Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of West Midlands Regional Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score Key</th>
<th>+ +</th>
<th>+</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>- -</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Significant Positive effect</td>
<td>Minor positive effect</td>
<td>No overall effect</td>
<td>Minor negative effect</td>
<td>Significant negative effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Score uncertain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NB:** where more than one symbol is presented in a box it indicates that the SEA has found more than one score for the category. Where the scores are both positive and negative, the boxes are deliberately not coloured. Where a box is coloured but also contains a ?, this indicates uncertainty over whether the effect could be a minor or significant effect although a professional judgement is expressed. A conclusion of uncertainty arises where there is insufficient evidence for expert judgement to conclude an effect.

*S* – short term (less than 0.75 year), *M* – medium term (between 0.75 and 5 years) and *L* – long term (> 5 years)

### West Midlands Regional Strategy

#### CC1: Climate Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative Root Category</th>
<th>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</th>
<th>Population &amp; Human Health</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air</th>
<th>Climatic factors</th>
<th>Material assets</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention</td>
<td>+ +</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Likely Significant Effects of Retention**

Policy CC1 is a generic and aspirational policy which addresses how the spatial planning system can mitigate the impacts of climate change across the West Midlands. The implementation of policy CC1 should result in generally positive outcomes across the SEA.
### Commentary

In the context of the West Midlands Regional Strategy, the revocation of policy CC1 is examined. Although the policy is generally considered to have positive outcomes, there are uncertainties associated with it, especially regarding biodiversity, population health, and climatic factors. The policy focuses on developing brownfield land and easing pressure on environmental criteria by concentrating development in existing Major Urban Areas, historic centres, and settlements in the West Midlands. However, promoting development could lead to tensions in some historic centres, potentially affecting the built historic heritage of the Black Country. Additionally, an increase in renewable energy schemes could impact landscape character, particularly in rural areas. Development on previously developed land in Major Urban Areas might result in the development of brownfield land, which could have adverse effects on biodiversity.

#### Mitigation Measures

None proposed.

#### Assumptions

The success of policy CC1 depends on the implementation of the policy through the preparation of local plans by local planning authorities in the West Midlands.

#### Uncertainty

Whilst the policy is judged to have generally positive outcomes, there are uncertainties associated with it, mainly concerning the long-term implications for biodiversity, population health, and climatic factors.

#### Likely Significant Effects of Revocation

Given the broad nature of the policy, revocation is anticipated to result in effects similar to retention as measures addressing climate change are taken up through the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (section 10, paragraphs 93-108) which seek to ensure that new development does not contribute to climate change and is resilient to its likely effects. There are also policies in section 12.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</th>
<th>Population &amp; human Health</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air</th>
<th>Climatic factors</th>
<th>Material assets</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Commentary

(paragraphs 126-141) of the National Planning Policy Framework on conserving and enhancing the historic environment.

**Mitigation Measures**

None proposed

**Assumptions**

As above.

**Uncertainty**

Notwithstanding the provisions on the NPPF, there are a number of uncertainties associated with revocation of the policy, principally relating to the long term implications for biodiversity, population and climatic factors. As for retention, there are uncertainties as to how planning policies on climate change will influence the longer term outcomes of these topics.
## Urban Renaissance

### UR1: Implementing an Urban Renaissance – the MUAs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</th>
<th>Population &amp; human Health</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air</th>
<th>Climatic factors</th>
<th>Material assets</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Likely Significant Effects of Retention

Policy UR1 sets out the core overall strategic objective of the West Midlands Regional Strategy which is to implement an urban renaissance in the region’s Major Urban Areas.

Supporting the economies of existing centres. Improving correlation between jobs, housing and services, thus reducing the need to travel, car reliance and improving mobility and access for all. Potential benefits for air quality and greenhouse gas emissions.

Overall benefits across the SEA themes, but particularly for biodiversity, population and human health and climatic factors. Benefits for biodiversity and soil topics arise from developing brownfield land and easing pressure on environmental receptors by concentrating development in existing Major Urban Areas, historic centres and settlements. Historic character of the West Midlands environment should be helped by the whole of the settlement strategy taking into account local character. However the policy, by promoting development, could also result in tensions in some historic centres leading to negative or uncertain impacts on heritage.

Where achievement of the of development on previously developed land in Major Urban Areas takes place it could result in the development of areas of brownfield land which had
### Commentary

Reducing vacant and derelict areas, supporting regeneration and protection of the countryside should have benefits for soil and the landscape inside and outside the West Midlands Major Urban Areas.

**Mitigation Measures**

None proposed.

**Assumptions**

Success of policy UR1 depends on the implementation of the policy through the preparation of the local plans in the West Midlands.

**Uncertainty**

Potential uncertainties exist in respect of the effects on air and cultural heritage factors in the short, medium and longer term due to the possible effects of traffic growth and pressure on existing land resources for development.

### Likely Significant Effects of Revocation

As set out in the National Planning Policy Framework, the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development and that policies in paragraphs 18-219, taken as a whole, constitute the Government’s view of what sustainable development in England means in practice for the planning system.

It is possible that removing the requirement to direct most strategically significant growth to the West Midlands Major Urban Areas and removing the target for the use of previously developed land could lead to less development within the Major Urban Areas, and result in less development of brownfield land. This could lead to more development on greenfield sites in the countryside around the region’s Major Urban Centres.

There are potential benefits for biodiversity if it resulted in less development on those areas.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</th>
<th>Population &amp; human Health</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air</th>
<th>Climatic factors</th>
<th>Material assets</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Commentary

Paragraph 111 of the National Planning Policy Framework encourages the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed, provided that it is not of high environmental value. Local planning authorities may continue to consider the case for setting a locally appropriate target for the use of brownfield land.

Paragraph 117 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that planning policies should identify and map components of the local ecological networks, including wildlife corridors and stepping stones that connect them and areas identified by local partnerships for habitat restoration or creation. This should reduce the risk of the potentially adverse effects identified above.

Paragraphs 126 to 141 of the National Planning Policy Framework have strong policies on conserving and enhancing the historic environment.

Mitigation Measures

Paragraph 111 of the National Planning Policy Framework encourages the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed, provided that it is not of high environmental value. Local planning authorities may continue to consider the case for setting a locally appropriate target for the use of brownfield land.

Paragraph 117 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that planning policies should identify and map components of the local ecological networks, including wildlife corridors and stepping stones that connect them and areas identified by local partnerships for habitat restoration or creation. This should reduce the risk of the potentially adverse effects identified above.

Paragraphs 126 to 141 of the National Planning Policy Framework have strong policies on conserving and enhancing the historic environment.

Assumptions

Local authorities will implement when preparing their local plans within the policy context set...
### Commentary

out in the National Planning Policy Framework.

**Uncertainty**

As with retention, potential uncertainties exist in respect of the effects on air and cultural heritage factors in the short, medium and longer term due to the possible effects of traffic growth and pressure on existing land resources for development. In addition, the longer term effects on biodiversity, soil and landscape resources are uncertain if aspirations for urban regeneration are not comprehensively realised through local plans.
### UR1A: Black Country Regeneration Policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</th>
<th>Population &amp; human Health</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air</th>
<th>Climatic factors</th>
<th>Material assets</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revocation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Commentary**

**Likely Significant Effects of Retention**

Policy UR1A identifies the Black Country sub region in the West Midlands as a primary focus for regeneration activity; hence development and investment will be centred on four strategic centres and growth corridors in the Black Country. The specific locations of the centres and corridors will be defined in the Black Country Joint Core Strategy and Local Development Documents. Policy UR1A also states development and environmental enhancement should be planned for and encouraged in other locations across the Black Country which support local centres and communities, use suitable sites and be accessible by public transport.

**Mitigation Measures**

None proposed.

**Assumptions**

The success of policy UR1A is dependent on the Black Country Joint Core Strategy being in place.

**Uncertainty**

None identified.

**Likely Significant Effects of Revocation**

The revocation of policy UR1A will have no negative impacts. This is because the Black Country Joint Core Strategy prepared by the four Black Country local planning authorities...
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</th>
<th>Population &amp; human Health</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air</th>
<th>Climatic factors</th>
<th>Material assets</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dudley, Sandwell, Walsall, Wolverhampton</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Commentary**

Oficina Dudley (Dudley, Sandwell, Walsall, Wolverhampton) was adopted in February 2011. The Black Country Joint Core Strategy was prepared within the regional planning policy framework set out by policy UR1A in the West Midlands Regional Strategy. This has ensured that the sub-regional high level strategic planning approach to promote the regeneration of the Black Country have effectively been coordinated by the four Black Country local planning authorities through their Joint Core Strategy.

Given the existence of the up to date Black Country Core Strategy, it is expected that the policy or variations of this policy through the implementation of the policies in the joint core strategy by the four Black Country local planning authorities will be delivered at the local level and the environmental effects of revocation would be the same as retention.

