

Watford Borough Council

Part 2 Local Plan-

Development Management Policies Options

Proposed 1st Consultation Version Sustainability Appraisal

Report

November 2013

Appendix 3 Detailed Assessment Matrix of the 1st Consultation Options

Assessment key:

Symbol	Description
✓✓	Very sustainable - Option is likely to contribute significantly to the SA/SEA objective
✓	Sustainable - Option is likely to contribute in some way to the SA/SEA objective
0	Neutral – Option is unlikely to impact on the SA/SEA objective
?	Uncertain – It is uncertain how or if the Option impacts on the SA/SEA objective
X	Unsustainable – Option is likely to have minor adverse impacts on the SA/SEA objective
X X	Very unsustainable – Option is likely to have significant adverse impacts on the SA/SEA objective

Policy Topic: **Sustainable Design 1 (SD5)**

Proposed **option 1**: Residential developments to achieve CfSH Level 3 and non-residential to meet BREEAM Good and Major developments achieve BREEAM Communities 2012; buildings within SPAs to achieve CfSH 4 and BREEAM Very Good.

Option 2: Residential developments to achieve CfSH Level 4 and non-residential to meet BREEAM Very Good and Major developments achieve BREEAM Communities 2012; buildings within SPAs to achieve CfSH 5 and BREEAM Excellent.

Option 3: Renewable energy generation

Option 4: Adopt Core Strategy Sustainable Development policies only

SEA/SA Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	Commentary & Recommendations
1. Biodiversity	✓	✓✓	-	✓	BREEAM and CfSH require developments to demonstrate protection and enhancements to biodiversity. While BREEAM Very Good standards required within SPAs in Option 1 will support the objective, the demanding requirements to achieve BREEAM Excellent within the SPAs under option 2 will bring significant benefit to the biodiversity features in the area. Core Strategy policy (Option 4) requires enhancement to aquatic and water related biodiversity under SD2.
2. Water resources	✓	✓✓	-	✓	BREEAM and CfSH require developments to demonstrate incorporation of water efficiency measures, including water harvesting. The requirement under Option 2 for buildings within SPA to achieve higher ratings will require demonstration of measures that could achieve significant savings therefore rated better than Option 1. SD2 of the Core Strategy covers water resources protection and consumption.
3. Flood risk	✓	✓	-	✓	Requirements within BREEAM and CfSH support management of flood risk and so does SD 2 of the Core Strategy (option 4).
4. Soil	✓	✓	-	✓	Requirements within BREEAM and CfSH support the soil objective. SD3 of the Core Strategy requires prioritising development on PDL.
5. Climate change impact reduction	✓	✓✓	✓	✓	In general BREEAM and CfSH requirements will drive energy efficiency in the design process, and support renewable energy and other resource efficient design. The BREEAM Excellent and CfSH 5 target, for buildings within SPAs, set within Option 2 can be achieved only upon incorporating all resource efficient measures, including operational energy reduction, water resources efficiency, promotion of green roofs/ walls which in turn will impact energy use. BREEAM

SEA/SA Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	Commentary & Recommendations
					<p>criteria will also look for evidence on use of technological development to provide clean and efficient use of resources (for example renewable)- fully supportive of the SA objective.</p> <p>Option 3 supports the possibility of using technology to provide clean and efficient use of resources, supporting the SA objective.</p> <p>The Core Strategy policies (option 4), at a high level supports water and energy efficiency and renewable use, however does not specify on how these can be translated to a building development level.</p>
6. Adaptation to climate change	✓	✓	✓	✓	<p>Options 1 and 2, by requirement of BREEAM and CfSH may support building design that takes advantage of climatological factors and will help design weather resistant building.</p> <p>Option 3 is supportive of the SA objective, by providing a possibility of self-sufficient energy generation</p> <p>Core Strategy policies (Option 4) support principles of climate change adaptation, however at a building level no detail on how this can be translated is available.</p>
7. Air quality	✓	✓	✓	-	<p>Options 1 and 2 will require the developments to demonstrate their support for sustainable transport, which in turn will help maintain or improve air quality in the area.</p> <p>Option 3 will help offset air emissions (including carbon and particulates) from burning of fossil fuels to produce electricity.</p> <p>Although the Core Strategy places emphasis on CO₂, sustainable transport is not explicitly promoted within this option. Transport emissions have a significant bearing on the air quality in an area.</p>
8. Maximise use of PDL	✓	✓	-	✓	Requirements of BREEAM and of the Core Strategy are supportive of use of brownfield land.
9. Resources (and material) efficiency	✓	✓✓	✓	✓	While Options 1, 2 and 3 are likely to contribute to achieving resource efficiency, BREEAM Excellent requirements are most likely to drive efficiency of all resources- material and energy whereas Options 1, 3 and 4 are likely to drive one or the other.
10. Historic environment and cultural assets	✓	✓	-	-	BREEAM requirements are supportive of protecting and enhancing cultural heritage.
11. Landscape and townscape character	✓	✓	-	-	BREEAM requirements are supportive of protecting and enhancing townscape/landscape character.
12. Population and human health	✓	✓	-	✓	BREEAM requirements (Options 1 and 2) and the Core Strategy policies (Option 4) are supportive of achieving human health and well-being objectives.

SEA/SA Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	Commentary & Recommendations
13. Sustainable patterns of development	-	-	-	-	No effect predicted.
14. Equity & Social inclusion	-	-	-	-	No effect predicted.
15. Access to good quality housing	-	-	-	-	No effect predicted.
16. Community identity and participation	✓	✓	-	-	BREEAM requirements are supportive of community participation; Options 3 and 4 will have a neutral effect on the SA objective.
17. Reduce crime (actual and perceived)	✓	✓	-	-	BREEAM requirements are supportive of achieving the SA objective; options 3 and 4 will have a neutral effect on the SA objective.
18. Prosperity and economic growth	-	?	-	-	Although positive under most environmental and some social aspects, it is not clear whether there will be resistance from the industry to invest in developments with very high targets such as BREEAM Excellent or CfSH 5. For this reason the impact is predicted to be uncertain under this SA objective.
19. Equity and accessibility to services	✓	✓	-	-	Through BREEAM Communities, large projects will aim to achieve equity and accessibility to amenities and services for its residents.
20. Revitalise town centres	-	-	-	-	No effect predicted.
<p>Recommendation & comments (prior to 1st consultation): 1) BREEAM and CfSH may drive re-use of in-situ materials and of recycled materials but are unlikely to require embodied carbon within construction materials as a key criteria in evaluation. Embodied carbon in building materials accounts to the overall global emissions. Consider discussing the need for developments to demonstrate reduction in embodied carbon.</p> <p>2) Although very positive to achieve sustainability objectives, achieving BREEAM Excellent or CfSH 5 may be very challenging for developers, or it may be reflected in the cost of the properties. Further detailed analysis on average cost-benefit may be helpful, however from a typical industry perspective the requirements may hinder potential investments in buildings development. It is acknowledged that the SPA requirements within Option 1 appear reasonable. A combination of requirements taken from options 1 and 2 may be considered.</p> <p>3) The policy is heavily dependent on BREEAM and CfSH- these are currently available rating systems, but there are industry debates about the actual energy efficiency achieved and specifically on the lack of training on maintenance of the systems during operations (monitoring)- some thought to this issue may be beneficial in achieving local economic growth; consider allowing for flexibility and/ or using other rating system such as CEEQUAL for major developments (which is awarded upon demonstration after construction that the committed proposals are incorporated and considers wider campus aspects rather than buildings). WBC response: BREEAM is widely used, adhere to BREEAM Communities</p> <p>4) Under options 1 and 2, the reasoning behind not explicitly mentioning renewable energy generation is understood (that it will be incorporated within BREEAM/CfSH requirements) it must be noted that the BREEAM Very Good credits could be achieved without investigating into renewable but investing in other topics, thus an opportunity to explore renewable energy may be lost. This is particularly relevant for any major development that may occur outside the SPA. WBC response: Added renewable energy as a new policy SD7.</p>					

SEA/SA Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	Commentary & Recommendations
<p>5) It is not clear whether BREEAM and CfSH requirements will fully assess community access to services and equitable provision of amenities. Social and economic objectives may not be fully represented, particularly in those developments that are not prescribed to adopt BREEAM Communities standard.</p> <p>6) Refurbishment developments (major applications) are not represented in the proposed policies, however it is acknowledged that the Core Strategy policy discusses this item and can be covered from a high level.</p>					

Policy Topic: **Sustainability Statement (SD6)**

Proposed **option**: Planning applications should be accompanied by a Sustainability statement which also includes checklist from the Hertfordshire Building Futures sustainability toolkit.

General SA commentary: In order to fulfil criteria within the sustainability toolkit the developer may take actions that will bring positive results to biodiversity, soil, water, flood risk mitigation, climate change adaptation, air quality, equity and accessibility to services and in general revitalise town centres, this policy discusses procedural matters and the policy itself will not have direct significant impact on the SA objective. For this reason a neutral rating is allocated under all SA objectives.

SEA/SA Topic	Option 1 (SD6)	Commentary & Recommendations
1. Biodiversity	-	No effect predicted.
2. Water resources	-	No effect predicted.
3. Flood risk	-	No effect predicted.
4. Soil	-	No effect predicted.
5. Climate change impact reduction	-	No effect predicted.
6. Adaptation to climate change	-	No effect predicted.
7. Air quality	-	No effect predicted.
8. Maximise use of PDL	-	No effect predicted.
9. Resources (and material) efficiency	-	No effect predicted.
10. Historic environment and cultural assets	-	No effect predicted.
11. Landscape and townscape character	-	No effect predicted.
12. Population and human health	-	No effect predicted.
13. Sustainable patterns of development	-	No effect predicted.
14. Equity & Social inclusion	-	No effect predicted.
15. Access to good quality housing	-	No effect predicted.
16. Community identity and participation	-	No effect predicted.
17. Reduce crime (actual and perceived)	-	No effect predicted.
18. Prosperity and economic growth	-	No effect predicted.
19. Equity and accessibility to services	-	No effect predicted.
20. Revitalise town centres	-	No effect predicted.
Recommendation: None		

Policy Topic: **SD7- Option 1- Renewable Energy Technology**

Option 2- Do nothing

SEA/SA Topic	Option 1 (SD7)	Option 2	Commentary & Recommendations
1. Biodiversity	-	-	No effect predicted.
2. Water resources	-	-	No effect predicted.
3. Flood risk	-	-	No effect predicted.
4. Soil	-	-	No effect predicted.
5. Climate change impact reduction	✓	?	Option 1 supports the possibility of using technology to provide clean and efficient use of resources, supporting the SA objective. Dependent on the availability of other technology (for example nuclear energy) or market instruments (such as buying renewable energy), Option 2 may or may not contribute to reducing the impact of climate change.
6. Adaptation to climate change	✓	-	Option 1 is supportive of the SA objective, by providing a possibility of self-sufficient energy generation..
7. Air quality	✓	-	Option 1 will help offset air emissions (including carbon and particulates) from burning of fossil fuels to produce electricity.
8. Maximise use of PDL	-	-	No effect predicted.
9. Resources (and material) efficiency	✓	-	Option 1 is likely to drive energy efficiency, and dependent on the technology to be used, may promote material efficiency
10. Historic environment and cultural assets	-	-	No effect predicted.
11. Landscape and townscape character	-	-	No effect predicted.
12. Population and human health	-	-	No effect predicted.
13. Sustainable patterns of development	-	-	No effect predicted.
14. Equity & Social inclusion	-	-	No effect predicted.
15. Access to good quality housing	-	-	No effect predicted.
16. Community identity and participation	-	-	No effect predicted.
17. Reduce crime (actual and perceived)	-	-	No effect predicted.
18. Prosperity and economic growth	-	-	No effect predicted.
19. Equity and accessibility to services	-	-	No effect predicted.
20. Revitalise town centres	-	-	No effect predicted.
Recommendation: None			

Policy topic: **Decentralised energy**

Option 1:SD8- Proposals for decentralised energy networks will be supported.

SEA/SA Topic	Option 1 (SD8)	Commentary & Recommendations
1. Biodiversity	-	No effect predicted.
2. Water resources	-	No effect predicted.
3. Flood risk	-	No effect predicted.
4. Soil	-	No effect predicted.
5. Climate change impact reduction	-✓	The policy option encourages technological development to provide clean and efficient use of natural resource (for energy generation)- supporting the SA objective.
6. Adaptation to climate change	✓	The policy requires development proposals where no energy network is currently in place to demonstrate flexibility in terms of making provision to plug into the decentralised system- a proposal aimed at adaptation to future changes- positively contributes to the SA objective..
7. Air quality	✓	There will be wider air quality benefits if not locally at power stations where air quality may be poor.
8. Maximise use of PDL	-	No effect predicted.
9. Resources (and material) efficiency	✓	Policy is supportive of the SA objective
10. Historic environment and cultural assets	-	No effect predicted.
11.Landscape and townscape character	-	No effect predicted.
12. Population and human health	-	No effect predicted.
13. Sustainable patterns of development	-	No effect predicted.
14. Equity & Social inclusion	-	No effect predicted.
15. Access to good quality housing	-	No effect predicted.
16. Community identity and participation	-	No effect predicted.
17. Reduce crime (actual and perceived)	-	No effect predicted.
18. Prosperity and economic growth	✓	When combined with training of local workforce on decentralised energy network technology the policy can help bring jobs to the local communities and perhaps position itself as a leader in this sector in the region.
19. Equity and accessibility to services	-	No effect predicted.
20. Revitalise town centres	-	No effect predicted.
Recommendation/ comment: Given many SPA have been proposed in the Borough and the policy requires all SPAs to make provision for district heating networks, consider encouraging skills training in this sector to be benefit of local workforce and create awareness through education programmes within schools and communities (through documents other than Development management policies).		

Policy Topic: **SD9 Flood Risk**

Alternative option1: No policy

Alternative option 2: No development in flood risk zone 3. (Not considered realistic in Watford given development pressures and extent of flood risk areas)

Option 3 (proposed approach): Strict controls over development in the flood plain (to ensure mitigation, and to include control over surface run off) – preferred approach.

