developments that fail to take account of the recommendations of the Town Design Statement or do not take advantage of opportunities to improve these Gateway sites will be refused.* | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Assessment Criteria** | | | | | | | **Assessment of Significant Effect** | | | | **Justification** | | | **Amendments to Policy** | |
| Criteria 1 from Schedule 1 of 2004 SEA Regulations – The characteristics of plans and programmes having regard, in particular, to: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| The degree to which the plan or programme sets a framework for projects and other activities, either with regard to the location, nature, size and operating conditions or by allocating resources | | | | | | | Not significant | | | | The policy provides a framework for supporting the development and improvement of a selection of small but key gateway sites into the town. Improvements may take the form of new development, refurbishment or adaptation of existing buildings or improvements to the public realm. The effects of the policy are not considered likely to be significant in environmental terms. | | | None | |
| The degree to which the plan or programme influences other plans and programmes including those in a hierarchy | | | | | | | Not significant | | | | Further detail and guidance on the implementation of the policy is provided in the Town Design Statement which the NDP helps support. | | | None | |
| The relevance of the plan or programme for the integration of environmental considerations in particular with a view to promoting sustainable development | | | | | | | Not significant | | | | With the Railway Station being one of the gateway sites, improvements may encourage greater use of the train station instead of the private car. Whilst this would have a beneficial effect, the overall impact is not considered to be significant. | | | None | |
| Environmental problems relevant to the plan or programme | | | | | | | Not significant | | | | The level of commuting and the carbon emissions arising from it are a problem relevant to the plan. The implementation of this policy may make a contribution towards reducing this. | | | None | |
| The relevance of the plan or programme for the implementation of Community legislation on the environment | | | | | | | Not significant | | | | This policy is not considered to impact upon Community Environmental Legislation. | | | None | |
| Criteria 2 from Schedule 1 of 2004 SEA Regulations – Characteristics of the effects and of the area likely to be affected, having regard, in particular, to: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| The probability, duration, frequency and reversibility of the effects | | | | | | | Not significant | | | | Each site has the potential to come forward for improvements separately and is generally dependent upon development of related sites. The effects will not be reversible but they are considered likely to have a positive beneficial impact upon the towns built environment. Despite the sites importance as key gateways, their relatively small scale means that they are not considered to be significant in overall environmental impact terms. | | | None | |
| The cumulative nature of the effects | | | | | | | Not significant | | | | If all of the proposed sites were brought forward cumulatively then there would be broader positive effects upon the built environment. Despite the sites importance as key gateways, their relatively small scale means that they are not considered to be significant in overall environmental impact terms. | | | None | |
| The transboundary nature of the effects | | | | | | | Not significant | | | | Should improvements result in increased travel by Railway then there may be some minor transboundary effects but these are not considered likely to be significant. | | | None | |
| The risks to human health or the environment (for example, due to accidents) | | | | | | | Not significant | | | | There are not considered to be any significant effects likely to arise from the improvement of these key gateway sites. | | | None | |
| The magnitude and spatial extent of the effects (geographical area and size of the population likely to be affected) | | | | | | | Not significant | | | | Whilst these gateway sites are used by a large proportion of the population, the scale of the sites means that it is considered the effects would not be significant. | | | None | |
| The value and vulnerability of the area likely to be affected due to special natural characteristics or cultural heritage | | | | | | | Not significant | | | | Improvement of these key gateway sites would have beneficial impacts upon the character and setting of the Conservation Area in the centre of Frome, although this is not considered likely to be significant. | | | None | |
| The value and vulnerability of the area likely to be affected due to exceeded environmental quality standards or limit values | | | | | | | Not significant | | | | There are not considered to be any significant impacts upon environmental quality standards or limit values arising from this policy. | | | None | |
| The value and vulnerability of the area likely to be affected due to intensive land-use | | | | | | | Not significant | | | | The policy aims to make aesthetic improvements to the quality of areas of land which are already intensively used as gateway sites by a large number of people and as a result no significant impacts are anticipated. | | | None | |
| The effects on areas or landscapes which have a recognised national, community of international protection status. | | | | | | | Not significant | | | | Improvement of these key gateway sites would have beneficial impacts upon the character and setting of the Conservation Area in the centre of Frome, although this is not considered likely to be significant. | | | None | |
| **HRA Assessment** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Potential impact** | | **Assessment of significant effect** | | | | | | | | | **Justification** | | | **Amendments to Policy** | | |
| Impact on bat foraging areas | | Not significant | | | | | | | | | The types of improvements and locations of these improvements are not considered likely to have a significant impact. | | | None | | |
| Air and dust pollution impact on SAC | | Not significant | | | | | | | | | There are not considered to be any discernible impacts likely to arise from this policy. | | | None | | |