**Mitigation Measures**
- None proposed.

**Assumptions**
- None.

**Uncertainty**
- None identified.
### UR1B: Housing and Employment Land

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</th>
<th>Population &amp; Human Health</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air</th>
<th>Climatic factors</th>
<th>Material assets</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retention</td>
<td>0 0 0 + + + 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 + + + + + + 0 0 0 + + +</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revocation</td>
<td>0 0 0 + + + 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 + + + + + + 0 0 0 + + +</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Commentary**

- **Likely Significant Effects of Retention**
  Policy UR1B states that within the growth corridors the Black Country Joint Core Strategy and Local Development Documents will define Employment Land Investment Corridors and lists four objectives the identification of the corridors should deliver - protection of designated land suitable for employment development; sites through the transfer of employment land for housing and mixed use development; the balanced development of both uses; and development should be supported by water cycle strategies so as to secure sustainable patterns of development. These will have positive effects on population (from the employment provision) and on climatic factors, material assets and landscape (from policies concerning sustainable patterns of development).

- **Mitigation Measures**
  None proposed.

- **Assumptions**
  The success of policy UR1B is dependent on the Black Country Joint Core Strategy being in place.

- **Uncertainty**
  None identified.

- **Likely Significant Effects of Revocation**
  The revocation of policy UR1B will have no negative impacts. This is because the Black Country Joint Core Strategy prepared by the four Black Country local planning authorities...
(Dudley, Sandwell, Walsall, Wolverhampton) was adopted in February 2011. The Black Country Joint Core Strategy was prepared within the regional planning policy framework set out by policy UR1B in the West Midlands Regional Strategy. This has ensured that the subregional high level strategic planning approach to promote the regeneration of the Black Country has effectively been co-ordinated by the four Black Country local planning authorities through their Joint Core Strategy.

Given the existence of the up to date Black Country Core Strategy, it is expected that the policy or variations of this policy through the implementation of the policies in the Joint Core Strategy by the four Black Country local planning authorities will be delivered at the local level and the environmental effects of revocation would be the same as retention.

**Mitigation Measures**

None proposed.

**Assumptions**

None.

**Uncertainty**

None identified.
### UR1C: Strategic Office Development in the Black Country

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</th>
<th>Population &amp; human Health</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air</th>
<th>Climatic factors</th>
<th>Material assets</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retention</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 + + + + 0 0 0 0 0 0 + + + + + + 0 0 0 + + +</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Commentary**

**Likely Significant Effects of Retention**

Policy UR1C identifies the scale of B1(a) office floorspace required from 2004 to 2021 to support the regeneration of the Black Country which should be centred in the four strategic centres of Walsall, West Bromwich, Wolverhampton and Brierley Hill. Again to deliver this policy the four local planning authorities covering the Black Country will do so through their Black Country Joint Core Strategy and Local Development Documents. These will have positive effects on population (from the employment provision) and on climatic factors, material assets and landscape (from policies concerning sustainable patterns of development). There will also be long term benefits on biodiversity from concentrating development on urban strategic centres.

**Mitigation Measures**

None proposed.

**Assumptions**

The success of policy UR1C is dependent on the Black Country Joint Core Strategy being in place.

**Uncertainty**

None identified.
### Likely Significant Effects of Revocation

The revocation of policy UR1C will have no negative impacts. This is because the Black Country Joint Core Strategy prepared by the four Black Country Core local planning authorities (Dudley, Sandwell, Walsall, Wolverhampton) was adopted in February 2011. The Black Country Joint Core Strategy was prepared within the regional planning policy framework set out in the West Midlands Regional Strategy. This has ensured that the sub-regional high-level strategic planning approach to promote the regeneration of the Black Country have effectively been coordinated by the four Black Country local planning authorities through their joint core strategy.

Given the existence of the up to date Black Country Core Strategy, it is expected that the policy or variations of this policy through the implementation of the policies in the Joint Core Strategy by the four Black Country local planning authorities will be delivered at the local level and the environmental effects of revocation would be the same as retention.

### Mitigation Measures

None proposed.

### Assumptions

None.

### Uncertainty

None identified.
Policy UR1D identifies the scale and distribution of retail floorspace required in the Black Country identifying four strategic centres where retail floor space should be located, the scale of the retail floor space in each centre, plus the scale of retail floorspace to be distributed across the sub region's non strategic retail centres. Again Policy UR1D will be delivered through the Black Country Joint Core Strategy and Local Development Documents which focus development (thus optimising the use of resources) on regeneration areas.

**Mitigation Measures**
None proposed.

**Assumptions**
The success of policy UR1C is dependent on the Black Country Joint Core Strategy being in place.

**Uncertainty**
None identified.

**Likely Significant Effects of Retention**
The revocation of policy UR1D will have no negative impacts. This is because the Black Country Joint Core Strategy and Local Development Documents which focus development (thus optimising the use of resources) on regeneration areas.
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Country Joint Core Strategy prepared by the four Black Country local planning authorities (Dudley, Sandwell, Walsall, Wolverhampton) was adopted in February 2011. The Black Country Joint Core Strategy was prepared within the context of policy UR1D in the West Midlands Regional Strategy. This has ensured that the sub regional high level strategic planning approach to promoting the regeneration of the Black Country have effectively been coordinated by the four Black Country local planning authorities through their joint core strategy.

Given the existences of the up to date Black Country Core Strategy, it is expected that the policy or variations of this policy through the implementation of the policies in the joint core strategy by the four Black Country local planning authorities will be delivered at the local level and the environmental effects of revocation would be the same as retention.

**Mitigation Measures**
None proposed.

**Assumptions**
None.

**Uncertainty**
None identified.
## UR2: Towns and Cities Outside Major Urban Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</th>
<th>Population &amp; human Health</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air</th>
<th>Climatic factors</th>
<th>Material assets</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retention</td>
<td>0 0 0 + + + 0 0 0 0 0 + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Commentary

#### Likely Significant Effects of Retention

Policy UR2 identifies 12 towns and cities in the West Midlands located outside the region’s Major Urban Areas and that through the preparation of local plans the local authorities covering these 12 towns and cities will need to promote the local regeneration of these 12 settlements.

The policy supports regeneration, investment and environmental enhancement of town and city centres. It also includes the provision of and access to services, shops and facilities locally, reducing travel need, and reducing related inequalities. This could have climatic, air quality and population benefits, particularly where development seeks to adapt to and mitigate the effects of climate change. Building on the positive elements of the distinctive characters of these 12 town and city centres in the West Midlands would have benefits for cultural heritage.

#### Mitigation Measures

None proposed.

#### Assumptions

Local authorities through the preparation of their local plans and working in partnership with the appropriate Local Economic Partnership, through the provisions of the Duty to Co-
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### Likely Significant Effects of Revocation

Revocation of policy UR2 is unlikely to have any different effects on the environment, compared to retention, except to the extent that it informs other policies, for example on transport, which would have implications for the amount of travel by car and other means. There could therefore be wider implications for air quality but these are uncertain. The application of National Planning Policy Framework policies on conserving and enhancing the historic environment set out in paragraphs 126-141 will deliver similar cultural heritage benefits as retention of the West Midlands Regional Strategy.

The National Planning Policy Framework also provides a strong policy framework for ensuring the vitality of town centres in paragraphs 23-27 and on supporting a prosperous rural economy paragraph 28, which is relevant because these 12 towns and cities serve rural hinterlands in the region. It also seeks through the transport policies set out in paragraphs 29-41 to promote sustainable transport modes and support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and congestion.

This will have similar benefits as with retention on climatic factors, and subject to appropriate traffic management measures, to air quality.

### Mitigation Measures

None proposed.

### Assumptions

As above.

### Uncertainty

Uncertainty could appear under revocation by virtue of the whether a similar level of positive...
outcomes is likely to be secured through local plans. The effects on air quality also relate to other external factors that impact on the demand for road travel (and whether this continues to increase).
**UR3: Enhancing the role of City, Town and District Centres**

### Commentary

**Likely Significant Effects of Retention**

Policy UR3 states that city, town and district centres and in particular those centres identified in the network of town and city centres in policy PA11, should be enhanced to play a leading role in urban renaissance programmes in order to provide services for local communities, a sense of identity and as drivers of economic growth.

This policy identifies the key role of towns and cities in the West Midlands, the role they will play to host new development, where this development should be concentrated and delivered focusing on the 25 towns and cities identified in policy PA11 of the West Midlands Regional Strategy. The principles aims and types of development to be located in these 25 towns and cities are set out in policy PA11.

Positive effects on population, air, climatic factors, material assets and cultural heritage have been identified. Long term significant effects are anticipated on population from employment opportunities created, the community facilities and infrastructure provided and improvements in the urban environment.

**Mitigation Measures**

None proposed.