SEA/SA Objective (Abridged)	Option 1: No policy	Option 2- No development on FZ3	Option 3- Policy SD9	Commentary & Recommendations
1. Biodiversity	x	✓	✓	<p>Option 1 does not address issues relating to flood risk or functional flood plain (both in terms of quality and quantity) implying effects on aquatic and terrestrial habitats may be ignored and may become severe in the long term with cumulative and synergistic effects from various new development sites.</p> <p>Where existing flood zones 3 assume the role of flood storage areas, and if they support biodiversity features, Option 2 is likely to maintain these features.</p> <p>The proposed Policy SD9 requires new development to be cognisant of the functional flood plain and its feeder routes (therefore species and habitats within wetlands and functional flood plains may be protected). The requirements of the policy may translate into creation of SuDS and swales which in turn can encourage terrestrial and aquatic biodiversity.</p>
2. Water resources	x	✓	✓	<p>Options 2 and 3 (Policy SD9) may help maintain the integrity of the flood plains (option 3 will not allow development to constrain flows to flood plains). The policy requirements may encourage adoption of measures such as SuDS that may help maintain or improve the quality of water resources.</p> <p>A do-nothing option (Option 1), in the medium and long term is most likely to affect the integrity of flood plains and result in a cumulative negative effect on the quality of water resources.</p>
3. Flood risk	x	✓	✓	<p>In a no-policy scenario (option 1) developments may be located in places that will either be not able to cope with the risk of flooding or add to the flood risk in the local area- both not desirable outcomes for the future of Watford.</p> <p>Option 3 (Policy SD9) addresses the risk of flooding from a holistic perspective i.e., limiting future developments from being exposed to the risk of the effects of flooding as well as limiting the potential for the developments to cause flood risk in the local area.</p>

SEA/SA Objective (Abridged)	Option 1: No policy	Option 2- No development on FZ3	Option 3- Policy SD9	Commentary & Recommendations
				Addressing storm water surges is dealt with by Policy SD10- cumulatively Policy SD9 and SD10 will have significant positive effect against the flood risk objective, both spatially and temporally. Option 2 will allow flood plains to continue their current role, without reducing their function of providing space for flood storage (thereby supporting adaptation and the SA objective).
4. Soil	-	-	-	No effect predicted
5. Climate change impact reduction	-	-	-	No effect predicted
6. Adaptation to climate change	-	-	-	No effect predicted
7. Air quality	-	-	-	No effect predicted
8. Maximise use of PDL	-	-	-	No effect predicted
9. Resources (and material) efficiency	-	-	-	No effect predicted
10. Historic environment and cultural assets	-	-	?	In a no policy scenario no significant impact can be predicted. Under Option 3 (Policy SD9), it is not clear how the physical features of the new developments that are required to provide resilience and resistance to flooding incorporate design features that will complement an historic setting.
11. Landscape and townscape character	-	-	?	In a no policy scenario no significant impact can be predicted. Under Option 3 (Policy SD9), it is not clear how the physical features of the new developments that are required to provide resilience and resistance to flooding incorporate design features that will complement the local setting.
12. Population and human health	x	-	✓	In a no policy scenario, residents of the new developments and existing residents around the proposed development will be exposed to the risk of flooding, i.e. will cause stress caused by the uncertainty. In the long term with the predicted increase in the effects of climate change a no policy scenario will have an adverse negative effect on the health objective. Option 3 (Policy SD9) will help maintain well-being of the individuals located near the development-supportive of the health objective.
13. Sustainable patterns of development	-	-	-	No effect predicted
14. Equity & Social inclusion	-	-	-	No effect predicted
15. Access to good quality housing	-	-	-	No effect predicted

SEA/SA Objective (Abridged)	Option 1: No policy	Option 2- No development on FZ3	Option 3- Policy SD9	Commentary & Recommendations
16. Community identity and participation	-	-	-	No effect predicted
17. Reduce crime (actual and perceived)	-	-	-	No effect predicted
18. Prosperity and economic growth	-	-	✓	Option 3 is likely to have a positive effect on the SA objective as the proposed policy may help limit the flood related damage to assets in commercial operations (for example flooding of commercial property and disruption to operations).
19. Equity and accessibility to services	-	-	-	No effect predicted
20. Revitalise town centres	-	-	✓	As more new developments in the medium to the long term adopt the policy, there will be reduced flood risk in the area that will most likely help maintain normal life; indirectly this implies reduced negative impact on retail shopping related trips.
Recommendation: Urban design and building aesthetics may be compromised while trying to address the flood resilience and resistance aspects. The policy SD9 should place emphasis on the creative use of landscape and design as an integral part of flood risk management				

Policy Topic: **SD10- Drainage**

Alternative option (Option 1) : Do-nothing scenario

Proposed option (Option 2): Require Drainage Impact Assessment; incorporate SuDS and integrate flood risk management to new developments

No alternative option proposed

SEA/SA Objective (Abridged)	Option 1- Do- nothing	Option 2- Policy SD10	Commentary & Recommendations
1. Biodiversity	-	✓	With no policy to address drainage from surface run-off and flooding no significant effect on biodiversity can be predicted. Policy SD10 requires incorporation of SuDS and explicit demonstration of biodiversity enhancement opportunities- all supportive of the biodiversity objective.
2. Water resources	?	✓	Policy SD10 requirements encourage adoption of measures such as SuDS that may help maintain or improve the quality of water resources. Conserving water could help protect sites that are vulnerable to loss of groundwater. In a do-nothing option the effect of absence of a drainage impact assessment or non-inclusion of SuDS will have location specific impact which is not possible to predict at this level.
3. Flood risk	-	✓	In a no-policy scenario developments may be located in places that will either be not able to cope with the risk of pluvial flooding, or add to the flood risk in the local area- both not desirable outcomes for the future of Watford. Policy SD10 would reduce the risk of sudden flood surges resulting from increased surface run-off due to rainfall. Cumulatively, Policies SD9 and SD10 will have a significant positive effect against the flood risk objective, both spatially and temporally.
4. Soil	-	✓	Under Option 2 there may be reduced risk of soil erosion resulting from storm water surges .
5. Climate change impact reduction	-	✓	Under Option 2, by reducing water demand and improving surface water attenuation will help prepare for the impacts of climate change.
6. Adaptation to climate change	-	-	No effect predicted
7. Air quality	-	-	No effect predicted
8. Maximise use of PDL	-	-	No effect predicted
9. Resources (and material) efficiency	-	-	No effect predicted
10. Historic environment and cultural assets	-	-	No effect predicted
11.Landscape and townscape character	-	-	No effect predicted

SEA/SA Objective (Abridged)	Option 1- Do- nothing	Option 2- Policy SD10	Commentary & Recommendations
12. Population and human health	x	✓	In a no policy scenario, residents of the new developments and existing residents around the proposed development will be exposed to the risk of flooding i.e. stress caused by uncertainty affecting wellbeing. Policy W2 would help to alleviate these issues and is therefore supportive of the health objective.
13. Sustainable patterns of development	-	-	No effect predicted
14. Equity & Social inclusion	-	-	No effect predicted
15. Access to good quality housing	-	-	No effect predicted
16. Community identity and participation	-	-	No effect predicted
17. Reduce crime (actual and perceived)	-	-	No effect predicted
18. Prosperity and economic growth	-	✓	Option 2 is likely to have a positive effect on the SA objective as the proposed policy may help limit the flood related damage to assets in commercial operations (for example warehouse flooding).
19. Equity and accessibility to services	-	-	No effect predicted
20. Revitalise town centres	-	✓	As more new developments in the medium to the long term adopt the policy, there will be reduced flood risk in the area that will most likely help maintain normal life; indirectly this implies reduced negative impact on retail shopping related trips.
Recommendation: None			

Policy Topic: **SD11-Water consumption**

Option 1: No policy scenario

Option 2: To rely on BREEAM and CfSH criteria to incorporate water efficiency standards

Option 3: To rely on Core Strategy SD2-Water Resources Policy

Option 4: Proposed Option – SD11 which covers water consumption, water resources protection and enhancement

SEA/SA Objective (Abridged)	Option 1- Do-nothing	Option 2- BREEAM & CfSH	Option 3- Core Strategy SD2	Option 4- Policy SD11	Commentary & Recommendations
1. Biodiversity	-	?	?	✓✓	No predicted effect under a do nothing option. Although at a Borough level Option 3 (CS SD2) may contribute positively to the biodiversity, it is uncertain on how the requirements of SD2 translates to build opportunities to enhance biodiversity (terrestrial and aquatic) at a site specific level. Dependent on the credits required under the Water resources topic of the BREEAM and CfSH the drive to create green roofs/walls and drought-proof planting may or may not occur i.e., some developers who choose BREEAM/CfSH may invest in biodiversity & water enhancement measures whereas others may choose to invest resources in other topics of BREEAM/CfSH that are not biodiversity related. Proposed Policy SD11 explicitly requires future developments to look into an integrated solution to both enhance biodiversity and help enhance water efficiency and therefore significant positive effects have been predicted against this objective.
2. Water resources	x	✓	✓	✓✓	In a do-nothing scenario, without any appropriate measure to control water consumption and on ground water abstraction, the SA objective cannot be achieved. By comparison, all other options will in general promote water efficiency measures at the building level. The proposed policy W3 emphasises protection of ground water resources (specific to Watford boundary) in addition to overall water resources.
3. Flood risk	-	-	-	-	No effect predicted
4. Soil	-	-	-	-	No effect predicted
5. Climate change impact reduction	-	-	-	-	No effect predicted
6. Adaptation to climate change	-	-	-	-	No effect predicted
7. Air quality	-	-	-	-	No effect predicted

SEA/SA Objective (Abridged)	Option 1- Do- nothing	Option 2- BREEAM & CfSH	Option 3- Core Strategy SD2	Option 4- Policy SD11	Commentary & Recommendations
8. Maximise use of PDL	-	-	-	-	No effect predicted
9. Resources (and material) efficiency	-	-	-	-	No effect predicted
10. Historic environment and cultural assets	-	-	-	-	No effect predicted
11. Landscape and townscape character	-	-	-	-	No effect predicted
12. Population and human health	-	-	-	-	No effect predicted
13. Sustainable patterns of development	-	-	-	-	No effect predicted
14. Equity & Social inclusion	-	-	-	-	No effect predicted
15. Access to good quality housing	-	-	-	-	No effect predicted
16. Community identity and participation	-	-	-	-	No effect predicted
17. Reduce crime (actual and perceived)	-	-	-	-	No effect predicted
18. Prosperity and economic growth	-	-	-	-	No effect predicted
19. Equity and accessibility to services	-	-	-	-	No effect predicted
20. Revitalise town centres	-	-	-	-	No effect predicted
<p>Recommendation (prior to 1st consultation): Consider strengthening the policy SD11 (option 4) to help prevent pollution (i.e., address quality aspect). For example overarching policy on more scrutiny at SPZ areas.</p> <p>With technological advancement and more evidence base likely to become available during the plan period, flexibility in the suggested per capita consumption is recommended. For example if future studies inform about more water stress or innovative technology can achieve say 70lpcd, the suggested 105lpcd may not necessarily motivate developers to adopt higher standards that may become available at a later stage.</p> <p><i>WBC response: WBC considers any higher standard in the future is likely to be mandated through national standards, whose adoption the policy supports.</i></p> <p>If the BREEAM and CfSH criteria referred to relates to the Sustainable Design criteria, explicitly state the rating requirement; if stated the SA scoring under the biodiversity objective (SA1) may be revised</p>					

Proposed Policy: **SD12 Protection of River Corridors, Canals and Watercourses and Restoration**

Alternative policy: Do-nothing scenario

SEA/SA Objective (Abridged)	Option 1- Do-nothing	Option 2- Policy SD12	Commentary & Recommendations
1. Biodiversity	x	✓✓	Under a do-nothing scenario development control for proposals along the water courses will be absent and may affect the water related habitats, resulting in long term negative impact. Policy SD12, on the other hand, places emphasis on habitat creation, enhancement and protection- all supportive of the biodiversity objective. Over time, with more developments along the water courses contributing to habitat creation, a blue corridor may be created in the medium to the long term brining significant positive effect on biodiversity features.
2. Water resources	x	✓	Without any appropriate measures to control development along the water courses, this SA objective cannot be achieved; instead over time, with no structured approach to developments along the water courses the objective may be negatively affected in the medium to the long term. Policy SD12 will help maintain integrity of water resources in the area. With the required buffer for new developments, occurrence of pollution incidents is likely to be low.
3. Flood risk	x	✓	A do-nothing option may not stop new developments from being located very close to the water courses, thus exposing to the risk of flooding. The buffer requirement stated in Policy SD12 is clearly aimed at both protecting the water course as well as protecting the development from the risk of flooding. It is assumed that Policy SD12 will interact with Policy SD9 and cumulatively contribute to achieving this SA objective.
4. Soil	-	-	No effect predicted
5. Climate change impact reduction	-	-	No effect predicted
6. Adaptation to climate change	-	-	No effect predicted
7. Air quality	-	-	No effect predicted
8. Maximise use of PDL	-	-	No effect predicted
9. Resources (and material) efficiency	-	-	No effect predicted
10. Historic environment and cultural assets	-	-	No effect predicted
11.Landscape and townscape character	-	✓	In a do-nothing scenario or in the short term with Policy SD12, no significant effect on the SA objective is predicted.

SEA/SA Objective (Abridged)	Option 1- Do- nothing	Option 2- Policy SD12	Commentary & Recommendations
			With the increased and cumulative contributions from new developments to the creation of habitats and improvements along the water courses, it is likely that the local distinctiveness and landscape character of developments along the water courses be improved in the medium to the long term.
12. Population and human health	-	✓	No significant effect is predicted under a do-nothing scenario. Biodiversity enhancements and in general river/ water corridor improvements are likely to occur as a result of the policy requirements. Residents who will have access to these improved areas will benefit, both in terms of physical access for walking and running purposes (to maintain healthy lifestyle) and provide a visual amenity (to add to general wellbeing).
13. Sustainable patterns of development	-	-	No effect predicted
14. Equity & Social inclusion	-	-	No effect predicted
15. Access to good quality housing	-	-	No effect predicted
16. Community identity and participation	-	-	No effect predicted
17. Reduce crime (actual and perceived)	-	-	No effect predicted
18. Prosperity and economic growth	-	-	No effect predicted
19. Equity and accessibility to services	-	-	No effect predicted
20. Revitalise town centres	-	-	No effect predicted
<p>Recommendation @ July 2013 (prior to consultation version): It is unclear whether the water course enhancements as a result of allowing new developments will be accessible to only a few individuals (i.e., immediate residential owners) or to the whole local community. Where possible, public access to enjoy the enhancement benefits is recommended without compromising the safety and privacy of the residents.</p> <p><i>WBC response: This recommendation has now been incorporated in the Autumn 2013 Consultation version.</i></p>			

Policy SD13: Groundwater Protection: To have a general policy on Groundwater Protection in addition to the policy on contamination

Option 2: not to have a general policy on Groundwater Protection

SEA/SA Objective (Abridged)	Option 1: Policy SD13	Option 2: No policy	Commentary & Recommendations
1. Biodiversity	✓	-	Under Option 1 there will be indirect positive effects for biodiversity as protecting groundwater sources, both in terms of quantity and quality, will be positive for water dependent species.
2. Water resources	✓	?	Under Option 1 the policy is supportive of maintaining ground water quality, but is not explicit about the quantity, although the explanatory text discusses quantity aspect. As such construction works on contaminated land that is likely to affect the Principal Aquifer (typically under the chalk) will require a clearance from the Environment Agency. Dependent on the site condition and scale of the project a risk assessment the water quality aspect may or may not be covered in a no policy scenario.
3. Flood risk	-	-	No effect predicted
4. Soil	-	-	No effect predicted
5. Climate change impact reduction	-	-	No effect predicted
6. Adaptation to climate change	-	-	No effect predicted
7. Air quality	-	-	No effect predicted
8. Maximise use of PDL	-	-	No effect predicted
9. Resources (and material) efficiency	-	-	No effect predicted
10. Historic environment and cultural assets	-	-	No effect predicted
11. Landscape and townscape character	-	-	No effect predicted
12. Population and human health	✓	-	Protection of groundwater will help to maintain a local supply of drinking water.
13. Sustainable patterns of development	-	-	No effect predicted
14. Equity & Social inclusion	-	-	No effect predicted
15. Access to good quality housing	-	-	No effect predicted
16. Community identity and participation	-	-	No effect predicted
17. Reduce crime (actual and perceived)	-	-	No effect predicted
18. Prosperity and economic growth	-	-	No effect predicted
19. Equity and accessibility to services	-	-	No effect predicted
20. Revitalise town centres	-	-	No effect predicted
<p>Recommendations/ comment (prior to 1st consultation): EA is now producing an update to the abstraction status in England which should become available in the future. This mapping exercise will indicate where abstraction should be refused or allowed having regard to ecological impact. This item may be considered to strengthen the policy position in terms of maintaining the quantity as well as quality. <i>WBC response: No change as a result but maps will be used as a resource once available.</i></p>			

Policy Topic: **Waste**

Proposed **option 1: SD14** Waste Policy- all developments should include facilities for waste storage and recycling; for significant waste generating developments the Council will have regard to local facilities.

Note: As a Waste policy is already in practice a do-nothing scenario cannot be assigned to this policy topic and no other alternatives are proposed.