| **Policy D3 – Visual Impact on Skyline:** *Applications for new buildings and highly visible extensions to existing properties in the identified area will be required to demonstrate there will be no detrimental impact on the skyline in this location. It is expected this will be achieved through the production of photomontages or elevations of any proposed buildings or tree works within the context of the skyline as viewed from locations A-F. Designs that are inappropriate for the area should be refused.* | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Assessment Criteria** | | | | | | | | **Assessment of Significant Effect** | | | **Justification** | | | **Amendments to Policy** | |
| Criteria 1 from Schedule 1 of 2004 SEA Regulations – The characteristics of plans and programmes having regard, in particular, to: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| The degree to which the plan or programme sets a framework for projects and other activities, either with regard to the location, nature, size and operating conditions or by allocating resources | | | | | | | | Not significant | | | The policy seeks to control the impacts of development within a series of locations considered to be key views within Frome. It does not seek to prevent development but instead attempts to ensure that design is of high quality and sensitive to its surroundings and long distance views. | | | None | |
| The degree to which the plan or programme influences other plans and programmes including those in a hierarchy | | | | | | | | Not significant | | | The policy refers to the Chris Blandford Associates 1996 study which identified the value of skyline sites worthy of protection and Mendip District Council’s Landscape Setting Plan for Frome. The policy is considered to supplement these and therefore no adverse environmental impacts are anticipated. | | | None | |
| The relevance of the plan or programme for the integration of environmental considerations in particular with a view to promoting sustainable development | | | | | | | | Not significant | | | There are not considered to be any relevant environmental impacts relating to sustainable development. | | | None | |
| Environmental problems relevant to the plan or programme | | | | | | | | Not significant | | | There are not considered to be any relevant impacts. Planning applications would still be subject to the usual planning application process and the policy seeks to add supplementary considerations to sensitive sites on the skyline of Frome. | | | None | |
| The relevance of the plan or programme for the implementation of Community legislation on the environment | | | | | | | | Not significant | | | There are not considered to be any relevant impacts upon the implementation of Community Environmental Legislation. Planning applications would still be subject to the usual planning application process and the policy seeks to add supplementary considerations to sensitive sites on the skyline of Frome. | | | None | |
| Criteria 2 from Schedule 1 of 2004 SEA Regulations – Characteristics of the effects and of the area likely to be affected, having regard, in particular, to: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| The probability, duration, frequency and reversibility of the effects | | | | | | | | Not significant | | | When sites are brought forward the visual impact upon the skyline would be permanent. However given that the policy offers sufficient protection the impacts are not considered likely to be significant. | | | None | |
| The cumulative nature of the effects | | | | | | | | Not significant | | | The cumulative effects of the policy are considered to have a beneficial effect through protecting valued skyline views, however these are not considered to be significant enough to warrant undertaking SEA. | | | None | |
| The transboundary nature of the effects | | | | | | | | Not significant | | | The policy focus is upon visual impacts within the town and therefore there are not considered to be any likely transboundary impacts. | | | None | |
| The risks to human health or the environment (for example, due to accidents) | | | | | | | | Not significant | | | There are not considered to be any relevant impacts. | | | None | |
| The magnitude and spatial extent of the effects (geographical area and size of the population likely to be affected) | | | | | | | | Not significant | | | Although the consideration of views throughout the town would be beneficial, there are not considered to be any significant impacts. | | | None | |
| The value and vulnerability of the area likely to be affected due to special natural characteristics or cultural heritage | | | | | | | | Not significant | | | The policy is considered likely to have a beneficial impact upon the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, although this would not be significant | | | None | |
| The value and vulnerability of the area likely to be affected due to exceeded environmental quality standards or limit values | | | | | | | | Not significant | | | There are not considered to be any significant impacts arising from this policy. | | | None | |
| The value and vulnerability of the area likely to be affected due to intensive land-use | | | | | | | | Not significant | | | The policy is not considered likely to lead to an intensification of land use as it is concerned with the visual impacts upon views throughout the town. | | | None | |
| The effects on areas or landscapes which have a recognised national, community of international protection status. | | | | | | | | Not significant | | | The policy is considered likely to have a beneficial impact upon the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, although this would not be significant | | | None | |
| **HRA Assessment** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Potential impact** | | **Assessment of significant effect** | | | | | | | | | **Justification** | | | **Amendments to Policy** | | |
| Impact on bat foraging areas | | Not significant | | | | | | | | | There is not considered to be any discernible impact as the policies main thrust is to ensure protection of valued skyline views. | | | None | | |
| Air and dust pollution impact on SAC | | Not significant | | | | | | | | | There are not considered to be any discernible impacts likely to arise from this policy. | | | None | | |