**Assumptions**

That a coordinated approach to planning is taken to promote high standards of development
### Commentary

Revocation of the West Midlands Regional Strategy will mean that it will be for local planning authorities to determine the priorities and location for growth and regeneration, working with other local authorities, business partners and their communities in their town and city centres. The Localism Act places a Duty to Co-operate on local authorities and the National Planning Policy Framework sets out clear policy on the Duty to Cooperate at paragraphs 178-181. In addition the National Planning Policy Framework sets out that local plans will be examined by an independent inspector whose role is to (amongst other things) assess whether the plan has been prepared in accordance with the Duty to Cooperate. Any significant environmental effects of the proposed distribution of new development in the region’s town, city and district centres should be identified and addressed through sustainability appraisal and strategic environmental assessment of local authority’s local plans.

The National Planning Policy Framework does not contain a target for development on previously developed land. However, paragraph 111 of the National Planning Policy Framework encourages the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed, provided that it is not of high environmental value. Local planning authorities may continue to consider the case for setting a locally appropriate target for the use of brownfield land, which will impact on the future development of town and city centres in the region.

It is possible that removing the target for the use of previously developed land could lead to...
### Commentary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</th>
<th>Population &amp; human Health</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air</th>
<th>Climatic factors</th>
<th>Material assets</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

benefits to biodiversity if it resulted in less development on those areas of brownfield land with high biodiversity value and to human health where there were lower housing densities. Alternatively, if it increased the amount of development on greenfield land away from existing settlements, this could have negative impacts on biodiversity, the countryside (i.e. soil and landscape); and air quality (if there is a greater need to travel).

Unco-ordinated, incremental development could be an unwanted consequence of a localised approach to development in the region’s town and city centres, although overall, no significant negative environmental effects are anticipated given the role of SA/SEA in appraising individual development plans and the role of the Duty to Co-operate in requiring a demonstration of joint working by authorities with clear cross-boundary interests.

**Mitigation Measures**

None Proposed.

**Assumptions**

As above.

**Uncertainty**

Revocation could introduce some longer term uncertainty in respect of the potential effects on biodiversity, population, air and climate through more dispersed development generating traffic.
## UR4: Social Infrastructure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</th>
<th>Population &amp; human Health</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air</th>
<th>Climatic factors</th>
<th>Material assets</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retention</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>+ +</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+ +</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Commentary

**Likely Significant Effects of Retention**

Policy UR4 is a generic policy encouraging local authorities, partners and community organisations etc in the West Midlands through Local Strategic Partnerships for example to work together to deliver the urban renaissance in the region. The policy also contributes to local regeneration and helps deprived areas to achieve their full potential and contributes to maintaining and enhancing the built and historic character (with positive effects for population and cultural heritage).

Policy UR4 will help improve the management of the impacts of access and recreation as well as contribute to local regeneration and help deprived areas. It increases access to leisure facilities (including woodlands, parks, watercourses), improves the quality and quantity of publicly accessible green space and provides opportunities for people to come into contact with and appreciate the natural and built environment.

**Mitigation Measures**

Policy UR4 seeks to ensure that proposals for cultural facilities do not adversely affect areas designated for their ecological, landscape or historic value, including sites of European or international importance for nature conservation. Policy UR4 also seeks to optimise opportunities to use means of transport other than the car and use transport networks that have adequate capacity to accommodate sustainable passenger and freight requirements.

**Assumptions**

That a coordinated approach to planning is taken to promote high standards of social
## Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of West Midlands Regional Strategy

### Alternative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</th>
<th>Population &amp; human Health</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air</th>
<th>Climatic factors</th>
<th>Material assets</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Commentary

Infrastructure provision across the region’s local authority areas and the policy objectives related to the implementation of policy UR4 can be addressed through the preparation of local plans and Development Plan Documents by local authorities, informed by working with their neighbouring local authorities through the Duty to Co-operate.

**Uncertainty**

The effects will depend on the nature of the proposals that come forward to promote social infrastructure and the elements of these proposals which have a spatial planning impact and if the mitigation measures identified are applied.

### Revocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</th>
<th>Population &amp; human Health</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air</th>
<th>Climatic factors</th>
<th>Material assets</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 + / ?</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0 / ?</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0 / ?</td>
<td>0 + / ?</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Likely Significant Effects of Revocation**

The National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 70 sets out policies to deliver the social, recreational and cultural facilities and services the community needs. It states that local planning authorities should plan positively for the provision and use of shared space, community facilities (such as sports venues and cultural buildings), to enhance the sustainability of communities and residential environments.

The National Planning Policy Framework at paragraphs 73 and 74 also promote assessments of the needs for open space, sports and recreation facilities and opportunities for new provision.

Policies in the National Planning Policy Framework also seek to promote and conserve cultural heritage, designated landscapes and green infrastructure, which will also contribute to the provision of cultural facilities.

Paragraphs 126 to 141 of the National Planning Policy Framework also have strong policies on conserving and enhancing the historic environment.

Implementation of these National Planning Policy Framework policies in local plans will have beneficial effects on population and cultural heritage. However, given that some authorities will require time to update their plan policies the benefits will only occur in the medium and longer term.
### Commentary

**Mitigation Measures**
As above.

**Assumptions**
As above.

**Uncertainty**
As the actual environment effects will depend on delivery of specific individual policies and local circumstances it is concluded that the effects of revocation of policy UR4 will be uncertain although the SEA criteria they are most likely to influence are considered to be cultural heritage, biodiversity, air quality, material assets and human health over the longer term where social infrastructure policies could vary by local plan area.
## Rural Renaissance

### RR1: Rural Renaissance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</th>
<th>Population &amp; human Health</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air</th>
<th>Climatic factors</th>
<th>Material assets</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retention</td>
<td>+ + + + + + 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 + 0 0 0 0 0 0 + + +</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Commentary

**Likely Significant Effects of Retention**

Policy RR1 seeks to promote the regeneration of the West Midlands rural areas located beyond the influence of the region’s Major Urban Areas by improving choice in housing, diversification of the rural economy and the provision of better public transport facilities in rural areas for example. This policy will be implemented through the preparation of local plans by local authorities in the region.

Retention would encourage regeneration in more isolated rural areas, use of brownfield land first in rural areas, and support local services.

The preferential use of brownfield land in Major Urban Areas for development would create a more attractive environment in built up areas and promote environmental benefits by avoiding development in the countryside within the travel to work area of the region’s Major Urban Areas. Further the policy seeks to promote public transport accessibility, reduce social inequalities relating to access to transport.

The policy would therefore have beneficial effects for biodiversity, population, climatic factors and landscape.

### Mitigation Measures
## Revocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</th>
<th>Population &amp; human Health</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air</th>
<th>Climatic factors</th>
<th>Material assets</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revocation</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Commentary**

None proposed.

**Assumptions**

Success will depend on public transport provision in rural areas requiring regeneration, and demand management in the existing Major Urban Areas and the rural areas within the travel to work catchment areas of the region’s urban centres.

**Uncertainty**

None identified.

**Likely Significant Effects of Revocation**

The effects from revocation of policy RR1 are similar to retention. Local authorities will be required to deliver legal and national objectives, including policies on promoting a competitive economy as set out in paragraphs 18-22 of the National Planning Policy Framework, supporting a prosperous rural economy paragraph 28 and promoting sustainable transport paragraphs 29-41 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The preparation of local plans by the region’s local planning authorities will provide the vehicles for addressing the challenge of regenerating rural areas as illustrated by policy RR1.

**Mitigation Measures**

None proposed.

**Assumptions**

As above.

**Uncertainty**

None identified.
RR2: The Rural Regeneration Zone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</th>
<th>Population &amp; human Health</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air</th>
<th>Climatic factors</th>
<th>Material assets</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Commentary**

**Likely Significant Effects of Retention**
Policy RR2 seeks to focus investment within the Rural Regeneration Zone as identified in the West Midlands Regional Strategy. Priority should be given to improvements in traffic management and public transport within the A49 transport corridor to support economic and social regeneration and improve accessibility. Policy RR2 also states that the regeneration of the region’s rural areas should also seek to enhance and protect the region’s landscapes such as its three Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) from any negative impacts from development. These will have benefits for population, air quality and landscape.

**Mitigation Measures**
None proposed.

**Assumptions**
Success will depend on public transport provision in rural areas requiring regeneration, and demand management in the existing Major Urban Areas and the rural areas within the travel to work catchment areas of the region’s urban centres.

**Uncertainty**
Managing traffic emissions over the longer term could produce uncertain outcomes on air quality.
### Likely Significant Effects of Revocation

None from revocation of policy RR2 which is an amplification of policy RR1 as local authorities will be required to deliver legal and national objectives, including policies on promoting a competitive economy as set out in paragraphs 18-22 of the National Planning Policy Framework, supporting a prosperous rural economy paragraph 28 and promoting sustainable transport paragraphs 29-41 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The preparation of local plans by the region’s local planning authorities will provide the vehicles for addressing the challenge of regenerating rural areas as illustrated by policy RR1 and policy RR2. If the policy were revoked, local planning authorities would still need to have regard to the strong policy set out in paragraphs 109 to 125 ‘Conserving and enhancing the natural environment’ and paragraphs 126 to 141 ‘Conserving and enhancing the historic environment’ of the National Planning Policy Framework. This includes policy on conserving and enhancing the natural and historic environment, and on requiring good design, which includes ensuring that development responds to the character and history of the areas landscape.