SEA/SA Topic	Option 1- Draft Policy 1 (SD14)	Commentary & Recommendations
1. Biodiversity	- ?	No direct effect from the proposed policy is predicted for the operation stage. At the construction stage, although major projects are likely to consider waste management of invasive species and that of protected species (through ecological clerks of works) it is not clear whether small projects will use similar rigorous methods. It is recommended that the policy is strengthened to provide guidance for small scale projects.
2. Water resources	-	No effect predicted.
3. Flood risk	-	No effect predicted.
4. Soil	-	No effect predicted.
5. Climate change impact reduction	✓	The proposed policy (option 1) will help promote recycling of operational waste which is likely to reduce indirect carbon emissions (either regionally or globally), thus will contribute towards achieving the SA objective. Promoting SWMPs could contribute to this objective by helping to reduce waste and promote recycling and re-use, thereby avoiding waste management methods that can contribute to greenhouse gases.
6. Adaptation to climate change	-	No effect predicted.
7. Air quality	-	No effect predicted.
8. Maximise use of PDL	-	No effect predicted.
9. Resources (and material) efficiency	✓	The policy and supporting text are aimed at encouraging efficiency in waste management which in turn may help re-use of resources.
10. Historic environment and cultural assets	-	No effect predicted.
11. Landscape and townscape character	-	No effect predicted.
12. Population and human health	-	No effect predicted.
13. Sustainable patterns of development	-	No effect predicted.
14. Equity & Social inclusion	-	No effect predicted.

SEA/SA Topic	Option 1- Draft Policy 1 (SD14)	Commentary & Recommendations
15. Access to good quality housing	-	No effect predicted.
16. Community identity and participation	-	No effect predicted.
17. Reduce crime (actual and perceived)	-	No effect predicted.
18. Prosperity and economic growth	-	No effect predicted.
19. Equity and accessibility to services	-	No effect predicted.
20. Revitalise town centres	-	No effect predicted.
<p>Recommendation:</p> <p>Consider providing specific guidance on handling waste in small scale projects that may involve biodiversity such as protected species (during excavation) or management of invasive species at the site. .</p> <p>As a general point, it is noted that the policy discusses waste collection, but waste minimisation is also a topic that should be considered either as part of this policy chapter, or within the sustainable development policy set. Such a policy can aim to push for further standards by either requiring developers to give details of how they will demonstrate waste material re-use in addition to the Site Waste Management Plan. The SWMP may be properly developed only at the detailed design and construction stage, but management decisions on how to handle anticipated waste such as using consolidated centres to store re-usable demolition waste and similar may be incorporated at the planning application stage.</p>		

Policy Topic: **Pollution and Contamination**

Proposed option 1: Draft Policy SD15 Unstable, contaminated and potentially contaminated land (policy brought forward from the Watford District Plan 2000, and refined with Environment Agency advice)

Alternative option 2: No policy

SEA/SA Objective (Abridged)	Option 1: Draft policy SD15	Option 2 – No Policy	Commentary & Recommendations
1. Biodiversity	✓	-	Under Option 1, where soil excavation occurs on sites containing invasive species such as Giant Hogweed or Japanese Knotweed the soil is typically classified as being contaminated and will therefore be covered by the policy requirements. This may help maintain or enhance biodiversity at the development site. For this reason the proposed policy option is considered to positively support the SA objective.
2. Water resources	?	?	Under Option 1, where the site is located within Source Protection Zones, or where a site's geology is underlain by chalk (aquifers) close to the ground, surface development construction may pose a risk to the ground water sources, thereby polluting the source. While the proposed policy will address this issue at sites identified to be potentially contaminated, not all sites within SPZ and weakly protected aquifer (for example directly under chalk) are likely to be protected by this policy. Therefore the effect will be positive or neutral, depending on the site conditions. For developments on sites with contamination history, national policy requiring remediation will apply, but similar to the effect predicted under option 1, sites not contaminated but within a SPZ may not be sufficiently protected.
3. Flood risk	-	-	No effect predicted
4. Soil	✓✓	✓	Option 1 will both help contain contamination spreading to local receptors, as well as help remediate land to enable better use of the land- thus fully supportive of the Soils SA objective. As contamination remediation is a national policy requirement, under a no-policy option positive contribution to soil improvement will occur.
5. Climate change impact reduction	-	-	No effect predicted
6. Adaptation to climate change	-	-	No effect predicted
7. Air quality	-	-	No effect predicted
8. Maximise use of PDL	✓	✓	The policy under option 1 relates to remediation of previously used site therefore supporting the SA objective. Under national policy, Option 2 will by default result in contamination remediation of PDL thus supporting the SA objective.

SEA/SA Objective (Abridged)	Option 1: Draft policy SD15	Option 2 – No Policy	Commentary & Recommendations
9. Resources (and material) efficiency	-	-	No effect predicted
10. Historic environment and cultural assets	-	-	No effect predicted
11. Landscape and townscape character	-	-	No effect predicted
12. Population and human health	✓	✓	As part of the remediation process, under both the options, health of the receptors in the neighbouring environment and future residents, in addition to the health of the construction workers will be taken into account, thereby supporting the Health SA objective.
13. Sustainable patterns of development	-	-	No effect predicted
14. Equity & Social inclusion	✓	✓	If a site considered is proposed for residential use, under both options, remediation of the site prior to housing will imply reduced environmental injustice- a positive action towards equity.
15. Access to good quality housing	-	-	No effect predicted
16. Community identity and participation	-	-	No effect predicted
17. Reduce crime (actual and perceived)	-	-	No effect predicted
18. Prosperity and economic growth	-	-	No effect predicted
19. Equity and accessibility to services	-	-	No effect predicted
20. Revitalise town centres	-	-	No effect predicted
<p>Recommendation (prior to 1st consultation): Consider inclusion of sites within SPZ and sites where the principal aquifer is not adequately protected by overlying geological features.</p> <p>Policy under option 1 could make reference to SURF-UK – an industry wide initiative that developed a framework in order to embed balanced decision making in the selection of remedial strategies in addressing land contamination as an integral part of sustainable development.</p> <p><i>WBC response: SPZ protection covered by policy SD13.</i></p>			

Policy Topic: **Potentially Hazardous or Polluting Development**

Proposed option: SD16 Permissions for hazardous or polluting development will be granted upon satisfying the Council that no risk to the environmental media or human health will occur.

Alternative option: Do-nothing scenario

SEA/SA Objective (Abridged)	Option 1– No Policy	Option 2 Draft policy SD16	Commentary & Recommendations	
1. Biodiversity	x	?	✓	<p>In a no policy scenario polluting development is most likely to harm biodiversity features- locally and/or regionally.</p> <p>Through the proposed policy potential risks may be identified and managed, but it is not clear as to how an emergency response will be managed. Given the nature of the proposed development, unknown risks cannot be ruled out; and the effects of these risks may be variable for different types of polluting developments and the receptor environment including biodiversity. For this reason an uncertain effect rating is allocated under Option 2.</p> <p>Although effects under unknown risks cannot be predicted, the assessment acknowledges the positive contribution the policy will make in terms of managing known risks to environmental features (including biodiversity).</p>
2. Water resources	x	?	✓	<p>In a no policy scenario polluting development may directly or indirectly affect water quality at the local/ regional level.</p> <p>Policy discussed under Option2 explicitly states that planning applications will need to have regard to impact on the water environment, therefore supporting the SA objective. Conversely it is not clear whether the applicant will be expected to cover wider cumulative and synergistic effects (over time and space) while assessing risk to the water environment. For this reason, a split assessment rating is allocated.</p>
3. Flood risk	-	-		No effect predicted
4. Soil	x	✓		<p>In a no policy scenario polluting development is most likely to harm soil features.</p> <p>The assessment acknowledges the positive contribution of the policy in terms of ensuring that potentially polluting development will take all steps to contain pollution (including to soil media).</p>
5. Climate change impact reduction	-	-		No effect predicted
6. Adaptation to climate change	-	-		No effect predicted
7. Air quality	-	-		No effect predicted
8. Maximise use of PDL	-	-		No effect predicted
9. Resources (and material) efficiency	-	-		No effect predicted

SEA/SA Objective (Abridged)	Option 1– No Policy	Option 2 Draft policy SD16	Commentary & Recommendations	
10. Historic environment and cultural assets	-	-	No effect predicted	
11.Landscape and townscape character	-	-	No effect predicted	
12. Population and human health	x	?	✓	<p>In a no policy scenario with no action in place for emergency situation to address risk to human health,a polluting development located within or nearer residential areas will affect the health of the residents.</p> <p>Option 2 explicitly requires planning applications to demonstrate consideration of the effect on human health, therefore supporting the SA objective.</p> <p>Conversely it is not clear whether the risk consideration will include indirect and long term impact on human health, including livelihood impact from unforeseen risks to the local and/or regional population (see Buncefield Report).For this reason a split assessment of uncertain and positive rating are allocated.</p>
13. Sustainable patterns of development	-	-	No effect predicted	
14. Equity & Social inclusion	-	-	No effect predicted	
15. Access to good quality housing	-	-	No effect predicted	
16. Community identity and participation	-	-	No effect predicted	
17. Reduce crime (actual and perceived)	-	-	No effect predicted	
18. Prosperity and economic growth	-	-	No effect predicted	
19. Equity and accessibility to services	-	-	No effect predicted	
20. Revitalise town centres	-	-	No effect predicted	
<p>Recommendation (prior to 1st consultation): On large polluting developments, consider discussing emergency response mechanisms and deployment of appropriate measures to mitigate loss of biodiversity in the case of predicted and unpredicted accidents.</p> <p>It is assumed that the risk assessment the Council will seek will include both direct risks to human and biodiversity receptors in the catchment area and indirect wider consequences such as potential impact on property, livelihoods and amenities. Consider stating the risks explicitly to provide guidance to applicants.</p> <p><i>WBC response: item covered by wording 'planning permission will be refused where insufficient information is provided'.</i></p>				

Policy Topic: **Air Quality**

Proposed **option 1**: Draft Policy SD17 Air Quality emphasis on mitigating air quality impacts and where possible to improve the air quality

Alternative **option 2**: No policy

SEA/SA Topic	Option 1- Draft Policy SD17	Option 2-No policy	Commentary & Recommendations
1. Biodiversity	✓	x	By minimising air pollution associated with proposed development there should be less risk of pollution affecting biodiversity, particularly within AQMAs. Additionally option 1 requires developers to demonstrate means to improve air quality- this may encourage to improve biodiversity. Under option 2, in a no policy scenario NPPF and Environment Agency requirements will apply which aim to mitigate worsening of air quality as a result of development therefore maintain business as usual or result in negligible negative effect on biodiversity features; locally; however when many developments are proposed in the same area cumulative negative effect is likely. .
2. Water resources	-	-	No effect predicted
3. Flood risk	-	-	No effect predicted
4. Soil	-	-	No effect predicted
5. Climate change impact reduction	✓	x	Proposed policy aims at addressing air quality issues (which includes CO ₂ emissions) while considering new development planning applications. In a 'No policy' scenario, although transport assessments and mitigation measures will be required under national policies, with increased new developments transport related emissions (including CO ₂) will inevitably increase causing localised impacts.
6. Adaptation to climate change	-	-	No effect predicted
7. Air quality	✓	x	Proposed policy option 1 is supportive of the SA objective, whereas in a 'No policy' scenario (option 2) new developments will be required by current national policy to reduce the negative impact as a result of the proposed development implying maintenance of business as usual scenario or negligible decrease in air quality locally. Cumulative impact from many developments in a same area may lead to negative impact, particularly within AQMAs and congestion hotspots.
8. Maximise use of PDL	-	-	No effect predicted
9. Resources (and material) efficiency	-	-	No effect predicted
10. Historic environment and cultural assets	✓	x	Under option 1, the policy would help maintain the setting of buildings (whether Listed or not) and in Conservation Areas.

SEA/SA Topic	Option 1- Draft Policy SD17	Option 2-No policy	Commentary & Recommendations
			In a no policy scenario, national policy applies which will help limit air quality deterioration from new development, thus helping maintain the business as usual scenario locally; however when many developments are proposed in the same area cumulative negative effect is likely.
11.Landscape and townscape character	-	-	No effect predicted
12. Population and human health	✓	x	The proposed policy will help reduce adverse health effects associated with poor air quality, particularly for residents and users within AQMA. Preserving amenity can contribute to both physical and mental well-being. Where air quality is already poor, a no policy option will worsen the situation affecting both the residents/ local building occupants and road users (both motorists and non-motorists) . In the long term cumulative impacts (from different congestion hotspots and AQMAs) will create adverse significant impact on the health of the local population in the medium to the long term
13. Sustainable patterns of development	-	-	No effect predicted
14. Equity & Social inclusion	-	-	No effect predicted
15. Access to good quality housing	-	-	No effect predicted
16. Community identity and participation	-	-	No effect predicted
17. Reduce crime (actual and perceived)	-	-	No effect predicted
18. Prosperity and economic growth	-	-	No effect predicted
19. Equity and accessibility to services	-	-	No effect predicted
20. Revitalise town centres	✓	x	Where new developments are proposed within and around the Town Centre area, option 1 will help maintain and improve air quality where current quality is poor. An improved environment may encourage users to the town centre which in turn will help the vitality of the centres. Conversely no improvements to air quality, including within the town centre (under option 2) will not contribute to the vitality of the town centre. As noted above where cumulative negative effects may occur as a result of many developments proposed in one area resulting in reducing attractiveness of town centres.
<p>Recommendation (prior to 1st consultation): Although the justification section of the proposed policy states that weight will be given to applications that will improve air quality and not just maintain quality in the area, the policy wording does not sufficiently reflect this idea. Policy wording states 'mitigation' which would mean limiting the predicted negative effect (to maintain business as usual); strengthen policy wording to reflect the discussion in the justification section.</p> <p><i>WBC response: Additional words included in the 1st consultation document: 'to ensure improvement in air quality'.</i></p>			

Policy Topic: **Noise Protection**

Proposed option 1: Draft Policy SD18 Noise sensitive development location guidance; noise exposure level guidance

Alternative option 2: Former PPS24 Noise exposure levels guidance only

SEA/SA Objective (Abridged)	Option 1: Draft Policy SD18	Option 2 – Former PPS24	Commentary & Recommendations
1. Biodiversity	-	-	No effect predicted
2. Water resources	-	-	No effect predicted
3. Flood risk	-	-	No effect predicted
4. Soil	-	-	No effect predicted
5. Climate change impact reduction	-	-	No effect predicted
6. Adaptation to climate change	-	-	No effect predicted
7. Air quality	-	-	No effect predicted
8. Maximise use of PDL	-	-	No effect predicted
9. Resources (and material) efficiency	-	-	No effect predicted
10. Historic environment and cultural assets	-	-	No effect predicted
11. Landscape and townscape character	-	-	No effect predicted
12. Population and human health	✓	✓	PPS 24 has now been revoked but the guidance aspects are adopted under the NPPF, therefore any development will need to adhere to limiting noise and vibration impact reduction which will help maintain the noise levels in the vicinity of a proposed development. The proposed Option 1 will also contribute positively in limiting noise related nuisance, therefore both options are likely to support the health objective.
13. Sustainable patterns of development	-	-	No effect predicted
14. Equity & Social inclusion	-	-	No effect predicted
15. Access to good quality housing	-	-	No effect predicted
16. Community identity and participation	-	-	No effect predicted
17. Reduce crime (actual and perceived)	-	-	No effect predicted
18. Prosperity and economic growth	-	-	No effect predicted
19. Equity and accessibility to services	-	-	No effect predicted
20. Revitalise town centres	-	-	No effect predicted
Recommendation: None			

Policy Topic: **External Lighting**

Proposed option 1: Draft Policy SD19 Avoid adverse negative impact on residential and ecological receptors and road users/ waterways users; avoid glare and spillage

Alternative option 2: No policy

SEA/SA Objective (Abridged)	Option 1: Draft Policy SD19	Option 2 – no policy	Commentary & Recommendations
1. Biodiversity	✓	✓	Under option 1, the proposed policy is sensitive to the effects of light spillage on biodiversity features (fauna). Equally in a no policy scenario under option 2, national planning policy guidance will apply that advises on ecological impact assessment from light pollution- therefore both options will support the SA objective,
2. Water resources	-	-	No effect predicted
3. Flood risk	-	-	No effect predicted
4. Soil	-	-	No effect predicted
5. Climate change impact reduction	-	-	No effect predicted
6. Adaptation to climate change	-	-	No effect predicted
7. Air quality	-	-	No effect predicted
8. Maximise use of PDL	-	-	No effect predicted
9. Resources (and material) efficiency	-	-	No effect predicted
10. Historic environment and cultural assets	-	-	No effect predicted
11. Landscape and townscape character	✓	✓	Reduced light spillage from new developments, under option 1 is most likely to improve visual amenity experience of landscape and townscape features. Under option 2, where NPPF guidance applies, factors to be considered include building materials and reflective glass in relation to its surroundings- all will contribute to the maintenance or improvement of the townscape features.
12. Population and human health	✓	✓	Improved visual amenity for the residents (under option 1) is most likely to contribute to the well-being of the population; The NPPF guidance under light pollution is specific about safeguarding open spaces and green belt as well as areas with light sensitive occupants- supporting the maintenance of well-being of the population .
13. Sustainable patterns of development	-	-	No effect predicted
14. Equity & Social inclusion	-	-	No effect predicted
15. Access to good quality housing	-	-	No effect predicted

SEA/SA Objective (Abridged)	Option 1: Draft Policy SD19	Option 2 – no policy	Commentary & Recommendations
16. Community identity and participation	-	-	No effect predicted
17. Reduce crime (actual and perceived)	✓	-	Policy under option 1 recognises the need to incorporate external lighting features sufficient for security purposes- supporting the SA objective. Appropriate street lighting within new developments would contribute towards the delivery of high quality, safe and inclusive design.
18. Prosperity and economic growth	-	-	No effect predicted
19. Equity and accessibility to services	-	-	No effect predicted
20. Revitalise town centres	-	-	No effect predicted
Recommendation: None			

Town Centre Retail Policies

TLC3: Restriction of non- retail uses in prime retail frontage

Options:

1. Continue with existing policy S5 from Watford Development Plan 2000
2. TLC 3 - Retain adopted plan policy (S5) but amend % and linear restriction so that A2 and A3 are restricted by % but not by reference to linear frontage and Retain Primary and secondary frontages as in existing plan (preferred approach).