| **Policy D4 – Tree Protection:** Permission for development will be only be granted providing that there is no unacceptable loss of, or damage to, existing trees or woodlands, that are assessed as having  landscape, street scene or ecological value.  For each new dwelling 3 new trees shall be planted (or in the case of non residential development 1 tree for each car  parking space or 1 tree per 50msq of gross floorspace) Such tree planting should take place on site or if impractical on a  site close to the subject development (in consultation with the Town Council). | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Assessment Criteria** | | | | | | | | **Assessment of Significant Effect** | | | **Justification** | | | | **Amendments to Policy** |
| Criteria 1 from Schedule 1 of 2004 SEA Regulations – The characteristics of plans and programmes having regard, in particular, to: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| The degree to which the plan or programme sets a framework for projects and other activities, either with regard to the location, nature, size and operating conditions or by allocating resources | | | | | | | | Not significant | | | The policy seeks to protect existing trees and woodlands whilst also offsetting the impact of development with additional tree planting. It sets out a standard requirement for the provision of new tree planting. The policy is anticipated to have a beneficial environmental impact, but in the overall context of development in the town this is not considered environmentally significant. | | | None | |
| The degree to which the plan or programme influences other plans and programmes including those in a hierarchy | | | | | | | | Not significant | | | The policy can be interpreted as being supportive of the Green Infrastructure policy of the emerging Local Plan and the general principles of the Green Infrastructure policy of the Frome NDP. | | | None | |
| The relevance of the plan or programme for the integration of environmental considerations in particular with a view to promoting sustainable development | | | | | | | | Not significant | | | The policy seeks the protection of natural landscapes and an increase in tree planting to off-set the impacts of development. This is considered to be broadly supportive of sustainable development principles and therefore not environmentally significant in terms of impacts. | | | None | |
| Environmental problems relevant to the plan or programme | | | | | | | | Not significant | | | The community considers that there is a lack of urban trees within Frome and therefore this policy will help to address this issue. | | | None | |
| The relevance of the plan or programme for the implementation of Community legislation on the environment | | | | | | | | Not significant | | | The policy is not considered likely to have any impacts relevant to community environmental legislation | | | None | |
| Criteria 2 from Schedule 1 of 2004 SEA Regulations – Characteristics of the effects and of the area likely to be affected, having regard, in particular, to: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| The probability, duration, frequency and reversibility of the effects | | | | | | | | Not significant | | | Whilst the planting of new trees is reversible through their removal, it is considered likely that they will be permanent. The effects are considered to be positive and beneficial although in the overall context, not overly significant. | | | None | |
| The cumulative nature of the effects | | | | | | | | Not significant | | | The cumulative impact of the policy will see an increase in the number of trees within Frome which will be a positive environmental effect but is not considered to be overly significant; | | | None | |
| The transboundary nature of the effects | | | | | | | | Not significant | | | There are not considered to be any transboundary effects likely as the policy only applies to Frome. | | | None | |
| The risks to human health or the environment (for example, due to accidents) | | | | | | | | Not significant | | | There are unlikely to be any increased accidents as a result of tree planting, but there may be positive benefits to human health through ‘greening’ the town. | | | None | |
| The magnitude and spatial extent of the effects (geographical area and size of the population likely to be affected) | | | | | | | | Not significant | | | The spatial extent of the effects will be broad as development will occur at different sites across the town, although given that the sites where planting will occur are as yet unknown is it difficult to judge the overall impacts. | | | None | |
| The value and vulnerability of the area likely to be affected due to special natural characteristics or cultural heritage | | | | | | | | Not significant | | | It is considered that the policy allows for the protection of areas of special natural characteristics whist presenting an opportunity to enhance the setting of sites of cultural heritage. | | | None | |
| The value and vulnerability of the area likely to be affected due to exceeded environmental quality standards or limit values | | | | | | | | Not significant | | | Additional tree planting may have a beneficial impact on improving air quality and is considered unlikely to have any negative impacts upon environmental quality standards or limit values. | | | None | |
| The value and vulnerability of the area likely to be affected due to intensive land-use | | | | | | | | Not significant | | | The policy is intended to off-set the impacts of intensification of land uses through development and is therefore seen as a positive beneficial impact. | | | None | |
| The effects on areas or landscapes which have a recognised national, community of international protection status. | | | | | | | | Not significant | | | It is considered that the policy allows for the protection of protected areas or landscape whist presenting an opportunity to enhance the setting of such places. | | | None | |
| **HRA Assessment** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Potential impact** | | **Assessment of significant effect** | | | | | | | | | **Justification** | | | **Amendments to Policy** | | |
| Impact on bat foraging areas | | Not significant | | | | | | | | | There are not anticipated to be any significant adverse environmental impacts, although there may be some positive environmental effects from the policy. | | | None | | |
| Air and dust pollution impact on SAC | | Not significant | | | | | | | | | The policy is not anticipated to lead to any increase in air and dust pollution impacts. | | | None | | |