The Duty to Cooperate is clearly relevant to local planning authorities’ approach to cross-boundary landscape assets and challenges. The UK is a signatory to the European Landscape Convention 2000, introduced a Europe-wide concept centring on the quality of landscape protection, management and planning and covering the entire territory, not just outstanding landscapes. Local planning authorities can have regard to the convention when pursuing locally focused planning approaches to landscape studies and conservation.

With the exception of beneficial effects on population and long term positive effects on air quality and landscape, on the basis of the above considerations, revocation of this policy would be likely to have a neutral effect on the environment.

### Mitigation Measures

None Proposed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</th>
<th>Population &amp; human Health</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air</th>
<th>Climatic factors</th>
<th>Material assets</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Commentary**

**Assumptions**
As above.

**Uncertainty**
The challenge of managing traffic emissions over the longer term could produce uncertain outcomes on air quality.
RR3: Market Towns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</th>
<th>Population &amp; human Health</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air</th>
<th>Climatic factors</th>
<th>Material assets</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Commentary**

**Likely Significant Effects of Retention**

Policy RR3 states that Market Towns have a key role to play in helping to deliver the regeneration of rural areas as set out in policy RR1, acting as a focus for sustainable economic and housing development and providing services and other facilities to their rural hinterland.

Policy RR3 supports rural diversification and development of the rural economy in the West Midlands, and identifies broad rural areas to which particular attention should be given. In principle, local populations should benefit from the enhancement of the vitality of market towns (through service provision and employment), as should cultural heritage and local landscapes which provide their setting through increased investment.

**Mitigation Measures**

None proposed.

**Assumptions**

None.

**Uncertainty**

The outcome of this policy is dependent on the decisions of individual local authorities in the region responding to a wide range of factors, some outside the control of the West Midlands Regional Strategy, such as the general economic climate and the opportunities for
### Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of West Midlands Regional Strategy

#### Alternative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</th>
<th>Population &amp; human Health</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air</th>
<th>Climatic factors</th>
<th>Material assets</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revocation</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Commentary

- **Likely Significant Effects of Revocation**
  - The National Planning Policy Framework contains strong policy supporting economic growth and diversification in rural areas as set out in paragraph 28.
  - Market Towns have a key role to play in supporting the diversification of the rural economy. The National Planning Policy Framework says that local and neighbourhood plans should support the sustainable growth and expansion of all types of business and enterprise in rural areas, and promote the development and diversification of agricultural and other land-based rural businesses. The National Planning Policy Framework does not contain a list of rural areas requiring particular attention. However, local authorities will need to work together under the Duty to Cooperate to ascertain which areas need particular support.
  - Given that the Regional Strategy does not identify specific Market Towns or sites in these towns, and it is not possible to predict where development will be directed to in local plans the outcome is uncertain, although we would expect it to be similar to the Regional Strategy.

- **Mitigation Measures**
  - None proposed.

- **Assumptions**
  - None.

- **Uncertainty**
  - Long-term, co-ordinated support for market towns could be uncertain with consequent effects on their economic vitality and consequently local populations.
RR4: Rural Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</th>
<th>Population &amp; human Health</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air</th>
<th>Climatic factors</th>
<th>Material assets</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retention</td>
<td>0 0 0 + + + 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 + 0 0 + 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Policy RR4 sets out a number of services which rural communities require to sustain a rural renaissance and sustainable forms of development in rural areas. Again these policy objectives should inform the preparation of local plans and Local Transport Plans by the region’s local authorities.

This policy recognises the key role Market Towns and other settlements in the region’s rural areas play in providing services to rural communities, providing local housing and improvement to local services, whilst supporting economic diversification. Retention of policy RR4 would have positive environmental impacts by providing local housing and employment, reducing the need to travel and improving the quality of the local environment.

Further policy RR4 seeks to ensure that transport contributes to addressing social and economic challenges in the region’s rural areas. This policy, if implemented, will have positive effects on population and human health, through increased accessibility to local services and employment and reducing inequalities, and a positive impact on air through reduced need to travel. However, the impact on soil and water will depend on how policy is implemented.

**Mitigation Measures**
None proposed.

**Assumptions**
## Commentary

### Likely Significant Effects of Revocation

None from the revocation of policy RR4. The effects of revocation are likely to be the same as retention (with positive effects on population, air and climatic factors being recorded).

Local authorities must have regard to national policy as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework, including policies on promoting a competitive economy paragraphs 18-22, supporting a prosperous rural economy paragraph 28 and promoting sustainable transport paragraphs 29-41 which will all contribute to promoting the rural services required to support the regeneration of rural areas.

The transport element of policy RR4 sets out aspirations that fit well with the broad thrust of the National Planning Policy Framework, including its policy for rural areas. However most of the actions are outside the scope of spatial planning. Where planning decisions would be required, for example to improve transport facilities or to make road safety improvements, the policy sets no requirements or targets and identifies no specific schemes.

### Mitigation Measures

None proposed.

### Assumptions

Regarding the transport policy element of policy RR4 the actions are outside the scope of the planning system. In addition, it will be for local authorities through their Local Transport Plans to identify measures to address rural transport issues.

### Uncertainty

Different approaches to local service provision adopted by local plans could have differential...
### Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of West Midlands Regional Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</th>
<th>Population &amp; human Health</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air</th>
<th>Climatic factors</th>
<th>Material assets</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>impacts for local populations over the longer term.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Communities for the Future

### CF1: Housing within Major Urban Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</th>
<th>Population &amp; human Health</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air</th>
<th>Climatic factors</th>
<th>Material assets</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Commentary

**Likely Significant Effects of Retention**

The increased provision of housing will have a significant positive effect on human health, and seeks to accommodate housing needs in the most sustainable way within the region’s Major Urban Areas whilst taking account of local housing conditions.

However, the policies are likely to have a negative effect on material assets as the increase in construction materials and energy is likely to increase. Furthermore, it is likely to lead to increased traffic in the region. It will also have a negative impact on soils and water as extra pressure is placed on these resources. The increased level of housing will also put additional pressure on local environment and wildlife through increased land take used for housing development.

**Mitigation Measures**

Many of the policies in the West Midlands Regional Strategy (for example on biodiversity, water, air quality, landscape and climate change) seek to mitigate the effects of new development (including housing) on the environment.
### Alternative Practicality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</th>
<th>Population &amp; human Health</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air</th>
<th>Climatic factors</th>
<th>Material assets</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Commentary

**Assumptions**

Policy CF1 assumes that infrastructure investment will be coordinated and delivered through the development process. It also assumes that the housing allocations are fully built out and there is no increase in the number of households that need to be planned for in the region’s Major Urban Areas beyond the planned level.

**Uncertainty**

The actual effects will depend on the location, nature and scale of development in different locations, linked to growth in local employment, transport and services and the uptake of less polluting forms of travel, local parking provision and access to green space.

#### Likely Significant Effects of Revocation

The effects of revocation are likely to be the same as retention.

Local planning authorities will determine their housing targets having regard to the policy on housing supply in the National Planning Policy Framework. Paragraph 47 states that, to boost significantly the supply of housing, local planning authorities should use their evidence base to ensure that their local plan meets the full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing in the housing market area, as far as is consistent with the policies set out in this Framework. Paragraph 159 states that they should prepare Strategic Housing Market Assessment to assess their full housing needs, working with neighbouring authorities where housing market areas cross administrative boundaries. The Strategic Housing Market Assessment should identify the scale and mix of housing and the range of tenures that the local population is likely to need over the plan period which meets household and population projections, taking account of migration and demographic change; addresses the need for all types of housing, including affordable housing and the needs of different groups in the community (such as, but not limited to, families with children, older people, people with disabilities, service families and people wishing to build their own homes); and caters for...
Paragraphs 173-177 of the National Planning Policy Framework seek to ensure the viability and deliverability of housing which if successful will lead to a greater proportion of the houses planned for actually being built over the plan period.

There will be scope in the West Midlands to change the housing distribution between districts. Joint working in line with the Duty to Cooperate will enable local planning authorities to distribute, and where necessary constrain, housing growth in a way that aims not only to fit with needs in each housing market area but also to accord with specific policies in the Framework that indicate development should be restricted (examples of which are given in the footnote on page 4 of the Framework). Consequently, whilst recognising uncertainties about possible impacts, it is reasonable to assume that higher overall provision closer to the latest projections (2008 figures) could be distributed in a way that would not have significantly different environmental effects, and might even be less harmful in some respects.