SEA/SA Objective (Abridged)	Option 1:	Option 2 (TLC 3):	Commentary & Recommendations
1. Biodiversity	-	-	No effect predicted
2. Water resources	-	-	No effect predicted
3. Flood risk	-	-	No effect predicted
4. Soil	-	-	No effect predicted
5. Climate change impact reduction	-	-	No effect predicted
6. Adaptation to climate change	-	-	No effect predicted
7. Air quality	-	-	No effect predicted
8. Maximise use of PDL	-	-	No effect predicted
9. Resources (and material) efficiency	-	-	No effect predicted
10. Historic environment and cultural assets	-	-	No effect predicted
11. Landscape and townscape character	-	-	No effect predicted
12. Population and human health	-	-	No effect predicted
13. Sustainable patterns of development	-	-	No effect predicted
14. Equity & Social inclusion	-	-	No effect predicted
15. Access to good quality housing	-	-	No effect predicted
16. Community identity and participation	-	-	No effect predicted
17. Reduce crime (actual and perceived)	-	-	No effect predicted
18. Prosperity and economic growth	-	-	No effect predicted
19. Equity and accessibility to services	✓	✓	Both options (in conjunction with TCL 4 and 5) will support the provision of space for services and jobs in the retail and non-retail sector.
20. Revitalise town centres	✓	?	<p>Option 1 will help maintain or boost local economy through encouraging A1-A3 uses; conversely due to the % restriction imposed opportunities to reduce vacancy rates may be missed which in turn could affect vitality of town centre- for these reasons, split assessment has been assigned.</p> <p>Under Option 2, A3 use which includes café at the ground floor level are likely to generate a sense of vitality and movement within Town centres by boosting the frontage activity within the High Street and the Town Centre.</p>

SEA/SA Objective (Abridged)	Option 1:	Option 2 (TLC 3):	Commentary & Recommendations
<p>Recommendation: The policy could be expanded also to support local talent and community based enterprises and thus support SA 18 Prosperity and economic growth.</p>			

TLC4 Restriction of non retail uses in the INTU Watford (Harlequin Centre and Charter Place)

Options:

1. Amend existing policy S6 to include Charter Place
2. Retain existing policy S6

SEA/SA Objective (Abridged)	Option 1:	Option 2:	Commentary & Recommendations
1. Biodiversity	-	-	No effect predicted
2. Water resources	-	-	No effect predicted
3. Flood risk	-	-	No effect predicted
4. Soil	-	-	No effect predicted
5. Climate change impact reduction	-	-	No effect predicted
6. Adaptation to climate change	-	-	No effect predicted
7. Air quality	-	-	No effect predicted
8. Maximise use of PDL	-	-	No effect predicted
9. Resources (and material) efficiency	-	-	No effect predicted
10. Historic environment and cultural assets	-	-	No effect predicted
11. Landscape and townscape character	-	-	No effect predicted
12. Population and human health	-	-	No effect predicted
13. Sustainable patterns of development	-	-	No effect predicted
14. Equity & Social inclusion	-	-	No effect predicted
15. Access to good quality housing	-	-	No effect predicted
16. Community identity and participation	-	-	No effect predicted
17. Reduce crime (actual and perceived)	-	-	No effect predicted
18. Prosperity and economic growth	-	-	No effect predicted
19. Equity and accessibility to services	✓	✓	Both options (in conjunction with TCL 4 and 5) will support the provision of space for services.
20. Revitalise town centres	✓	✓	Both options support A1 type use and to an extent (10%) that of A2 and A3 use. Both options combined with TLC 3 and TLC5 are likely to help maintain a balance of A1, A2 and A3 uses- thus will create attractive and active frontage from the High Street side of the Harlequin and Charter Place.
Recommendation: None			

TLC5: Restriction of non-retail uses within secondary retail frontage

Options:

1. Amend existing policy S7 so that A2 and A3 are allowed but A4 and A5 restricted
2. Retain existing policy S7

SEA/SA Objective (Abridged)	Option 1:	Option 2:	Commentary & Recommendations
1. Biodiversity	-	-	No effect predicted
2. Water resources	-	-	No effect predicted
3. Flood risk	-	-	No effect predicted
4. Soil	-	-	No effect predicted
5. Climate change impact reduction	-	-	No effect predicted
6. Adaptation to climate change	-	-	No effect predicted
7. Air quality	-	-	No effect predicted
8. Maximise use of PDL	-	-	No effect predicted
9. Resources (and material) efficiency	-	-	No effect predicted
10. Historic environment and cultural assets	-	-	No effect predicted
11. Landscape and townscape character	-	-	No effect predicted
12. Population and human health	-	-	No effect predicted
13. Sustainable patterns of development	-	-	No effect predicted
14. Equity & Social inclusion	-	-	No effect predicted
15. Access to good quality housing	-	-	No effect predicted
16. Community identity and participation	-	-	No effect predicted
17. Reduce crime (actual and perceived)	-	-	No effect predicted
18. Prosperity and economic growth	✓	✓	The preferred option i.e., Option 1, by comparison to Option 2 is more flexible to give regard to market trends rather than adopt restrictive % allocations. Equally the policy includes criteria to check uncontrolled conversions from A2/A3 use to A4/A5 use- both aspects will help promote balanced and cohesive economic development.
19. Equity and accessibility to services	✓	✓	Both options (in conjunction with TCL 4 and 5) will support the provision of space for non-retail services and protect jobs in this sector.
20. Revitalise town centres	✓	?	Option 1 supports growth of non-retail use class that will contribute to creating sense of active frontages by comparison to Option 2 (which may also promote take-away joints) that will not contribute to the vibrancy of the Town Centre.
Recommendation: None			

TLC 6: **A3 Hub Areas**

Options:

1. Proposed policy to allow A3 use within the Hubs without any % restriction and not to allow additional A4 and A5 use
2. No policy

SEA/SA Objective (Abridged)	Option 1:	Option 2:	Commentary & Recommendations
1. Biodiversity	-	-	No effect predicted
2. Water resources	-	-	No effect predicted
3. Flood risk	-	-	No effect predicted
4. Soil	-	-	No effect predicted
5. Climate change impact reduction	-	-	No effect predicted
6. Adaptation to climate change	-	-	No effect predicted
7. Air quality	-	-	No effect predicted
8. Maximise use of PDL	-	-	No effect predicted
9. Resources (and material) efficiency	-	-	No effect predicted
10. Historic environment and cultural assets	-	-	No effect predicted
11. Landscape and townscape character	-	-	No effect predicted
12. Population and human health	-	-	No effect predicted
13. Sustainable patterns of development	-	-	No effect predicted
14. Equity & Social inclusion	-	-	No effect predicted
15. Access to good quality housing	-	-	No effect predicted
16. Community identity and participation	✓	-	The proposed option will help create spaces for informal interaction and in general contribute to creating attractive places in which to live. A do-nothing scenario will continue business as usual.
17. Reduce crime (actual and perceived)	-	-	No effect predicted
18. Prosperity and economic growth	-	-	No effect predicted
19. Equity and accessibility to services	-	-	No effect predicted
20. Revitalise town centres	✓✓	-	The proposed option will help create spaces for informal interaction and active frontages and in general contribute to creating attractive places and therefore vitality of the Town Centre. As the hubs will form gateways to the shopping area, it is assumed that the animated spaces the hubs may create will invite retail users into the town centre.
Recommendation: None			

TLC 7: Control of Nuisance

Options:

1. New policy to help limit nuisance to neighbours near the A3-A5 premises (created by amalgamating WDP 2000 Policies S11 and S12 with some revisions)- proposed approach;
2. Retain WDP 2000 policies S11 and S12

SEA/SA Objective (Abridged)	Option 1 (TLC7):	Option 2:	Commentary & Recommendations
1. Biodiversity	-	-	No effect predicted
2. Water resources	-	-	No effect predicted
3. Flood risk	-	-	No effect predicted
4. Soil	-	-	No effect predicted
5. Climate change impact reduction	-	-	No effect predicted
6. Adaptation to climate change	-	-	No effect predicted
7. Air quality	?	✓	Option 2 (existing policy) specifically adds traffic generation as a criteria in determining applications for A3 use thus explicitly supporting the Air quality objective. Under Option1, it is unclear whether the traffic generation (and related air quality emissions and nuisance) will be limited.
8. Maximise use of PDL	-	-	No effect predicted
9. Resources (and material) efficiency	-	-	No effect predicted
10. Historic environment and cultural assets	-	-	No effect predicted
11. Landscape and townscape character	-	-	No effect predicted
12. Population and human health	✓	✓	Both options are supportive of maintaining quality of the living environment for residents who will live closer to the A3-A5 uses.
13. Sustainable patterns of development	-	-	No effect predicted
14. Equity & Social inclusion	-	-	No effect predicted
15. Access to good quality housing	-	-	No effect predicted
16. Community identity and participation	-	-	No effect predicted
17. Reduce crime (actual and perceived)	✓	✓	Both options explicitly address community safety and security aspects, and includes measures that will prevent environmental crime.
18. Prosperity and economic growth	-	-	No effect predicted
19. Equity and accessibility to services	-	-	No effect predicted
20. Revitalise town centres	-	-	No effect predicted
Recommendation: Consider including traffic generation, car parking and highway safety criteria from the existing policy into the proposed policy; Consider including design criteria that will encourage spaces to limit crime (perceived) and stringent measures (such as CCTV) to limit the occurrence of crime(actual).			

TLC8: Character Areas

i) Commercial Area - Clarendon Road:

Options:

1. No further policies needed covered in core strategy employment and town centre policies (EMP1 and SS1 in terms of employment and jobs).
2. A policy relating to the retention of commercial floorspace in the commercial area around Clarendon Road to be included in the Employment section of the DM policies.

Both options have been assessed as part of Employment Policy 2 (EMP2) within the Development Management SA document.

ii) Cultural Area: - The Parade and Colosseum/Palace Theatre

Options:

1. Retain Core Strategy Policy TLC1 without further changes
2. Support the cultural role of the area, and resist changes from this use but allow residential use within upper floors
3. Consider for site allocation, to retain existing convenience store (Sainsbury's) but include other A type uses as well as residential use on the upper floors (preferred option).

SEA/SA Objective (Abridged)	Option 1:	Option 2:	Option 3:	Commentary & Recommendations
1. Biodiversity	-	-	-	No effect predicted
2. Water resources	-	-	-	No effect predicted
3. Flood risk	-	-	-	No effect predicted
4. Soil	-	-	-	No effect predicted
5. Climate change impact reduction	-	-	-	No effect predicted
6. Adaptation to climate change	-	-	-	No effect predicted
7. Air quality	-	-	-	
8. Maximise use of PDL	-	-	-	No effect predicted
9. Resources (and material) efficiency	-	-	-	No effect predicted
10. Historic environment and cultural assets	-	-	-	Both Options 1 and 2 will help maintain the Cultural heritage within the Conservation area. It is assumed that the proposal under Option 3 will adhere to the DM policy on Built Heritage, therefore the effect on Townscape character will be maintained; if this cross-reference is not applicable a minor negative rating should be assigned under Option 3.
11. Landscape and townscape character	-	-	-	No effect predicted
12. Population and human health	-	-	-	No effect predicted
13. Sustainable patterns of development	-	-	-	No effect predicted
14. Equity & Social inclusion	-	-	-	No effect predicted

SEA/SA Objective (Abridged)	Option 1:	Option 2:	Option 3:	Commentary & Recommendations
15. Access to good quality housing	-	✓	✓	Both Options 2 and 3 support housing provision which is likely to include an affordable housing element and will be closer to services- thus supporting the SA objective.
16. Community identity and participation	✓	✓	?	Options 1 and 2 will help continue to provide space for community interaction and to an extent enhance the cultural assets and help create and maintain a sense of community belonging and community pride. It is not clear whether Option 3 will compromise on the cultural identity of the Colosseum and The Parade areas which now provides space for community gathering and a sense of community pride.
17. Reduce crime (actual and perceived)	-	-	-	No effect predicted
18. Prosperity and economic growth	-	-	-	No effect predicted
19. Equity and accessibility to services	-	-	-	No effect predicted
20. Revitalise town centres	✓	✓	✓	Options 1 and 2 will support land uses that will create active frontages which in-turn will help maintain the vitality of the town centre as well as create jobs. Option 3 offers a combination of convenience shopping with other retail and residential use- all of which are likely to create a sense of activity and therefore bring inward investment into the area.
Recommendations: None				

iii) Civic Area

Options:

1. No policy
2. Support the redevelopment of underused parts of the area for uses which complement the civic role of this area
3. Support redevelopment proposals within the area provided there is a S106/CIL contribution towards the public realm works

SEA/SA Objective (Abridged)	Option 1:	Option 2:	Option 3:	Commentary & Recommendations
1. Biodiversity	-	-	-	No effect predicted
2. Water resources	-	-	-	No effect predicted
3. Flood risk	-	-	-	No effect predicted
4. Soil	-	-	-	No effect predicted
5. Climate change impact reduction	-	-	-	No effect predicted
6. Adaptation to climate change	-	-	-	No effect predicted
7. Air quality	-	-	-	No effect predicted
8. Maximise use of PDL	-	-	-	No effect predicted
9. Resources (and material) efficiency	-	-	-	No effect predicted
10. Historic environment and cultural assets	-	-	-	No effect predicted
11. Landscape and townscape character	x	?	✓	Option 1 will further deteriorate townscape character within the Civic area. Under Option 2, dependent on the redevelopment proposals, in synergy with the Built Heritage DM policy may improve the public realm or may worsen the character of the area (for example multi-storey car park may not contribute positively to the townscape). Option 3 explicitly refers to contribution to public realm works, which will have an impact on the townscape character of the area.
12. Population and human health	-	-	-	
13. Sustainable patterns of development	-	-	-	No effect predicted
14. Equity & Social inclusion	-	-	-	No effect predicted
15. Access to good quality housing	-	-	-	No effect predicted
16. Community identity and participation	-	?	✓	Improvements to public realm through Option 3, is likely to create attractive places to live and create local identity- thus supporting the SA objective. Dependent on the design contribution redevelopment in the area will have on creating local identity, Option 2 may or may not contribute to promoting areas that local community will feel proud about.
17. Reduce crime (actual and perceived)	-	-	-	No effect predicted

SEA/SA Objective (Abridged)	Option 1:	Option 2:	Option 3:	Commentary & Recommendations
18. Prosperity and economic growth	-	✓	✓	Options 2 and 3 will help attract local investment, thus helping create jobs, supporting the SA objective.
19. Equity and accessibility to services	-	-	-	No effect predicted
20. Revitalise town centres	-	✓	✓✓ ?	Option 2 will help support bringing inward investment into the Town centre. Option 3 will contribute to holistic regeneration i.e., redevelopment combined with public realm improvements- thus helping create attractive spaces improving vitality of the Town centre. However under Option 3, with a precondition to make financial contributions, it is not known whether small or medium scale developers will be interested in investing in the area. For this reason, a split assessment is assigned under Option 3.
Recommendations: None				

(iv) Queens Road and Market Street Specialist/Local Shopping Areas

Options:

- 1) No additional policy, suffice to use TCP3 Secondary shopping frontage
- 2) Policy to support local independent stores and to place restriction on demolition and loss of existing units unless replacement units would meet the needs of local/independent stores
- 3) Policy which has the objective of physical enhancement and de-cluttering of public realm and to produce a guidance in consultation with local shop owners and residents (preferred option).

SEA/SA Objective (Abridged)	Option 1:	Option 2:	Option 3:	Commentary & Recommendations
1. Biodiversity	-	-	-	No effect predicted
2. Water resources	-	-	-	No effect predicted
3. Flood risk	-	-	-	No effect predicted
4. Soil	-	-	-	No effect predicted
5. Climate change impact reduction	-	-	-	No effect predicted
6. Adaptation to climate change	-	-	-	No effect predicted
7. Air quality	-	-	-	
8. Maximise use of PDL	-	-	-	No effect predicted
9. Resources (and material) efficiency	-	-	-	No effect predicted
10. Historic environment and cultural assets	-	-	-	No effect predicted
11. Landscape and townscape character	-	-	✓	Option 3 supports decluttering of the public realm in the area and to produce guidance in consultation with the immediate users of the area.
12. Population and human health	-	-	-	No effect predicted
13. Sustainable patterns of development	-	-	-	No effect predicted
14. Equity & Social inclusion	-	-	✓	Option 3 will take a consultative approach and includes local residents and shop owners to design development within the area thus supportive of the SA objective.
15. Access to good quality housing	-	-	-	No effect predicted
16. Community identity and participation	-	✓	✓	Option 2 is supportive of encouraging local stores, most likely from within the community thus helping fellow community members to relate to the area- thus supporting the SA objective. Option 3 will take a consultative approach to design development within the area thus supportive of the SA objective.
17. Reduce crime (actual and perceived)	-	-	-	No effect predicted

SEA/SA Objective (Abridged)	Option 1:	Option 2:	Option 3:	Commentary & Recommendations
18. Prosperity and economic growth	✓	✓	✓	All options are likely to support local investment and create community economic development opportunities.
19. Equity and accessibility to services	-	-	-	No effect predicted
20. Revitalise town centres	✓	✓	✓	All options will support the promotion of local centres and will help create secondary retail spaces such as cafes which may bring active frontages to the Town Centres.
Recommendations: None				

(v) Lower High Street King Street to Ring Road - south– Shopping and Restaurant Area

Options:

1. No additional policy, TCP 3 and TCP 4 will suffice.
2. Policy to support local independent stores and to place restriction on demolition and loss of existing units, instead seek enhancement as area is within a conservation area
3. Policy to modernise Council owned Buildings (occupied by tenants) along the Key route between the shopping malls and High Street Station

SEA/SA Objective (Abridged)	Option 1:	Option 2:	Option 3:	Commentary & Recommendations
1. Biodiversity	-	-	-	No effect predicted
2. Water resources	-	-	-	No effect predicted
3. Flood risk	-	-	-	No effect predicted
4. Soil	-	-	-	No effect predicted
5. Climate change impact reduction	-	-	-	No effect predicted
6. Adaptation to climate change	-	-	-	No effect predicted
7. Air quality	-	-	-	
8. Maximise use of PDL	-	-	-	No effect predicted
9. Resources (and material) efficiency	-	-	-	No effect predicted
10. Historic environment and cultural assets	-	✓	-	Option 2 will help maintain the existing conservation area character, thus supportive of the SA objective.
11. Landscape and townscape character	-	-	✓	By helping to maintain historic assets, Option 2 will help maintain the townscape character in the area. Option 3 supports improvements to the public realm, which in turn will help improve the townscape character within the area.
12. Population and human health	-	-	-	No effect predicted
13. Sustainable patterns of development	-	-	-	No effect predicted
14. Equity & Social inclusion	-	-	-	No effect predicted
15. Access to good quality housing	-	-	-	No effect predicted
16. Community identity and participation	-	✓	-	Option 2 is supportive of encouraging local stores, most likely from within the community thus helping fellow community members to relate to the area- thus supporting the SA objective.
17. Reduce crime (actual and perceived)	-	-	-	No effect predicted
18. Prosperity and economic growth	✓	✓	-	Options 1 and 2 are likely to support local investment and create community economic development opportunities.
19. Equity and accessibility to services	-	-	-	No effect predicted
20. Revitalise town centres	✓	✓	✓	Options 1 and 2 will support the promotion of local centres and will help create secondary retail spaces such as cafes which may bring active frontages to the Town Centres.

SEA/SA Objective (Abridged)	Option 1:	Option 2:	Option 3:	Commentary & Recommendations
				Physical improvements along the Key route may build confidence with more investors therefore may help increase inward investment into the local centre.
Recommendation: None				

(vi) Heritage Area St Mary's and High Street/King Street conservation areas

Options:

- 1) No further policies needed as covered in Conservation Area Management plan and development opportunities are limited
- 2) Site to be allocated at the Church road car park (adjacent to a green space) to maintain green link and enhance edge of car park space

SEA/SA Objective (Abridged)	Option 1:	Option 2:	Commentary & Recommendations
1. Biodiversity	-	-	No effect predicted
2. Water resources	-	-	No effect predicted
3. Flood risk	-	-	No effect predicted
4. Soil	-	-	No effect predicted
5. Climate change impact reduction	-	-	No effect predicted
6. Adaptation to climate change	-	-	No effect predicted
7. Air quality	-	-	
8. Maximise use of PDL	-	-	No effect predicted
9. Resources (and material) efficiency	-	-	No effect predicted
10. Historic environment and cultural assets	✓	✓	Both options will help maintain the existing conservation area character, thus supportive of the SA objective.
11. Landscape and townscape character	✓	✓	By helping to maintain historic assets, both options will help maintain the townscape character in the area.
12. Population and human health	-	✓	Option 2 will add to the green link space thus increasing opportunity for local residents to access the space to conduct exercises therefore lead healthy lifestyle.
13. Sustainable patterns of development	-	-	No effect predicted
14. Equity & Social inclusion	-	-	No effect predicted
15. Access to good quality housing	-	-	No effect predicted
16. Community identity and participation	-	-	No effect predicted
17. Reduce crime (actual and perceived)	-	-	No effect predicted
18. Prosperity and economic growth	-	-	No effect predicted
19. Equity and accessibility to services	-	-	No effect predicted
20. Revitalise town centres	-	-	No effect predicted
Recommendation: None			

TLC9: Public Realm enhancement

Options:

1. Council to seek S106/CIL funding for development proposals within the Town Centre to support Public Realm proposals within the Streetscape Manual 2013.

SEA/SA Objective (Abridged)	Option 1 (TLC9)	Commentary & Recommendations
1. Biodiversity	-	No effect predicted
2. Water resources	-	No effect predicted
3. Flood risk	-	No effect predicted
4. Soil	-	No effect predicted
5. Climate change impact reduction	-	No effect predicted
6. Adaptation to climate change	-	No effect predicted
7. Air quality	-	No effect predicted
8. Maximise use of PDL	-	No effect predicted
9. Resources (and material) efficiency	-	No effect predicted
10. Historic environment and cultural assets	-	No effect predicted
11. Landscape and townscape character	-	No effect predicted
12. Population and human health	-	No effect predicted
13. Sustainable patterns of development	-	No effect predicted
14. Equity & Social inclusion	-	No effect predicted
15. Access to good quality housing	-	No effect predicted
16. Community identity and participation	✓	Improvements to public realm through Option 1, are likely to create attractive places to live and create local identity.
17. Reduce crime (actual and perceived)	-	No effect predicted
18. Prosperity and economic growth	-	No effect predicted
19. Equity and accessibility to services	-	No effect predicted
20. Revitalise town centres	✓✓ ?	Option 1 will contribute to holistic regeneration i.e., redevelopment combined with public realm improvements- thus helping create attractive spaces improving vitality of the Town centre. However under Option 1, with a precondition to make financial contributions, it is not known whether small or medium scale developers will be interested in investing in the area. For this reason, a split assessment- positive and uncertain is assigned.
Recommendation: None		

Policy Topic: Local centres- Shopping provision

TLC10: Restriction of non A1 use classes: The policy sets out policy to ensure that centres retain convenience retail units so that such facilities are available locally. Options are presented under each category District Centre, Neighbourhood Centre and Local shops

District centre:

1. Level of A1 set at 50% of units
2. Or use WDP 2000 has the levels which are 60% or 40% non retail and 50% when vacancy levels are > 10%.
3. Consider whether need to concentrate A1 units within the broader extent of the centre

SEA/SA Objective (Abridged)	Option 1:	Option 2:	Option 3:	Commentary & Recommendations
1. Biodiversity	-	-	-	No effect predicted
2. Water resources	-	-	-	No effect predicted
3. Flood risk	-	-	-	No effect predicted
4. Soil	-	-	-	No effect predicted
5. Climate change impact reduction	-	-	-	No effect predicted
6. Adaptation to climate change	-	-	-	No effect predicted
7. Air quality	-	-	-	No effect predicted
8. Maximise use of PDL	-	-	-	No effect predicted
9. Resources (and material) efficiency	-	-	-	No effect predicted
10. Historic environment and cultural assets	-	-	-	No effect predicted
11. Landscape and townscape character	-	-	-	No effect predicted
12. Population and human health		-	-	No effect predicted
13. Sustainable patterns of development	-	-	-	No effect predicted
14. Equity & Social inclusion	-	-	-	No effect predicted
15. Access to good quality housing	-	-	-	No effect predicted
16. Community identity and participation	-	-	-	No effect predicted
17. Reduce crime (actual and perceived)	-	-	-	No effect predicted
18. Prosperity and economic growth	-	-	-	No effect predicted
19. Equity and accessibility to services	✓	✓	✓	All options support the provision of space for services and jobs in the services sector.
20. Revitalise town centres	✓ ?	✓ ?	✓ ?	A3 use which includes Restaurants and Café at the ground floor level is likely to generate a sense of vitality and movement within District centres. Given this premise, it is not known whether restricting location of these uses from the ground floor (as required by both options) will prove counterproductive to achieving the SA objective. For this reason an uncertain rating is allocated; however

SEA/SA Objective (Abridged)	Option 1:	Option 2:	Option 3:	Commentary & Recommendations	
	■	■	■	■	the assessment also acknowledges that the policy will help promote retail use within the District Centre effectively. A split assessment is therefore assigned to all options.
Recommendation: None					

Neighbourhood centres:

1. Retain A1 floorspace as a % of units set at a level of A1 set at 40% of units or
2. Use WDP 2000 level of 60% dropping to 50% if >10% vacancy
3. must retain at least 1 unit in convenience A1 (whilst this may be desirable it cannot be controlled through UCO as all retail is in the same use class – A1)

SEA/SA Objective (Abridged)	Option 1:	Option 2:	Option 3:	Commentary & Recommendations
1. Biodiversity	-	-	-	No effect predicted
2. Water resources	-	-	-	No effect predicted
3. Flood risk	-	-	-	No effect predicted
4. Soil	-	-	-	No effect predicted
5. Climate change impact reduction	-	-	-	No effect predicted
6. Adaptation to climate change	-	-	-	No effect predicted
7. Air quality	-	-	-	No effect predicted
8. Maximise use of PDL	-	-	-	No effect predicted
9. Resources (and material) efficiency	-	-	-	No effect predicted
10. Historic environment and cultural assets	-	-	-	No effect predicted
11. Landscape and townscape character	-	-	-	No effect predicted
12. Population and human health		-	-	No effect predicted
13. Sustainable patterns of development	-	-	-	No effect predicted
14. Equity & Social inclusion	-	-	-	No effect predicted
15. Access to good quality housing	-	-	-	No effect predicted
16. Community identity and participation	-	-	-	No effect predicted
17. Reduce crime (actual and perceived)	-	-	-	No effect predicted
18. Prosperity and economic growth	-	-	-	No effect predicted
19. Equity and accessibility to services	✓	✓	✓	All options support the provision of space for services and jobs in the retail and services sector.
20. Revitalise town centres	✓	✓	✓	By retaining a percentage of retail related use, all options will help create a sense of activity and buzz around the neighbourhood centre, which in turn will help improve vitality of the neighbourhood centre. While all options will have a positive effect, by comparison Option 2 will help improve vibrancy, unless non A1 use class will be replaced more by A3 use.
<p>Recommendation: Considering A3 use (café and restaurants) may contribute to active frontages, encourage such land use class for non A1 use. SA comment: It is not clear whether nonA1 use will include B, C and D class or other A class uses. If former, strongly recommend considering further protection to A type uses to support the Town centre and Prosperity and economic growth objectives.</p>				

Local shops:

Options:

1. Set level of A1 units at 40%
2. or use WDP level of 60% dropping to 50% when vacancy >10%
3. or set at 50% and ensure that at least 1 unit is retained in convenience A1 preferably a small local general store.

SEA/SA Objective (Abridged)	Option 1:	Option 2:	Option 3:	Commentary & Recommendations
1. Biodiversity	-	-	-	No effect predicted
2. Water resources	-	-	-	No effect predicted
3. Flood risk	-	-	-	No effect predicted
4. Soil	-	-	-	No effect predicted
5. Climate change impact reduction	-	-	-	No effect predicted
6. Adaptation to climate change	-	-	-	No effect predicted
7. Air quality	-	-	-	No effect predicted
8. Maximise use of PDL	-	-	-	No effect predicted
9. Resources (and material) efficiency	-	-	-	No effect predicted
10. Historic environment and cultural assets	-	-	-	No effect predicted
11. Landscape and townscape character	-	-	-	No effect predicted
12. Population and human health		-	-	No effect predicted
13. Sustainable patterns of development	-	-	-	No effect predicted
14. Equity & Social inclusion	-	-	-	No effect predicted
15. Access to good quality housing	-	-	-	No effect predicted
16. Community identity and participation	-	-	-	No effect predicted
17. Reduce crime (actual and perceived)	-	-	-	No effect predicted
18. Prosperity and economic growth	-	-	-	No effect predicted
19. Equity and accessibility to services	✓	✓✓	✓	All options will ensure local communities have access to retail services, including convenience retail. However Option 2 will ensure greater presence of retail units therefore access to more services.
20. Revitalise town centres	-	-	-	Policy not applicable to Local shop level therefore no effect predicted
Recommendation: None				

TLC11: Community Facilities

Option:

1. The Council will encourage the provision of new community uses that addresses an identified demand from the local community. Stricter criteria will be applied to evaluate applications that will result in the loss or downgrading of existing community facilities
2. Do nothing

SEA/SA Objective (Abridged)	Option 1:	Option 2:	Commentary & Recommendations
1. Biodiversity	-	-	No effect predicted
2. Water resources	-	-	No effect predicted
3. Flood risk	-	-	No effect predicted
4. Soil	-	-	No effect predicted
5. Climate change impact reduction	-	-	No effect predicted
6. Adaptation to climate change	-	-	No effect predicted
7. Air quality	-	-	No effect predicted
8. Maximise use of PDL	-	-	No effect predicted
9. Resources (and material) efficiency	-	-	No effect predicted
10. Historic environment and cultural assets	-	-	No effect predicted
11. Landscape and townscape character	-	-	No effect predicted
12. Population and human health	✓	-	Option 1 will help maintain access to local community facilities that are likely to create a sense of belonging to the area, and likely to encourage interaction that may contribute to the health and well-being of the residents.
13. Sustainable patterns of development	-	-	No effect predicted
14. Equity & Social inclusion	-	-	No effect predicted
15. Access to good quality housing	-	-	No effect predicted
16. Community identity and participation	✓	x	Option 1 will help maintain access to local community facilities that are likely to create a sense of belonging to the area. On the contrary, in the absence of a policy to limit the loss of community facilities there will be negative impact on community interaction.
17. Reduce crime (actual and perceived)	-	-	No effect predicted
18. Prosperity and economic growth	-	-	No effect predicted
19. Equity and accessibility to services	-	-	No effect predicted
20. Revitalise town centres	-	-	
Recommendation: None			

Policy Topic: **Conversion of HMOs to Flats**

Proposed **option 1: Policy HS5** Conversion of HMOS to Flats to comply with Policy H4 and vacancy evidence for at least 6 months required
A do-nothing option does not apply to this topic as current national policy on conversion of HMOs exists and the proposal gives further guidance on the Council's approach while assessing applications.