Given the existence of the up to date Black Country Core Strategy, it is expected that the policy or variations of this policy through the implementation of the policies in the joint core strategy by the four Black Country local planning authorities will be delivered at the local level and the environmental effects of revocation would be the same as retention. Other adopted or emerging Core Strategies (for example Stoke, Rugby, Solihull and Shropshire) are using RSS housing targets, and whilst the delivery trajectory could be reduced in light of the current housing market, the net effect should be similar to the housing delivery aspirations of the West Midlands RSS.

**Mitigation Measures**
## Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of West Midlands Regional Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</th>
<th>Population &amp; human Health</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air</th>
<th>Climatic factors</th>
<th>Material assets</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Commentary

None proposed.

### Assumptions

Revocation of policy CF1 assumes that local authorities will continue to use up-to-date evidence to plan for their housing needs, and regularly review their housing needs.

### Uncertainty

The actual effects will depend on the location, nature and scale of development in different locations, linked to growth in local employment, transport and services and the uptake of less polluting forms of travel, local parking provision and access to green space.
### CF2: Housing beyond the Major Urban Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</th>
<th>Population &amp; human Health</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air</th>
<th>Climatic factors</th>
<th>Material assets</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retention</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Likely Significant Effects of Retention" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Likely Significant Effects of Retention" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Likely Significant Effects of Retention" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Likely Significant Effects of Retention" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Likely Significant Effects of Retention" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Likely Significant Effects of Retention" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Likely Significant Effects of Retention" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Likely Significant Effects of Retention" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Likely Significant Effects of Retention" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Commentary**

- **Likely Significant Effects of Retention**
  - Focusing growth and regeneration based development outside the region’s Major Urban Areas is likely to lead to important changes in the character of those settlements identified such as Worcester, Telford, Shrewsbury, Hereford and Rugby. Releasing housing land has the potential to have both positive and negative effects on the natural, cultural, built and archaeological heritage of these settlements. Housing development is likely to change the character of these settlements. The environmental policies in the West Midlands Regional Strategy should help to provide protection for these settlements. Provision of affordable housing should be facilitated through the growth proposed.
  - The viability and sustainability of urban communities are enhanced through the promotion of tourist, cultural and educational developments in these five settlements. The policy contributes towards sustainability by developing in line with environmental and heritage considerations. The policy includes many objectives that help to contribute towards healthy lifestyles including reducing the need to travel which should help to promote walking and cycling. The policy will reduce health and welfare inequalities by coordinating the necessary infrastructure provision to support housing development outside the region’s Major Urban Areas.
  - This policy will maintain and enhance community facilities through further development and maintenance of existing infrastructure. The vitality of communities will be enhanced through careful development and enhancement of the local identity and character. Social cohesion
## Commentary

will be positively impacted upon through economic regeneration, employment growth and provision of affordable housing. Increase in community empowerment will be dependent upon the response of the community to new development.

The policy should help to promote healthy lifestyles through general regeneration of communities, improvement in skill levels and the provision of affordable housing. The public’s health will be improved through improved provision in health and social care infrastructure, and improved access to green spaces.

**Mitigation Measures**

For impacts on Best and Most Versatile (BMV) land and mineral resources, there is no specific mitigation available short of detailed studies on the particular attributes of areas and weighing these in a broader equation of sustainability performance.

**Assumptions**

None.

**Uncertainty**

The locality-specific impacts of growth are likely to vary considerably in their positive and negative effects, and significant development does not imply negative effects and vice versa. Much will depend upon the effectiveness of coordinated masterplanning, ensuring that resources such as green infrastructure and service provision are integral aspects of development.

### Likely Significant Effects of Revocation

Devolving responsibility for housing and employment to local authorities is unlikely to result in significantly different effects to that intended by the policies set out in the West Midlands Regional Strategy.

The provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework in respect of high quality design and the protection and enhancement of natural resources, for example, mean that there are
### Commentary

Safeguards in the manner in which development is realised. What is less predictable, however, is whether the provisions will be effective in areas of major change outside the region’s Major Urban Areas where significant development will inevitably result in changes in landscape character and pressures on natural resources.

Differences in the interpretation of the National Planning Policy Framework could result in discordant approaches to resource protection and enhancement in adjacent local authorities. Equally there could be a loss of momentum for the regeneration of specific settlements where significant additional development could be difficult to justify in the absence of demand. Provision for affordable housing and wider community infrastructure could be compromised.

The long term potential effects on population, soil, water, air, climatic factors, material assets and landscape reflect these changes.

#### Mitigation Measures
None proposed.

#### Assumptions
That assessments housing and employment need yield broadly similar scale of development anticipated by the West Midlands Regional Strategy.

#### Uncertainty
Local authorities, whilst providing for needs could choose widely differing strategies for dealing with growth, with positive of negative effects across the range of indicators according to local circumstances. Thus a more dispersed pattern of growth might be preferred to urban extensions for example.
### CF3: Levels and distribution of housing development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</th>
<th>Population &amp; human Health</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air</th>
<th>Climatic factors</th>
<th>Material assets</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retention</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Commentary**

**Likely Significant Effects of Retention**

The increased provision of housing, particularly affordable housing, is likely to lead to significant positive effects on the population and human health. However, this will also depend on related factors such as the quality of the houses, their density, location relative to green spaces and ambient air quality.

The policies are likely to have potentially significant negative effects on the water resources of the region. The demand for construction materials and energy is likely to increase, as is traffic in the region. These are likely to have negative impacts for the environment.

The scale of the developments within the West Midlands will have impacts on the character of the affected areas, in addition to negative impacts upon the habitats, wildlife and landscape of the region from the developments.

**Mitigation Measures**

Many of the policies in the West Midlands Regional Strategy (for example, on biodiversity, water, air quality, cultural heritage and landscape) seek to mitigate the effects of the housing provision on the environment. In addition, the statutory duties of organisations such as the Environment Agency and water companies to plan for and licence the necessary infrastructure in a sustainable way.

**Assumptions**

The housing allocations in policy CF3 were under review in the Phase 2 review of the West
### Likely Significant Effects of Revocation

Revocation of policy CF3 will not remove the need for more houses to be built within the West Midlands. Indeed, it is Government policy to boost significantly the supply of housing, for example through initiatives such as the Community Infrastructure Levy, New Homes Bonus and the local retention of business rates which are intended to encourage a more positive attitude to growth and allow communities to both share the benefits and mitigate the negative effects of growth.

Paragraph 159 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that local planning authorities should have a clear understanding of housing needs in their area. They should prepare Strategic Housing Market Assessment to assess their full housing needs, working with neighbouring authorities where housing market areas cross administrative boundaries. The Strategic Housing Market Assessment should identify the scale and mix of housing and the range of tenures that the local population is likely to need over the plan period which meets household and population projections, taking account of migration and demographic change; addresses the need for all types of housing, including affordable housing and the needs of different groups in the community (such as, but not limited to, families with children, older people, people with disabilities, service families and people wishing to build their own homes); and caters for housing demand and the scale of housing supply necessary to meet this demand.

### Uncertainty

The actual effects will depend on the location, nature and scale of development in different areas, linked to available transport infrastructure and the uptake of less polluting forms of travel.

---

**Commentary**

Midlands Regional Strategy with the intention to bring forward higher housing numbers. The review was not finished. It is assumed therefore that the retention policy CF3 would in the longer term, without further review result in insufficient homes to meet the anticipated need. This could have a negative effect on the population if this were to occur.

---

**Table:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</th>
<th>Population &amp; human Health</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air</th>
<th>Climatic factors</th>
<th>Material assets</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revocation</td>
<td>0 / ?</td>
<td>0 / ?</td>
<td>0 / ?</td>
<td>0 / ?</td>
<td>0 / ?</td>
<td>0 / ?</td>
<td>0 / ?</td>
<td>0 / ?</td>
<td>0 / ?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Paragraphs:**

1. Paragraph 159 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that local planning authorities should have a clear understanding of housing needs in their area. They should prepare Strategic Housing Market Assessment to assess their full housing needs, working with neighbouring authorities where housing market areas cross administrative boundaries. The Strategic Housing Market Assessment should identify the scale and mix of housing and the range of tenures that the local population is likely to need over the plan period which meets household and population projections, taking account of migration and demographic change; addresses the need for all types of housing, including affordable housing and the needs of different groups in the community (such as, but not limited to, families with children, older people, people with disabilities, service families and people wishing to build their own homes); and caters for housing demand and the scale of housing supply necessary to meet this demand.
Paragraphs 173-177 of the National Planning Policy Framework seek to ensure the viability and deliverability of housing which if successful will lead to a greater proportion of the houses planned for actually being built over the plan period.

Paragraph 47 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that to boost significantly the supply of housing, local planning authorities should use their evidence base to ensure that their local plan meets the full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing in the housing market area, as far as is consistent with the policies set out in the Framework, including identifying key sites which are critical to the delivery of the housing strategy over the plan period.