SEA/SA Topic	Option 1- Draft Policy HS5	Commentary & Recommendations
1. Biodiversity	-	No effect predicted
2. Water resources	?	The impact on per capita water consumption resulting from a conversion from HMOs to flats will be variable for each case, as this will be dependent on the occupancy and user behaviour. However, if the flat conversions will need to comply with the Sustainable Design Policies within the DM, there may be positive effect.
3. Flood risk	-	No effect predicted
4. Soil	-	No effect predicted
5. Climate change impact reduction	-	No effect predicted
6. Adaptation to climate change	-	No effect predicted
7. Air quality	?	Change in occupancy and user requirement to transport needs may be variable for each case which is unknown at this stage, therefore the effect of Policy HS5 on this SA objective cannot be determined.
8. Maximise use of PDL	✓	Option supports redevelopment on existing land
9. Resources (and material) efficiency	-	No effect predicted
10. Historic environment and cultural assets	-	No effect predicted
11. Landscape and townscape character	-	No effect predicted
12. Population and human health	✓	The position of Policy H4 (which will be referred to whilst considering Policy HS5) relating to assessment of access to health services and open spaces/greenspaces is clear and protects existing provision.
13. Sustainable patterns of development	-	No effect predicted
14. Equity & Social inclusion	-	No effect predicted
15. Access to good quality housing	✓	Option will promote mix of housing tenure, thus supportive of the SA objective.
16. Community identity and participation	-	No effect predicted
17. Reduce crime (actual and perceived)	-	No effect predicted
18. Prosperity and economic growth	-	No effect predicted
19. Equity and accessibility to services	-	No effect predicted
20. Revitalise town centres	-	No effect predicted

SEA/SA Topic	Option 1- Draft Policy HS5	Commentary & Recommendations
<p>Recommendation: It is not clear whether the conversions will be subject to all policies within the DM including Sustainable Design policy which requires adherence to Code for Sustainable Homes standards at new dwelling units. <i>WBC response: DM policies will apply.</i></p>		

Policy Topic: Conversion to HMOs

Proposed **option 1: Policy HS6** Applications for new houses in multiple occupation (HMO's) or hostels

Alternative option: Enable Article 4 Direction for HMOs

SEA/SA Topic	Option 1- Draft Policy HS6	Option 2- Article 4	Commentary & Recommendations
1. Biodiversity	?	?	Under both options, it is not clear how biodiversity features will be maintained if the non-residential development put forward are important for biodiversity (e.g. bats). In the absence of a standalone DM policy on biodiversity, it is not possible to assume that this topic will be covered without explicit reference.
2. Water resources	x	x	For both options, it is assumed that non-residential use will typically require less water than residential purposes (unless revised from catering/ restaurant or light industrial use)
3. Flood risk	-	-	No effect predicted
4. Soil	-	-	No effect predicted
5. Climate change impact reduction	-	-	No effect predicted
6. Adaptation to climate change	-	-	No effect predicted
7. Air quality	-	x	Option 1 requires car parking provision to be arranged so as not to add to congestion helping to address air quality issues relating to transport from new developments. It is assumed that planning applications coming through Article 4 for conversions will adhere to the car parking standards within the DM policies- similar to the requirement of Option 1, but weightage on limiting congestion (therefore air pollution) is not available unlike Option 1.
8. Maximise use of PDL	✓	✓	Option supports redevelopment on existing land
9. Resources (and material) efficiency	-	-	No effect predicted
10. Historic environment and cultural assets	✓	-	Option 1 places emphasis on the design to respect the character of the local area and will support development that will not alter the frontage of residential block. Option 2, on its own will not have any significant role in achieving the SA objective. .
11.Landscape and townscape character	-	-	No effect predicted
12. Population and human health	-	-	No effect predicted
13. Sustainable patterns of development	✓ -	✓ -	The assessment results are split between positive and neutral for both options. Positive because HMOs typically attract single or student population who may look for accommodation closer to their work area, thus bringing housing and jobs closer and reducing the need to travel.

SEA/SA Topic	Option 1- Draft Policy HS6	Option 2- Article 4	Commentary & Recommendations
			There may be no relation at all if the HMO occupants do not work in the Borough or near the area of occupancy.
14. Equity & Social inclusion	-	-	No effect predicted
15. Access to good quality housing	✓	✓	Option will promote mix of housing tenure, thus supportive of the SA objective.
16. Community identity and participation	-	-	No effect predicted
17. Reduce crime (actual and perceived)	-	-	No effect predicted
18. Prosperity and economic growth	-	-	No effect predicted
19. Equity and accessibility to services	?	?	It is not clear whether access to services will form part of the assessment criteria whilst considering applications under both the options.
20. Revitalise town centres	-		No effect predicted
Recommendation (prior to 1st consultation): Consider adding access to amenities, services and public transport criterion <i>WBC response: these items are sufficiently covered by the Core Strategy.</i>			

Policy Topic: Conversions and Extensions

Proposed **option 1: Policy HS7** Criteria to consider for applications on Conversions to enable provision of family sized units and HMOs

Alternative option 2: Allocate areas within Borough where Conversions are restricted

Alternative option 3: Stipulate minimum floor area details within the Converted units

SEA/SA Topic	Option 1- Draft Policy HS7	Option 2-Area restriction for Conversion	Option 3- Min. floor space defined	Commentary & Recommendations
1. Biodiversity	-	-	-	No effect predicted
2. Water resources	-	-	-	No effect predicted.
3. Flood risk	-	-	-	No effect predicted
4. Soil	-	-	-	No effect predicted
5. Climate change impact reduction	-	-	-	No effect predicted
6. Adaptation to climate change	-	-	-	No effect predicted
7. Air quality	x	x	x	Although Option 1 requires that pressure on existing parking is not acceptable, conversion will result in multiple users who may own cars, resulting in increased traffic. Options 2 and 3 are details on how Conversions criteria, nevertheless they support conversions that will result in multiple users who may own cars.
8. Maximise use of PDL	✓	✓	✓	Option supports redevelopment on existing land
9. Resources (and material) efficiency	-	-	-	No effect predicted
10. Historic environment and cultural assets	?	?	?	It is not clear how the cultural heritage objective will be affected as a result of conversion as the policy does not explicitly discuss this topic.
11. Landscape and townscape character	?	?	-	Under option 1 as the conversion may occur anywhere in the Borough, including areas with good townscape character, it is not clear how the conversion will affect these features. Option 2 may be able to provide more direction, for example restrict conversion in Conservation Areas or similar and support the SA objective; however with the current details available within the option it has not been possible as to what would have been the criteria to choosing restricted areas. Under option 3 no direct relation has been established, so no effect predicted.

SEA/SA Topic	Option 1- Draft Policy HS7	Option 2-Area restriction for Conversion	Option 3- Min. floor space defined	Commentary & Recommendations
12. Population and human health	✓	-	-	Position of the Policy under Option 1 relating to assessment of access to health services and open spaces/greenspaces is clear and protects existing provision.
13. Sustainable patterns of development	✓ -	✓ -	✓ -	All options are supportive of conversion and the assessment results are the same across all options. The results are split between positive and neutral for both options. Positive because HMOs typically attract single or student population who may look for accommodation closer to their work area, thus bringing housing and jobs closer and reducing the need to travel. There may be no relation at all if the HMO occupants do not work in the Borough or near the area of occupancy.
14. Equity & Social inclusion	-	-	-	No effect predicted
15. Access to good quality housing	✓	✓	✓	Option will promote mix of housing tenure, thus supportive of the SA objective.
16. Community identity and participation	-	-	-	No effect predicted
17. Reduce crime (actual and perceived)	-	-	-	No effect predicted
18. Prosperity and economic growth	-	-	-	No effect predicted
19. Equity and accessibility to services	✓	-	-	Option 1 is supportive of protecting services provision to existing residents and not allowing additional pressure on the services implying requirements for the proposed units will be assessed along with existing services provision.
20. Revitalise town centres	-	-	-	No effect predicted
Recommendation: None				

Policy Topic: Non-residential proposals in residential areas
Proposed **option 1: Policy HS8** Non-residential use in residential areas

No alternative policy, including a no policy scenario, as the proposal is in practice brought forward from Watford District Plan 2000.

SEA/SA Topic	Option 1- Policy HS8	Commentary & Recommendations
1. Biodiversity	-	No effect predicted
2. Water resources	-	No effect predicted
3. Flood risk	-	No effect predicted
4. Soil	-	No effect predicted
5. Climate change impact reduction	-	No effect predicted
6. Adaptation to climate change	-	No effect predicted
7. Air quality	✓	The policy takes traffic generation into account (which relates to air quality) and will help maintain air quality
8. Maximise use of PDL	✓	Option supports redevelopment on existing land
9. Resources (and material) efficiency	-	No effect predicted
10. Historic environment and cultural assets	✓	The policy takes local area character into account while assessing applications, supportive of the SA objective
11. Landscape and townscape character	✓	The policy takes local area character and open space features into account while assessing applications, supportive of the SA objective
12. Population and human health	-	No effect predicted
13. Sustainable patterns of development	✓	The policy may promote work-live unit and similar arrangements which is supportive of the SA objective.
14. Equity & Social inclusion	-	No effect predicted
15. Access to good quality housing	-	No effect predicted
16. Community identity and participation	-	No effect predicted
17. Reduce crime (actual and perceived)	-	No effect predicted
18. Prosperity and economic growth	✓	Policy may promote non-residential uses that may create jobs for local workforce, thus supporting the SA objective
19. Equity and accessibility to services	-	No effect predicted
20. Revitalise town centres	-	No effect predicted
Recommendation: None		

Policy Topic: Affordable Housing

Proposed **option 1: Policy HS9** Retention of Affordable Housing Provision

No alternative policy, including a no policy scenario, as the proposal is in practice brought forward from Watford District Plan 2000 and there is a need for affordable housing provision in the area.

SEA/SA Topic	Option 1- Policy HS9	Commentary & Recommendations
1. Biodiversity	-	No effect predicted
2. Water resources	-	No effect predicted
3. Flood risk	-	No effect predicted
4. Soil	-	No effect predicted
5. Climate change impact reduction	-	No effect predicted
6. Adaptation to climate change	-	No effect predicted
7. Air quality	-	The policy takes traffic generation into account (which relates to air quality) and will help maintain air quality
8. Maximise use of PDL	-	Option supports redevelopment on existing land
9. Resources (and material) efficiency	-	No effect predicted
10. Historic environment and cultural assets	-	The policy takes local area character into account while assessing applications, supportive of the SA objective
11. Landscape and townscape character	-	The policy takes local area character and open space features into account while assessing applications, supportive of the SA objective
12. Population and human health	-	No effect predicted
13. Sustainable patterns of development	-	The policy may promote work-live unit and similar arrangements which is supportive of the SA objective.
14. Equity & Social inclusion	✓	Policy will help secure housing units for families that cannot compete in the housing market.
15. Access to good quality housing	?	Policy is fully supportive of maintaining the provision, however this objective relates to either promoting more affordable housing or improving the condition of existing provision- the policy does not discuss either of these details therefore its performance against this SA criterion cannot be determined.
16. Community identity and participation	-	No effect predicted
17. Reduce crime (actual and perceived)	-	No effect predicted
18. Prosperity and economic growth	✓	Policy supports mix of housing provision therefore allows range of workforce to stay in the Borough, supporting prosperity in the area.
19. Equity and accessibility to services	-	No effect predicted

SEA/SA Topic	Option 1- Policy HS9	Commentary & Recommendations
20. Revitalise town centres	-	No effect predicted
<p>Recommendation (prior to 1st consultation): Consider discussing provision of new affordable housing, for example targets, where and how they may be encouraged in the Borough.</p> <p><i>WBC response: Core Strategy covers this issue.</i></p>		

Policy topic: Garden development

Option 1: Do-nothing scenario

Option 2: Policy preventing back garden development

Option 3: Proposed policy (HS10)

SEA/SA Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3 (HS10)	Commentary & Recommendations
1. Biodiversity	X	✓	✓	<p>With no control, development will result in loss of green space and related biodiversity under Option 1. Although other Core Strategy and development management policies will apply to new developments (infill) it will result in the loss or disturbance to existing habitats (even with mitigation), for this reason a minor negative rating is assigned against this option. Also a cumulative negative effect may occur if many unregulated back garden developments occur in the Borough.</p> <p>Under Option 2 any biodiversity feature located in the back garden will be retained and remain protected.</p> <p>Option 3 is supportive of retaining gardens that contribute to wider swathe of green space - therefore habitats protection. For individual standalone sites with potential biodiversity features, criteria set within the Residential Design Guide for extensions (General Principle8: Biodiversity Conservation) and Achieving design quality chapter within the Residential Design Guide for New Homes will help protect biodiversity features of back gardens.</p>
2. Water resources	✓	-	✓	<p>Under Option 1, other Core Strategy and development management policies relating to pollution prevention and water resources management will anyway apply for new developments (infill), implying the water resources objective may be achieved or remain neutral.</p> <p>By preventing back garden development, option 2 will retain the business as usual scenario.</p> <p>Under Option 3, as new development management policies and Core Strategy policies will apply, including SD1, proposals for back garden development should seek to protect and/or enhance quality of water bodies in the area, and incorporate water efficiency measures in the building- thus supporting the SA objective.</p>

SEA/SA Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3 (HS10)	Commentary & Recommendations
3. Flood risk	✓	-	✓	Under Options 1 and 3, new proposals will be required to comply with the flood risk and drainage policies within the development management policies, implying the risk of surface water run-off increase for the area will be considered, therefore the SA objective will be achieved.
4. Soil	x	✓	x	Options 1 and 3 will result in the loss of top soil but option 2 will help protect top soil.
5. Climate change impact reduction	-	-	-	No effect predicted.
6. Adaptation to climate change	-	-	-	No effect predicted.
7. Air quality	x	-	x	Depending on the location of the site i.e., if near congestion hotspots and if the site contains trees that may be lost to the development the purification of air function will be reduced under Options 1 and 3. Under Option 2 a business as usual scenario will continue.
8. Maximise use of PDL	-	-	-	As back gardens are regarded as PDL, a neutral impact rating is allocated under options 1 and 3, but the loss of top soil is acknowledged under the Soils SA objective.
9. Resources (and material) efficiency	-	-	-	No effect predicted.
10. Historic environment and cultural assets	✓	-	✓✓	Through Core Strategy and other development management policies, development under option 1 may still be controlled to safeguard historic environment around a proposed site. Option 3 is supportive of maintaining the form and character of the local area, which will include respecting cultural heritage assets. In addition the policy under Option 3 will not permit garden land that forms part of/ provides amenity to residents (which may include historic parks and gardens). In addition to the Core Strategy and other development management policies, this option will help safeguard current assets and aim to improve design quality in the area.
11. Landscape and townscape character	✓	-	✓✓	Although current Core Strategy policies and the proposed development management policies on built heritage and design could help maintain the townscape character in an area (effect under Option 1), Option 3 places emphasis on the form, function, design and respect to local character within the design and therefore will have a significantly support to achieve the SA objective.

SEA/SA Topic	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3 (HS10)	Commentary & Recommendations
				Option2 will not alter current state therefore neutral rating is allocated.
12. Population and human health	-	-	-	No effect predicted.
13. Sustainable patterns of development	-	-	-	No effect predicted.
14. Equity & Social inclusion	-	-	-	No effect predicted.
15. Access to good quality housing	?	-	?	By allowing residential development, Options 1 and 3 will contribute to the provision of a range of housing type/ tenure supporting the SA objective; however it is not possible to conclude at this stage that houses from these sites will contribute to affordable housing (which forms part of the assessment criteria). The effect can be variable at each site. For this reason, an uncertain score is allocated.
16. Community identity and participation	-	-	-	No effect predicted.
17. Reduce crime (actual and perceived)	-	-	-	No effect predicted.
18. Prosperity and economic growth	-	-	-	No effect predicted.
19. Equity and accessibility to services	-	-	-	No effect predicted.
20. Revitalise town centres	-	-	-	No effect predicted.
<p>Recommendation (prior to 1st consultation): The Character of the Area Study referred to in the policy is an information document that an applicant for new development must be aware of and should take the information into account in the development process. As the Study document does not provide design guidance or suggest policies to be followed in these areas, rewording policy HS10 to reflect that reference to the Character of the Area Study is recommended, instead of including the Study in the criteria list (suggest that reference to the Character of the Area study is retained within the policy box and not moved to background text).</p> <p><i>WBC response: recommendation taken forward.</i></p>				

Policy Topic: **Employment Policy EMP3** - – Clarendon Road and Bridle Path Office Area

Proposed option: Specific policy to protect Clarendon Road as a primary office location and encourage improvements to the quality and supply of office accommodation there.

Options considered:

Option 1: Without the plan. Not reasonable, therefore not assessed.

Option 2: Relying on the employment policies set out in the adopted Core Strategy only. Assessed in matrix below.

Option 3: Introducing separate criteria for consideration of employment generating and non-employment generating uses within employment areas. Option considered unnecessary given criteria in EMP2 - therefore not assessed.

Option 4: Bringing forward of Watford District Plan 2000 policies relating to existing and proposed employment uses outside of allocated employment areas. Option considered unnecessary given that sufficient employment space has been identified in the Core Strategy - therefore not assessed.

Option 5: Including a policy on live/work units – this was considered unnecessary as the previous District Plan policy on live/work units was never used and therefore was not saved in 2007. Therefore not assessed.

Option 6: Specific policy to protect Clarendon Road as a primary office location and encourage improvements to the quality and supply of office accommodation in that location. Preferred Option - assessed in matrix below.

Option 7: WBC also considered whether specific policies were needed in respect of Watford Business Park or other employment areas.

This is a procedural issue that is difficult to appraise using the standard assessment matrix format.

Watford Business Park is part of the Western Gateway SPA and so the regeneration of this relatively run down area is already covered by a specific policy in the Core Strategy.

Other employment areas that are not already specifically covered by Core Strategy policies are likely to benefit from a similar type of policy to that proposed for Clarendon Road.

SEA/SA Objective (Abridged)	Option 2: Core Strategy Policies only	Option 6: Employment Policy 2 (EMP3)	Commentary & Recommendations
1. Biodiversity	-	-	No effect predicted
2. Water resources	-	-	No effect predicted
3. Flood risk	-	-	No effect predicted
4. Soil	-	-	No effect predicted
5. Climate change impact reduction	-	✓	Retaining office space in this part of the Borough should help reduce the need for travel and associated greenhouse gas emissions. Allowing some limited ancillary/supporting uses in the area will also help reduce vehicle trips. Policy EMP3 requires new developments to contribute to / be designed to be linked in with CHP/decentralised energy networks. This is supportive of this objective.
6. Adaptation to climate change	-	-	No effect predicted
7. Air quality	-	-	No effect predicted

SEA/SA Objective (Abridged)	Option 2: Core Strategy Policies only	Option 6: Employment Policy 2 (EMP3)	Commentary & Recommendations
8. Maximise use of PDL	✓	✓	As no Greenfield sites for employment are available at Watford all employment allocations will be within a PDL. For this reason both options are assessed to support the SA objective.
9. Resources (and material) efficiency	-	-	No effect predicted
10. Historic environment and cultural assets	-	-	No effect predicted
11. Landscape and townscape character	-	-	No effect predicted
12. Population and human health	-	-	No effect predicted
13. Sustainable patterns of development	-	✓	Retaining office space and allowing some limited ancillary/supporting uses in this area of the Borough will contribute towards sustainable patterns of development. In the Core Strategy Policies scenario as the growth is focused on town and neighbourhood centre, protection to Clarendon Road may be reduced.
14. Equity & Social inclusion	-	-	No effect predicted
15. Access to good quality housing	-	-	No effect predicted
16. Community identity and participation	-	-	No effect predicted
17. Reduce crime (actual and perceived)	-	-	No effect predicted
18. Prosperity and economic growth	✓	✓✓	Clarendon Road has been recognised in the Core Strategy as a key area for future improvement and job creation. Policy EMP3 is aimed at protecting Clarendon Road as a primary office location and encouraging improvements to the quality and supply of office accommodation in that particular location in the Borough. This should help towards enhancing the prosperity of the Borough by attracting inward investment and helping to meet the anticipated demand for future office space. Whilst the Core Strategy policies will generate positive effects towards achieving this objective, they will not provide the same level of protection for the Clarendon Road area, nor the drive towards improving the quality of the office provision in this part of the Borough so that high quality office occupiers are attracted to the Borough.
19. Equity and accessibility to services	✓	✓✓	Policy EMP3 requires new development in the area to contribute to growth in employment in a variety of sectors covered by the B1a and B1b use class. In addition the policy allows for limited ancillary/supporting uses, which will provide different types of jobs to the offices. These policy elements will help to encourage the provision of a range of jobs that are accessible to the local population. Core Strategy policies are supportive of this objective, but do not provide the emphasis for this key area for potential job creation.

SEA/SA Objective (Abridged)	Option 2: Core Strategy Policies only	Option 6: Employment Policy 2 (EMP3)	Commentary & Recommendations
20. Revitalise town centres	-	✓	Policy EMP3 requires that non-B1a/b development in the Clarendon Road area is of a scale does not undermine the role of the town centre or the proposed Watford Junction area.
<p>Recommendation (prior to policy revision after 1st internal SA assessment): Extending the policy to also cover Bridle Path should provide additional benefits on top of those predicted for the Clarendon Road policy coverage, although existing Core Strategy policy do provide the generic criteria required to redevelop this area.</p> <p><i>WBC response: This recommendation has been adopted in the 1st consultation document.</i></p> <p>SA comment: There may be some merit in extending the requirement to connect to the CHP network indicated in this policy to EMP1.</p> <p><i>WBC response: This recommendation has been put forward as a consultation question in the 1st consultation document.</i></p>			

Option 5: Policy Topic: **T6: Car Parking Provision - Residential Development and Car Parking Provision – Non-Residential Development**

Alternatives considered:

Option 1.

Keep existing maximum parking standards in WDP 2000.

Option 2.

Have more restrictive maximum parking standards (the assumption has been made that these are 'more restrictive'

than those in WDP 2000)

Option 3.

Have less restrictive maximum parking standards (the assumption has been made that these are 'less restrictive' than

those in WDP 2000)

Option 4.

Have no parking standards and allow developers to provide the level of parking they wish.

SEA/SA Objective (Abridged)	Option 1: WDP 2000 standards	Option 2: More restrictive standards	Option 3: Less restrictive standards	Option 4: No parking standards	Option 5: New DM policies (T6)	Commentary & Recommendations
1. Biodiversity	-	-	-	-	-	No effect predicted
2. Water resources	-	-	-	-	-	No effect predicted
3. Flood risk	-	-	x	x	-	Options 3 and 4: The potentially higher levels of parking provision and impermeable surfacing could result in increased surface run-off, with an increased risk of pluvial flooding.
4. Soil	-	-	-	-	-	No effect predicted
5. Climate change impact reduction	-	✓	x	x	?	Option 2: Imposing more restrictive car parking standards is likely to reduce car usage for shorter trips, therefore limiting transport emissions, including GHG. Options 3 and 4: more parking provision (through the less restrictive, or no, standards) will encourage greater car use and result in increased GHG emissions. Option 5: Car parking provision for residential development in the Controlled Parking Zone is slightly higher in the new DM policy than in WDP 2000. However, outside the CPZ the provision is slightly lower than the WDP 2000. It is uncertain how this will affect overall changes in GHG emissions.
6. Adaptation to climate change	-	-	-	-	-	No effect predicted
7. Air quality	-	✓	x	x	?	Option 2: Imposing more restrictive car parking standards is likely to reduce car usage which

SEA/SA Objective (Abridged)	Option 1: WDP 2000 standards	Option 2: More restrictive standards	Option 3: Less restrictive standards	Option 4: No parking standards	Option 5: New DM policies (T6)	Commentary & Recommendations
						could have positive implications for air quality, locally. Options 3 and 4: more parking provision (through the less restrictive, or no, standards) will encourage greater car use and result in increased GHG emissions. Option 5: Car parking provision for residential development in the Controlled Parking Zone is slightly higher in the new DM policy than in WDP 2000. However, outside the CPZ the provision is slightly lower than the WDP 2000. It is uncertain how this will affect overall changes in airborne emissions.
8. Maximise use of PDL	-	-	-	-	-	No effect predicted
9. Resources (and material) efficiency	-	-	-	-	-	No effect predicted
10. Historic environment and cultural assets	-	-	-	-	-	No effect predicted
11. Landscape and townscape character	-	-	?	-	-	Option 3: higher provision for parking in new developments could reduce the levels of on-street parking and therefore have a positive impact on the landscape and townscape around development sites.
12. Population and human health	-	?	x	x	✓	Option 2: Imposing more restrictive car parking standards is likely to reduce car usage which could have positive implications for health if it encourages more people to walk and cycle. Options 3 and 4: Allowing higher levels of parking discourages the take-up of healthier travel options such as walking and cycling. Option 5: provides a balance between meeting the demand for parking, whilst aiming to not encourage excessive car use. This will help support this objective by facilitating healthy modes of travel.

SEA/SA Objective (Abridged)	Option 1: WDP 2000 standards	Option 2: More restrictive standards	Option 3: Less restrictive standards	Option 4: No parking standards	Option 5: New DM policies (T6)	Commentary & Recommendations
13. Sustainable patterns of development	-	-	-	-	-	No effect predicted
14. Equity & Social inclusion	-	?	x	x	✓	Option 2: Imposing more restrictive car parking standards is likely to reduce car usage which could improve accessibility to services for those who do not have access to a private vehicle (assuming public transport improvements will be co-ordinated). Option 3: Allowing higher levels of parking could make it more difficult for non-car users to access services. Option 5: provides a balance between meeting the demand for parking, whilst aiming to not encourage excessive car use. This will help support this objective by facilitating access to services for all members of society.
15. Access to good quality housing	-	-	-	-	-	No effect predicted
16. Community identity and participation	-	-	-	-	-	No effect predicted
17. Reduce crime (actual and perceived)	-	-	-	-	-	No effect predicted
18. Prosperity and economic growth	✓	x	?	?	✓	Options 1 and 5: Policy allows adequate parking spaces for business uses, thus supporting economic growth. Option 2: More restrictive standards could lead to businesses being discouraged from moving to Watford, or shoppers being attracted to other nearby retail centres that have a higher provision of parking. Options 3 & 4: whilst higher levels of parking provision would provide for those living, working and visiting Watford, if it results in high levels of congestion that could act to reduce economic output and then also discourage visitors/shoppers.
19. Equity and accessibility to services	-	?	-	-	-	Option 3: Allowing higher levels of parking could make it more difficult for non-car users to access jobs and services.

SEA/SA Objective (Abridged)	Option 1: WDP 2000 standards	Option 2: More restrictive standards	Option 3: Less restrictive standards	Option 4: No parking standards	Option 5: New DM policies (T6)	Commentary & Recommendations
20. Revitalise town centres	-	?	-	-	-	Option 2: More restrictive standards could lead to an improved pedestrian environment in the town centre which would support this objective.
Recommendations: Safeguard current disabled parking provision and create new spaces as per requirement for the disabled at non-residential and non-employment use areas.						

Draft Policy: **Additional Policy on Electric Charging Points/ Low Emission Vehicles**

Option 1: Do-nothing scenario

Option 2: New policy: T7 For commercial developments, electric charging points will be actively sought (guidance ration on parking spaces-charging points is drafted)

SEA/SA Objective (Abridged)	Option 1: Do-nothing	Option 5: New DM policy (T7)	Commentary & Recommendations
1. Biodiversity	-	-	No effect predicted
2. Water resources	-	-	No effect predicted
3. Flood risk	-	-	No effect predicted
4. Soil	-	-	No effect predicted
5. Climate change impact reduction	-	?	Option 2: electric/low emission vehicles may reduce local emissions therefore supporting the SA objective, however the wider debate may suggest that fossil fuels are burnt to generate electricity- negating the local positive effect the option may generate. Unless the source of electricity is renewable impact against this objective cannot be stated with certainty.
6. Adaptation to climate change	-	-	No effect predicted
7. Air quality	-	✓	Option 2: electric vehicles/low emission vehicles will reduce load of air quality pollutants in any local area, therefore helping improve the air quality.
8. Maximise use of PDL	-	-	No effect predicted
9. Resources (and material) efficiency	-	-	No effect predicted
10. Historic environment and cultural assets	-	-	No effect predicted
11.Landscape and townscape character	-	-	Option 3: higher provision for parking in new developments could reduce the levels of on-street parking and therefore have a positive impact on the landscape and townscape around development sites.
12. Population and human health	-	-	No effect predicted
13. Sustainable patterns of development	-	-	No effect predicted
14. Equity & Social inclusion	-	-	No effect predicted
15. Access to good quality housing	-	-	No effect predicted
16. Community identity and participation	-	-	No effect predicted
17. Reduce crime (actual and perceived)	-	-	No effect predicted
18. Prosperity and economic growth	-	✓	Option 2: Provision of the charging point will help the Borough cater to users in alignment with technological advancements. Commercial premises with the provision may help attract users to the area and in general help project an image of a place evolving to adopt modern living.

SEA/SA Objective (Abridged)	Option 1: Do-nothing	Option 5: New DM policy (T7)	Commentary & Recommendations
19. Equity and accessibility to services	-	-	No effect predicted
20. Revitalise town centres	-	-	No effect predicted
Recommendation: Consider incorporating technological flexibility to add more charging points, if the take-up to this practice increases over time.			

Draft Policy: **Cycle Parking Provision**

Option 1: **T8**- More people could potentially be encouraged to cycle for short, local journeys if they had secure cycle storage facilities at their place of residence and at their destination. It is therefore important that secure cycle storage facilities are provided for both residential and non-residential developments to encourage cycle ownership and use.

Alternatives:

Option 2. Increased cycle parking standards.

Option 3. Decrease cycle parking standards.

Option 4. Have no cycle parking standards and allow developers to provide the level of cycle parking they wish. (For this option the assumption has been made that without the requirement to do so, developers will in general provide limited cycle parking in new developments).