Adopted or emerging Core Strategies (for example The Black Country, Stoke, Rugby, Solihull and Shropshire) are using RSS housing targets, and whilst the delivery trajectory could be reduced in light of the current housing market, the net effect should be similar to the housing delivery aspirations of the West Midlands RSS.

Ultimately, the environmental effects will depend on the housing delivered across the region, their location and other factors such as their design. Much of the National Planning Policy Framework seeks to mitigate as far as possible adverse effects on the environment. Overall, therefore the effects of revocation are likely to be similar to retaining the policy CF3 but may be more uncertain over where such effects will occur as this will be dependent on specific local plan policies for housing land allocation.

**Mitigation Measures**

Measures in the National Planning Policy Framework as well as the requirement to meet legally binding standards for air and water pollution should provide at least the same level of environmental protection as is the case with the retention of policy CF3.

**Assumptions**

It is assumed that factors outside the influence of the Regional Strategy, such as the economy and demand for housing remain the same irrespective of whether policy CF3 is revoked or retained.
### Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of West Midlands Regional Strategy

#### Commentary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</th>
<th>Population &amp; human Health</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air</th>
<th>Climatic factors</th>
<th>Material assets</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Uncertainty

As above.
## CF4: The reuse of land and buildings for housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</th>
<th>Population &amp; human Health</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air</th>
<th>Climatic factors</th>
<th>Material assets</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retention</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 +</td>
<td>+ + + +</td>
<td>+ + +</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>+ + + +</td>
<td>+ + + +</td>
<td>+ + + +</td>
<td>+ + + +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/ ?</td>
<td>+ + + +</td>
<td>+ + +</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>+ + + +</td>
<td>+ + + +</td>
<td>+ + + +</td>
<td>+ + + +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy CF4 encourages local planning authorities to optimise the opportunities for recycling land and buildings for new housing development, contributing to the achievement of the West Midlands regional target of at least 76% of future housing provision being on previously developed land between 2001-2011. This is assessed as having a significant positive effect on population and human health through aiding the delivery of new housing to meet local housing needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The policy encourages regeneration, use of brownfield land, creating an attractive environment in built up areas and providing environmental benefit by avoiding development in the countryside. Accessibility, reducing travel need in particular road transport will have benefits for air quality and green house gas emissions. Reducing inequalities relating to access and transport all stem from the sustainable reuse of brownfield land and old building stock.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mitigation Measures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None Proposed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assumptions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy CF4 was designed to be in place for a specific time period of 2001-2011, this time period has now expired, so the policy has no relevance in terms of informing the local plans prepared by local planning authorities in the West Midlands.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of West Midlands Regional Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</th>
<th>Population &amp; human Health</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air</th>
<th>Climatic factors</th>
<th>Material assets</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revocation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Commentary**

Success will depend on public transport and demand management, without these, concentrating development in existing urban centres within the Major Urban Areas is likely to add to congestion, delays and pollution and obstruct economic activity, instead of achieving the opposite as intended.

**Uncertainty**

Effects of the policy of urban concentration on biodiversity and cultural heritage interests as more land is redeveloped.

#### Likely Significant Effects of Revocation

The revocation of policy CF4 will have no effect because the policy had a specific time period in which to operate which was from 2001 to 2011, which has now expired.

Further, the revocation of policy CF4 would not remove the requirement for local authorities to prepare local plans to be consistent with legal and national policy requirements on meeting obligations on carbon emissions, adopting a precautionary approach to climate change, maximising the potential for more sustainable relations and respecting environmental limits.

Revocation of the brownfield targets may affect how local planning authorities direct development and preferential use of available brownfield land.

Paragraph 51 of the National Planning Policy Framework requires local authorities to identify and bring back into residential use empty housing and buildings in line with local housing and empty homes strategies. Paragraph 110 encourages in plan making the aim of minimising pollution and other adverse effects on the local and natural environment, and the allocation of land with the least environmental or amenity value. Paragraph 112 encourages the re-use of brownfield land, and the setting of locally appropriate brownfield land use targets.

**Mitigation Measures**

None Proposed.

**Assumptions**
### Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of West Midlands Regional Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</th>
<th>Population &amp; human Health</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air</th>
<th>Climatic factors</th>
<th>Material assets</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Commentary**

None.

**Uncertainty**

Local authorities will now be required to develop their own targets for development of brownfield land. Given that this target will not be centrally monitored or specified, there is uncertainty as to whether targets for use of Brownfield land will be higher or lower than they would have been under the West Midlands Regional Strategy. As for retention, uncertainties surround the effects of the policy of urban concentration on biodiversity and cultural heritage interests as more land is redeveloped.
**CF5: Delivering affordable housing and mixed communities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</th>
<th>Population &amp; human Health</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air</th>
<th>Climatic factors</th>
<th>Material assets</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retention</td>
<td>S M L S M L S M L S M L S M L S M L S M L S M L S M L S M L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 + + + + 0 0 0 0 0 0 + 0 0 + 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Commentary**

**Likely Significant Effects of Retention**

Policy CF5 seeks to promote the development of affordable housing and the creation of mixed communities, addressing housing needs in the most sustainable way whilst taking account of local housing conditions. Consequently, it is assessed as having a significant positive effect on population and human health.

Policy CF5 also states that local plans should make adequate provision for sites to accommodate gypsies and travellers so as to meet their accommodation needs. Making adequate provision for sites to accommodate gypsies and travellers will deliver positive effects to population and human health. It could also reduce or remove adverse effects arising from illegal pitch sites.

**Mitigation Measures**

None proposed.

**Assumptions**

Policy CF5 assumes that the affordable housing levels set out in the Regional Strategy are appropriate and will continue to meet local housing need throughout the life of the West Midlands Regional Strategy.

For gypsies and travellers it is assumed that the location of pitches will be selected so as to minimise the adverse effects on the environment.
## Commentary

**Uncertainty**
None identified.

For gypsies and travellers the actual effect of policy CF5 would have depended on the location and number of pitches provided for the community through the West Midlands Regional Strategy.

**Likely significant effects of Revocation**
Revocation is assessed as having similar effects as retention.

Local plans prepared by local planning authorities will need to have regard to the National Planning Policy Framework. Revoking this policy will simplify policy for users given the local plan will no longer have regional, sub-regional and local affordable housing targets. There is therefore potential uncertainty on the level of overall affordable housing supply in the region and it is possible that a different spatial distribution of affordable housing provision across the region will occur, which will have different environmental effects in the long term once all local plans are updated.

Local authorities under paragraph 47 of the National Planning Policy Framework should use their evidence base to ensure local plans meet assessed needs for affordable housing. As set out in paragraph 173 of the National Planning Policy Framework, the provision of affordable housing in local plans depends on the financial viability and land availability within a local area to do so. This will be tested by other parties via local plan examination process. Therefore, the provision of affordable housing and setting of target is a locally led and based decision making process. Local planning authorities are also expected to work together to meet the development needs of their local area.

However, it is acknowledged that there is the possibility of a range of cumulative effects in the region, arising from individual local plan decisions. The potential effect on SEA criteria will be uncertain and range from positive or negative dependent upon the level and final
### Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of West Midlands Regional Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</th>
<th>Population &amp; human Health</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air</th>
<th>Climatic factors</th>
<th>Material assets</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S M L S M L S M L S M L S M L S M L S M L S M L S M L S M L S M L</td>
<td>Commentary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

distribution of affordable housing in and across the region which may occur.

The planning policy for travellers sites (March 2012) should provide the required provision for gypsies and travellers. It asks local authorities to use a “robust evidence base” to assess needs for the purposes of planning and managing development of traveller sites, and to set targets for traveller sites based on their needs assessment. The policy asks local authorities to bring forward a five-year supply of land for traveller sites in their plans to meet the targets they have set and to update it annually. The policy also asks local authorities to look into the longer term and also to identify a supply of specific developable sites or broad locations, where possible.

For gypsies and travellers the environmental impact of the revocation of policy CF5 would be the same as its retention.

**Mitigation**

None proposed.

**Assumptions**

Revocation of policy CF3 assumes that local planning authorities will continue to use up-to-date evidence to plan for their housing needs, and regularly review their housing needs, including the provision of affordable housing, pitches and sites for the traveller community and the promotion of mixed communities.

**Uncertainty**

None identified.
## CF6: Managing housing land provision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</th>
<th>Population &amp; Human Health</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air</th>
<th>Climatic factors</th>
<th>Material assets</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Likely Significant Effects of Retention
Policy CF6 provides amplification for policy CF4 and the delivery of these policy objectives through the preparation of local plans by the region’s local planning authorities. It broadly supports the region’s regeneration programmes, ensuring that the scale and distribution of new housing stimulate the region’s economy.

Policy CF6 can have some positive effect on population and human health, by building social and community capital to support regeneration initiatives. It will also have positive environmental effects on water and air but the impact on soil and climate factors, which should be positive, will depend on the use that is made of brownfield and derelict sites and whether the proposals increases traffic levels.

### Mitigation Measures
None proposed.

### Assumptions
This policy assumes existing regeneration and housing development strategies for the region will continue over the period of the life of the West Midlands Regional Strategy.

### Uncertainty
Uncertainties exist in relation to potential impacts on biodiversity, soils, climate and cultural heritage because of potential intensification of urban areas.
## Likely Significant Effects of Revocation

None from the revocation of policy CF6. National planning policy as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework already requires local authorities to plan for the housing needs of their communities, and that any policies are informed by a robust evidence base through a Strategic Housing Market Assessment and land availability through a Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment. Removing the phasing of local plans will give local authorities greater flexibility to deliver a wide range of housing sites to meet their housing requirements. However, in areas of low demand, local authorities will need to work with other local authorities using the Duty to Cooperate as is required under the Localism Act 2011 and paragraphs 178-181 of the National Planning Policy Framework to ensure that housing needs are met. Revocation of policy CF6 should have a neutral effect.

Adopted or emerging Core Strategies (for example The Black Country, Stoke, Rugby, Solihull and Shropshire) are using RSS housing targets, and whilst the delivery trajectory could be reduced in light of the current housing market, the net effect (and resulting environmental effects) should be similar to the housing delivery aspirations of the West Midlands RSS.

### Mitigation Measures

None proposed.

### Assumptions

As above.

### Uncertainty

Uncertainties exist in relation to potential impacts on biodiversity, soils, climate and cultural heritage because of potential intensification of urban areas.
### Prosperity for All

**PA1: Prosperity for All**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</th>
<th>Population &amp; human Health</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air</th>
<th>Climatic factors</th>
<th>Material assets</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retention</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Likely Significant Effects of Retention**

Policy PA1 is a generic policy, which sets out the policy context informing the 15 policies grouped under the heading Prosperity for All. The key objective for policy PA1 is to focus economic development and growth in the West Midlands in the region’s Major Urban Areas. Policy PA1 will bring about sustainable development within the guiding principles of the UK Sustainable Development Strategy 2005 and contributing to the creation of sustainable communities described in the supporting text to policy PA1, in doing so it sets the overarching framework for the remainder of the West Midlands Regional Strategy. The focus on increased prosperity is assessed as having a negative effect on material assets due to the increase in demand for resources and aggregates and the resulting waste arising.

The only specific requirement set out in policy PA1 is that local plans and Local Development Documents should help to meet obligations on carbon emissions and should adopt a precautionary approach to climate change by avoiding or minimising potential contributions to adverse change and incorporating measures which adapt as far as possible to unavoidable change.

**Mitigation Measures**

None proposed.
## Commentary

### Assumptions
None.

### Uncertainty
Effects on soil, water, air, climatic factors, cultural heritage and landscape will depend on the quantum, nature and location of development across the region over the life of the West Midlands Regional Strategy.

### Likely Significant Effects of Revocation
The effects of revocation are assessed as being similar to retention.

Paragraph 6 of the National Planning Policy Framework makes clear that the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. The policies in paragraphs 18 to 219 of the Framework, taken as a whole, constitute the Government’s view of what sustainable development in England means in practice for the planning system.

The revocation of this policy would not remove the requirement for local plans and Local Development Documents to be consistent with legal and national policy requirements on meeting obligations on carbon emissions, adopting a precautionary approach to climate change, maximising the potential for more sustainable relations and respecting environmental limits. There should therefore be the same effects on climatic factors as with retention of the policy.

The RSS did not set specific targets for the provision of employment land or jobs, leaving this to individual Core Strategies, although a hierarchy of types of site is specified as part of a strategic approach to economic development. The implications of the loss of this co-ordinated approach will be difficult to judge given the relatively long timeframe required to measure tangible outcomes.

It is therefore considered that revocation of policy PA1 would have no difference from retention.
## Commentary

**Mitigation Measures**

None proposed.

**Assumptions**

It is assumed that local planning authorities will operate in accordance with their statutory duties to meet air and water quality standards, to afford the appropriate level of protection to designated sites and species and that they have due regard to the policies in the National Planning Policy Framework in plan making and development management decisions.

**Uncertainty**

Effects on soil, water, air, climatic factors, cultural heritage and landscape will depend on the quantum, nature and location of development across the West Midlands region.
## PA2: Urban Regeneration Zones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</th>
<th>Population &amp; human Health</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air</th>
<th>Climatic factors</th>
<th>Material assets</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retention</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Commentary

**Likely Significant Effects of Retention**

Policy PA2 is a generic policy setting out the broad objective to deliver an urban renaissance in the West Midlands Major Urban Areas preventing the further decentralisation of the region’s population and economy away from its urban conurbations. The policy lists a number of priority areas for regeneration because of their generally weak economic performance and significant areas of deprivation, but leaves it to local authorities to set out policies in their local plans and relevant non-statutory plans and strategies to tackle the problems of economic, social and environmental deprivation in these areas and their potential for regeneration so as to support the urban renaissance in the region. This is assessed as having positive effects on population and climatic factors because of the potential for an uplift in economic activity and the incorporation of renewable technologies (such as Combined Heat and Power Schemes or District Heating Networks) into new development.

**Mitigation Measures**

None proposed.

**Assumptions**

None.

**Uncertainty**

The outcome of policy PA2 is dependent on the decisions of individual local authorities.
### Likely Significant Effects of Revocation

Paragraph 21 of the National Planning Policy Framework makes clear that in drawing up local plans, local planning authorities should identify areas for economic regeneration, infrastructure provision and environmental enhancement. Local authorities will need to work together under the Duty to Cooperate to identify and prioritise investment and development in the most deprived areas. Overall, the effects of revocation are likely to be similar to retaining the West Midlands Regional Strategy but in terms of specific location are likely to be uncertain.

#### Mitigation Measures

None proposed.

#### Assumptions

None.

#### Uncertainty

The outcome of policy PA2 is dependent on the decisions of individual local authorities responding to a wide range of factors, some outside the control of the spatial planning system, such as the general economic climate and the availability of European and national funding of regeneration programmes. Specific uncertainties cannot be attributed to individual topics.
PA3: High-Technology Corridors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</th>
<th>Population &amp; human Health</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air</th>
<th>Climatic factors</th>
<th>Material assets</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retention</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Commentary**

**Likely Significant Effects of Retention**

Policy PA3 encourages the diversification of the West Midlands economy by promoting the region’s high technology sector of its economy, centred on three corridors capable of providing the type of environment which high technology industries would wish to locate in. Policy PA3 also supports policy PA4 because the high technology sector is dependent upon establishing close working relationships with the region’s higher education sector. The promotion of high technology industries will encourage employment growth, which will benefit the population if higher levels of employment were secured in the region. Depending on the location of employment related to the high technology development, relative to the homes of the workforce and decisions taken on the mode of travel to work there could be either positive or negative effects on transport and hence air quality depending on effects on private car miles travelled and congestion generated.

**Mitigation Measures**

None proposed.

**Assumptions**

None.

**Uncertainty**

Depending on the location of employment related development, relative to the homes of the workforce and decisions taken on the mode of travel to work there could be either positive or
## Likely Significant Effects of Revocation

The RSS did not set specific targets for the provision of employment land or jobs, leaving this to individual Core Strategies, although a hierarchy of types of site is specified as part of a strategic approach to economic development. The implications of the loss of this co-ordinated approach will be difficult to judge given the relatively long timeframe required to measure tangible outcomes. In addition, the LEPs are at an early stage of development in the region and it is unclear whether they would wish to develop similar initiatives. Consequently, the effects on the population, in economic terms, are judged to be uncertain.

Key planning principles set out in paragraph 17 of the National Planning Policy Framework include that planning should proactively drive and support sustainable economic development to deliver the homes, business and industrial units, infrastructure and thriving local places that the country needs. Every effort should be made objectively to identify and then meet the housing, business and other development needs of an area, and respond positively to wider opportunities for growth. Paragraphs 18-22 of the framework deal with building a strong, competitive economy. In particular, paragraph 21 states that in drawing up local plans, local planning authorities should:

- set out a clear economic vision and strategy for their area which positively and proactively encourages sustainable economic growth;
- set criteria, or identify strategic sites, for local and inward investment to match the strategy and to meet anticipated needs over the plan period;
- support existing business sectors, taking account of whether they are expanding or contracting and, where possible, identify and plan for new or emerging sectors likely to locate in their area. Policies should be flexible enough to accommodate needs not

### Commentary

negative effects on transport and hence air quality depending on effects of private car miles travelled and congestion.