SEA/SA Objective (Abridged)	Option 1: New policy (T8)	Option 2: Increased cycle parking standards	Option 3: Decreased cycle parking standards	Option 4: No cycle parking standards	Commentary & Recommendations
1. Biodiversity	-	-	-	-	No effect predicted
2. Water resources	-	-	-	-	No effect predicted
3. Flood risk	-	-	-	-	No effect predicted
4. Soil	-	-	-	-	No effect predicted
5. Climate change impact reduction	✓	✓✓	x	x	Option 1: the levels of cycling parking provision encourage a certain level of day to day cycling in the Borough which will help to reduce GHG emissions. Option 2: Increased cycle parking standards may result in greater positive effects in the long-term (than Option 1) by making cycling a more feasible mode of transport and reducing GHG emissions from vehicles. The opposite effect will result from Option 3 and Option 4.
6. Adaptation to climate change	-	-	-	-	No effect predicted
7. Air quality	✓	✓✓	x	x	Option 1: the levels of cycling parking provision encourage a certain level of day to day cycling in the Borough which will help to reduce issue of poor air quality, particularly in AQMAs. Option 2: Increased cycle parking standards may result in greater positive effects in the long-term (than Option 1) by making cycling a more feasible mode of transport, thereby reducing vehicle airborne emissions. The opposite effect will result from Option 3 and Option 4.
8. Maximise use of PDL	-	-	-	-	No effect predicted

SEA/SA Objective (Abridged)	Option 1: New policy (T8)	Option 2: Increased cycle parking standards	Option 3: Decreased cycle parking standards	Option 4: No cycle parking standards	Commentary & Recommendations
9. Resources (and material) efficiency	-	-	-	-	No effect predicted
10. Historic environment and cultural assets	-	-	-	-	No effect predicted
11. Landscape and townscape character	-	-	-	-	No effect predicted
12. Population and human health	✓	✓✓	x	x	Option 1: the levels of cycling parking provision encourage a certain level of day to day cycling that will help in encouraging healthy modes of travel. Option 2: Increased levels of cycle parking provision (compared to Option 1) are likely to further encourage the take-up of cycling as a healthy travel option. The opposite effect will result from Options 3 and 4:
13. Sustainable patterns of development	-	-	-	-	No effect predicted
14. Equity & Social inclusion	-	-	-	-	No effect predicted
15. Access to good quality housing	-	-	-	-	No effect predicted
16. Community identity and participation	-	-	-	-	No effect predicted
17. Reduce crime (actual and perceived)	-	-	-	-	No effect predicted
18. Prosperity and economic growth	-	-	-	-	No effect predicted
19. Equity and accessibility to services	-	-	-	-	No effect predicted
20. Revitalise town centres	-	?	-	-	Option 2: Increased cycle parking standards could lead to an improved environment in the town centre, but only if it helps to reduce the volume of cars.
<p>Recommendations: Given the emphasis provided in the Core Strategy towards promoting travel by means other than the private car, WBC should consider an increase in the cycle parking standards compared to those in the WDP2000, particularly for new developments in the town centre and other central zones. This will help towards achieving the family friendly town centre with a safe and accessible environment that is a key objective of the Core Strategy.</p>					

Policy Topic: **T9 Access and Servicing**

Option 1: Brought forward from Watford District Plan 2000, policy requires appropriate arrangements for access and egress from the site for servicing purposes, including emergency services.

As policy is already in use, a no policy option is not feasible.

SEA/SA Topic	Option 1- Draft Policy T9	Commentary & Recommendations
1. Biodiversity	-	No effect predicted.
2. Water resources	-	No effect predicted.
3. Flood risk	-	No effect predicted.
4. Soil	-	No effect predicted.
5. Climate change impact reduction	-	No effect predicted.
6. Adaptation to climate change	-	No effect predicted.
7. Air quality	-	No effect predicted.
8. Maximise use of PDL	-	No effect predicted.
9. Resources (and material) efficiency	-	No effect predicted.
10. Historic environment and cultural assets	-	No effect predicted.
11. Landscape and townscape character	-	No effect predicted.
12. Population and human health	✓	Option ensures incorporation of safety aspects to service buildings, both during normal function and during emergency- thus supporting well-being of the occupants.
13. Sustainable patterns of development	-	No effect predicted.
14. Equity & Social inclusion	-	No effect predicted.
15. Access to good quality housing	-	No effect predicted.
16. Community identity and participation	-	No effect predicted.
17. Reduce crime (actual and perceived)	-	No effect predicted.
18. Prosperity and economic growth	-	No effect predicted.
19. Equity and accessibility to services	-	No effect predicted.
20. Revitalise town centres	-	No effect predicted.
Recommendation: None		

Policy Topic: **Design**

Proposed option 1: UD3 Shop fronts and Advertisement signs

Alternative option: No policy

SEA/SA Topic	Option 1- Draft Policy UD3	Option 2- No policy	Commentary & Recommendations
1. Biodiversity	-	-	No effect predicted.
2. Water resources	-	-	No effect predicted.
3. Flood risk	-	-	No effect predicted.
4. Soil	-	-	No effect predicted.
5. Climate change impact reduction	-	-	No effect predicted.
6. Adaptation to climate change	-	-	No effect predicted.
7. Air quality	-	-	No effect predicted.
8. Maximise use of PDL	-	-	No effect predicted.
9. Resources (and material) efficiency	-	-	No effect predicted.
10. Historic environment and cultural assets	✓	x	Option 1 provides clear indication that new frontages should respect existing features and align with the character of the area. This point is particularly beneficial when considering retail frontages in historic environment, and is thus supportive of the SA objective. On the contrary, in the absence of any guidance (Option 2) and control on the appearance and signage, new developments may produce designs that are not suitable to the settings and could lead to erosion of the area's local character.
11. Landscape and townscape character	✓	x	Option 1 aims at creating unified pattern in terms of design thus adding to the visual amenity and character of the local settings. Option 2, in the absence of guidance and control may lead to haphazard design which may spoil the townscape character.
12. Population and human health	-	-	No effect predicted.
13. Sustainable patterns of development	-	-	No effect predicted.
14. Equity & Social inclusion	-	-	No effect predicted.
15. Access to good quality housing	-	-	No effect predicted.
16. Community identity and participation	-	-	No effect predicted.
17. Reduce crime (actual and perceived)	-	-	No effect predicted.

SEA/SA Topic	Option 1- Draft Policy UD3	Option 2- No policy	Commentary & Recommendations
18. Prosperity and economic growth	-	-	No effect predicted.
19. Equity and accessibility to services	-	-	No effect predicted.
20. Revitalise town centres	✓	x	<p>Under option 1, retail frontages and advertisement signs are likely to look in harmony with each other in a wider Town Centre setting, which could be visually pleasing, thus inviting for visitors and users to the area.</p> <p>Without a policy, uncoordinated retail frontages may lead to providing a sense of haphazard setting, unattractive for inward investment.</p>
<p>Recommendation: Consider making specific comments on guidelines for Advertisement signs within Conservation Areas and in Town Centres. <i>WBC response: Cross reference to the Shop front Design Guide and the Conservation Areas Management Plan included to address recommendation.</i></p>			

Policy Topic: **Built Heritage**

Proposed option 1: Policy UD4 Listed Buildings, Conservation Areas, Locally Listed Buildings, Registered Parks and Gardens & Archaeology

Alternative option: No policy

SEA/SA Topic	Option 1- Draft Policy UD4	Option 2- No policy	Commentary & Recommendations
1. Biodiversity	✓	-	Option 1 takes a holistic approach to conservation of the built heritage by including landscape and trees that will form part of these areas. This approach will help preserve biodiversity within and around the heritage assets, thus supportive of the SA objective. In a no policy scenario the Council will apply national policy which will not have any effect on biodiversity, unless indirect.
2. Water resources	-	-	No effect predicted.
3. Flood risk	-	-	No effect predicted.
4. Soil	-	-	No effect predicted.
5. Climate change impact reduction	-	-	No effect predicted.
6. Adaptation to climate change	-	-	No effect predicted.
7. Air quality	-	-	No effect predicted.
8. Maximise use of PDL	-	-	No effect predicted.
9. Resources (and material) efficiency	-	-	No effect predicted.
10. Historic environment and cultural assets	✓✓	✓	The policy is aimed at maintaining and enhancing historic and cultural assets and its settings. Option 1 takes into account each situation i.e., individual listed building, conservation areas, Registered Parks and Gardens and its settings- all of which are aimed to be preserved, and where possible enhanced. In a no policy scenario where national policy applies, the Council will have statutory duty to preserve historic and cultural assets, however it may not emphasise on preserving the settings and take into account landscape of the area- nevertheless Option 2 would have a positive effect on the SA objective.
11. Landscape and townscape character	✓	-	Option 1 takes a holistic approach to conservation of the built heritage by including landscape and trees that will form part of these areas.
12. Population and human health	✓	✓	Under both option scenarios, heritage assets would be preserved which in turn will enhance visual amenity and thus contribute to happiness and well-being of the population.
13. Sustainable patterns of development	-	-	No effect predicted.
14. Equity & Social inclusion	-	-	No effect predicted.

SEA/SA Topic	Option 1- Draft Policy UD4	Option 2- No policy	Commentary & Recommendations
15. Access to good quality housing	-	-	No effect predicted.
16. Community identity and participation	-	-	No effect predicted.
17. Reduce crime (actual and perceived)	-	-	No effect predicted.
18. Prosperity and economic growth	-	-	No effect predicted.
19. Equity and accessibility to services	-	-	No effect predicted.
20. Revitalise town centres	✓	-	Supports preservation of Listed Buildings and the settings of the Listed Buildings which will help maintain historic character of the Town Centre such as the Charter Place. Similarly the policy will help maintain the Conservation Area character, including its surroundings.
<p>Recommendation (prior to 1st consultation): Consider opportunity to reduce ambiguity in the wording under Listed Buildings such as ‘exceptional circumstances’ to grant permission to demolition of Listed Buildings.</p> <p><i>WBC response: Sentence reworded to state permissions will not be granted unless exceptional circumstance be demonstrated.</i></p> <p><i>SA recommendation implied to explain what exceptional circumstance means (and thus remove ambiguity). If any guidance, or example on what ‘exceptional’ circumstance can be given SA recommends inclusion of the same.</i></p>			

Policy Topic: **Trees, woodlands and hedgerows**

Proposed **option 1: GI 5** Preservation of woodlands, trees and promotion of new planting

SEA/SA Topic	Option 1- Draft Policy 1	Commentary & Recommendations
1. Biodiversity	✓	By protecting trees, woodlands and hedgerows, biodiversity features that are dependent on these habitats will also be protected and enhanced.
2. Water resources	-	No effect predicted.
3. Flood risk	✓	Retention of trees within woodland and increased tree cover (particularly within flood plains and storage areas) will help mitigate the risk of flooding.
4. Soil	✓	Increased tree cover helps secure top soil, thus supporting the SA objective.
5. Climate change impact reduction	✓	The proposed policy (option 1) will help retain woodland and promote green cover, which in turn helps to promote carbon sequestration.
6. Adaptation to climate change	-	No effect predicted.
7. Air quality	✓	Although likely to be localised, increased tree cover helps improve quality, and is thus supportive of the SA objective.
8. Maximise use of PDL	-	No effect predicted.
9. Resources (and material) efficiency	-	No effect predicted.
10. Historic environment and cultural assets	-	No effect predicted.
11. Landscape and townscape character	✓	Policy will help maintain landscape character in areas where tree cover and hedgerows are present.
12. Population and human health	✓	Positive health benefits can be associated with preserving trees and greenspaces in the form of improved air quality, visual amenity and recreation space provision.
13. Sustainable patterns of development	-	No effect predicted.
14. Equity & Social inclusion	-	No effect predicted.
15. Access to good quality housing	-	No effect predicted.
16. Community identity and participation	-	No effect predicted.
17. Reduce crime (actual and perceived)	-	No effect predicted.
18. Prosperity and economic growth	-	No effect predicted.
19. Equity and accessibility to services	-	No effect predicted.
20. Revitalise town centres	-	No effect predicted.

SEA/SA Topic	Option 1- Draft Policy 1	Commentary & Recommendations
<p>Recommendation (prior to finalising the consultation report): Some guidance on the level of new planting required in major developments or within SPAs may be useful to provide 'green lungs' throughout Watford, rather than as pockets within the Borough. New text introduced in the 1st consultation draft: 'to encourage new developments and SPAs to deliver more planting, as part of delivering the greening and legibility project'.</p> <p>Also consider encouraging developments to consider options such as vertical gardens, green roofs and green walls- these are directly related to securing BREEAM credits and will fully support DM Sustainable Design policies.</p> <p>The policy can be more explicit about protection of trees within Conservation Areas, in addition to those under TPOs. <i>WBC response: New text introduced in the 1st consultation draft : "To protect or replace trees within Conservation Areas".</i></p>		

Policy Topic: **Sports Hubs**

Proposed **option 1: GI 6:** Support to the development of designated strategic pitch sites; and list of conditions to consider change of sports provision to other development

SEA/SA Topic	Option 1- Sports hub	Commentary & Recommendations
1. Biodiversity	-	No effect predicted.
2. Water resources	-	No effect predicted.
3. Flood risk	-	No effect predicted.
4. Soil	-	No effect predicted.
5. Climate change impact reduction	-	No effect predicted.
6. Adaptation to climate change	-	No effect predicted.
7. Air quality	-	No effect predicted.
8. Maximise use of PDL	-	No effect predicted.
9. Resources (and material) efficiency	-	No effect predicted.
10. Historic environment and cultural assets	-	No effect predicted.
11. Landscape and townscape character	-	No effect predicted.
12. Population and human health	✓	Positive health benefits can be associated with preserving play areas and sports pitches to conduct walking and cycling activities and in general for recreation purposes.
13. Sustainable patterns of development	-	No effect predicted.
14. Equity & Social inclusion	✓	The policy is supportive of protecting existing provision, and promoting new sports hubs that will be distributed around the Borough.
15. Access to good quality housing	-	No effect predicted.
16. Community identity and participation	-	No effect predicted.
17. Reduce crime (actual and perceived)	-	No effect predicted.
18. Prosperity and economic growth	-	No effect predicted.
19. Equity and accessibility to services	-	No effect predicted.
20. Revitalise town centres	-	No effect predicted.
Recommendation: Consider ways to address existing deficit, particularly near deprived wards.		

Policy Topic: **Open Space and Children/Young Person's Play Space in Residential Development**

Proposed **option 1: GI 7:** Require new developments to make provision for openspace and play spaces, as well as safeguard existing play space provision.

SEA/SA Topic	Option 1- Sports hub	Commentary & Recommendations
1. Biodiversity	-	No effect predicted.
2. Water resources	-	No effect predicted.
3. Flood risk	-	No effect predicted.
4. Soil	-	No effect predicted.
5. Climate change impact reduction	-	No effect predicted.
6. Adaptation to climate change	-	No effect predicted.
7. Air quality	-	No effect predicted.
8. Maximise use of PDL	-	No effect predicted.
9. Resources (and material) efficiency	-	No effect predicted.
10. Historic environment and cultural assets	-	No effect predicted.
11. Landscape and townscape character	-	No effect predicted.
12. Population and human health	✓	Positive health benefits can be associated with preserving and creating play areas and open spaces to conduct walking and cycling activities and in general for recreation purposes.
13. Sustainable patterns of development	-	No effect predicted.
14. Equity & Social inclusion	✓	The policy is supportive of protecting existing provision, and promoting new open spaces and play areas that will be distributed around the Borough.
15. Access to good quality housing	-	No effect predicted.
16. Community identity and participation	-	No effect predicted.
17. Reduce crime (actual and perceived)	-	No effect predicted.
18. Prosperity and economic growth	-	No effect predicted.
19. Equity and accessibility to services	-	No effect predicted.
20. Revitalise town centres	-	No effect predicted.
Recommendation: None		