The effects will also be very dependent on the economy and the ability to attract high technology businesses to the region’s identified three high technology corridors.
Paragraph 158 of the National Planning Policy Framework seeks to ensure that local plans are based on adequate, up-to-date and relevant evidence about the economic, social and environmental characteristics and prospects of the area. Local planning authorities should ensure that their assessment of and strategies for housing, employment and other uses are integrated, and that they take full account of relevant market and economic signals.

Paragraph 37 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that planning policies should aim for a balance of land uses within their area so that people can be encouraged to minimise journey lengths for employment, shopping, leisure, education and other activities, which would all support the development of high technology corridors in the West Midlands, if local authorities wish to pursue this policy.

Mitigation Measures
None proposed.

Assumptions
None.

Uncertainty
Depending on the location of employment related development, relative to the homes of the workforce and decisions taken on the mode of travel to work there could be either positive or

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</th>
<th>Population &amp; human Health</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air</th>
<th>Climatic factors</th>
<th>Material assets</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Biodiversity, flora and fauna | Population & human Health | Soil | Water | Air | Climatic factors | Material assets | Cultural Heritage | Landscape | Commentary
---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---
S | M | L | S | M | L | S | M | L | S | M | L | S | M | L | S | M | L | S | M | L | S | M | L | S | M | L | S | M | L

negative effects on transport and hence air quality depending on effects on private car miles travelled and congestion. For the population topic, the effects will also be dependent on the strategies of the LEPs and the ability to attract high technology businesses to the region.
### PA4: Development related to Higher/Further Education and Research Establishment and incubator units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</th>
<th>Population &amp; Human Health</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air</th>
<th>Climatic factors</th>
<th>Material assets</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retention</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>+ + +</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Likely Significant Effects of Retention**

Policy PA4 is related to policy PA3. The objective of policy PA4 is that local planning authorities through the preparation of their local plans should seek to accommodate the growth higher/further education institutions and their related infrastructure such as research institutes and incubator units for example for high technology start up businesses. This policy will support regeneration, use of brownfield and degraded land, supporting local services, businesses and generating employment opportunities (and is assessed as having positive effects on the population accordingly). The development of higher/further education campuses can also help to create an attractive environment in built up areas. Accessibility, reducing travel need in particular road transport with benefits for air quality. Due to the location of higher/further education institutions in the region’s Major Urban Areas, the policy could also contribute to reducing inequalities relating to access and transport.

**Mitigation Measures**

None proposed

**Assumptions**

The effects will depend on public transport and demand management: without these, concentrating development in existing centres which host higher/further education campuses and their associated infrastructure, but if not properly planned through collaborative working between local authorities and relevant agencies could add to congestion, delays and pollution and obstruct economic activity, instead of achieving the opposite as intended.
**Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of West Midlands Regional Strategy**

### Likely Significant Effects of Revocation

The revocation of Policy PA4 will have no negative environmental impacts.

The objective of policy PA4 is that local planning authorities through the preparation of their local plans should seek to accommodate the growth higher/further education institutions and their related infrastructure such as research institutes and incubator units for example for high technology start up businesses. This policy will support regeneration, use of brownfield and degraded land, supporting local services, businesses and generating employment opportunities. The development of higher/further education campuses can also help to create an attractive environment in built up areas. The NPPF (paragraph 21) clearly sets out that local planning authorities should “plan positively for the location, promotion and expansion of clusters or networks of knowledge driven, creative or high technology industries” as part of broader economic development and the encouragement of inward investment to support regeneration.

### Mitigation Measures

None proposed

### Assumptions

The effects will depend on public transport and demand management: without these, concentrating development in existing centres which host higher/further education campuses and their associated infrastructure, but if not properly planned through collaborative working between local authorities and relevant agencies could to add to congestion, delays and pollution and obstruct economic activity, instead of achieving the opposite as intended. However these issues can be addressed by local planning authorities and relevant agencies in the West Midlands through working together in line with the expectations on joint cross boundary planning set out by the Duty to Co-operate.
### Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of West Midlands Regional Strategy

#### Biodiversity, flora and fauna

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</th>
<th>Population &amp; human Health</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air</th>
<th>Climatic factors</th>
<th>Material assets</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Uncertainty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None identified.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Policy PA5 encourages local planning authorities to identify employment areas which have a key role to play in promoting the region’s economy, but in need of modernisation and renewal so that they can achieve their full potential. The policy lists a number of actions to be taken so that these sites can contribute to the regeneration of the wider West Midlands region by turning around their generally weak economic performance and significant areas of deprivation where these employment sites are often located, but leaves it to local planning authorities to set out policies in their local plans and relevant non-statutory plans to tackle the problems of economic, social and environmental deprivation in these areas and exploit the full potential of employment areas in the West Midlands region.

**Mitigation Measures**
None identified.

**Assumptions**
It is assumed that local planning authorities will operate in accordance with their statutory duties to promote the regeneration of employment areas in their localities through the preparation of their local plans.

**Uncertainty**
The outcome of policy PA5 is dependent on the decisions of individual local authorities responding to a wide range of factors, some outside the control of the West Midlands region.
## Likely Significant Effects of Revocation

Paragraph 21 of the National Planning Policy Framework makes clear that in drawing up local plans, local planning authorities should identify areas for economic regeneration, infrastructure provision and environmental enhancement. Local authorities will need to work together under the Duty to Cooperate to identify and prioritise investment and development in areas such as employment areas in need of modernisation and renewal. Overall, the effects of revocation of policy PA5 are likely to be similar to retaining the West Midlands Regional Strategy.

### Mitigation Measures

None proposed.

### Assumptions

It is assumed that local planning authorities will operate in accordance with their statutory duties to promote the regeneration of employment areas in their localities through the preparation of their local plans.

### Uncertainty

The outcome of policy PA5 is dependent on the decisions of individual local authorities responding to a wide range of factors, some outside the control of the spatial planning system, such as the general economic climate in the West Midlands and nationally.
### PA6: Portfolio of Employment Land

#### Commentary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</th>
<th>Population &amp; human Health</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air</th>
<th>Climatic factors</th>
<th>Material assets</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lykely Significant Effects of Retention</td>
<td>Policy PA6 encourages local planning authorities in liaison with other relevant agencies to identify the provision of a range and choice of readily available employment sites necessary to support the region’s economic development and growth. Identifying sub-areas where employment land is needed to support growth and achieve a closer relationship between jobs and homes could deliver many benefits, such as minimising commuting, promoting more sustainable communities and maximising the use of public transport. However, this will be greatly influenced by economic factors outside the influence of the West Midlands regional strategy and through behavioural change.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Measures</td>
<td>None proposed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumptions</td>
<td>It is assumed that local planning authorities will operate in accordance with their statutory duties to promote the regeneration strategies and the provision of adequate employment land in their localities through the preparation of their local plans to support the vitality of the region’s economy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertainty</td>
<td>The outcome of this policy is dependent on the decisions of individual local authorities responding to a wide range of factors, some outside the control of the West Midlands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Likely Significant Effects of Revocation

The National Planning Policy Framework has clear policies on promoting sustainable growth across all sectors of the economy, integral to economic growth and employment generation is the provision of sufficient amounts of employment land. Paragraphs 18-22 of the framework, sets out the need to plan proactively to meet the development needs of business. This combined with the Duty to Cooperate provides the policy framework to deliver similar outcomes to policy PA6. In addition the National Planning Policy Framework makes clear that local planning authorities should ensure that their assessment of and strategies for housing, employment and other uses are integrated, and that they take full account of relevant market and economic signals.

The RSS did not set specific targets for the provision of employment land or jobs, leaving this to individual Core Strategies, although a hierarchy of types of site is specified as part of a strategic approach to economic development. The implications of the loss of this co-ordinated approach will be difficult to judge given the relatively long timeframe required to measure tangible outcomes.

Overall, the effects of revocation are likely to be similar to retaining the West Midlands Regional Strategy.

### Mitigation Measures

None proposed.

### Assumptions

It is assumed that local planning authorities will operate in accordance with their statutory duties to promote the regeneration strategies and the provision of adequate employment land in their localities through the preparation of their local plans to support the vitality of the Regional Strategy, such as the general economic climate, the development of particular business sectors and the travel patterns between new and existing housing and new economic development opportunities centred around particular employment nodes.
### Commentary

Regional landscape.

**Uncertainty**

The outcome of this policy is dependent on the decisions of individual local authorities responding to a wide range of factors, some outside the control of spatial planning, such as the general economic climate, the development of particular business sectors and the travel patterns between new and existing housing and new economic development opportunities centred around particular employment nodes.
### PA7: Regional Investment Sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</th>
<th>Population &amp; Human Health</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air</th>
<th>Climatic factors</th>
<th>Material assets</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retention</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>+ +</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Commentary**

**Likely Significant Effects of Retention**

Policy PA7 encourages local planning authorities in liaison with other relevant agencies to identify key regional investment sites from the range of employment sites already existing in the region, but which have the potential to support the region’s economic development and growth. Identifying sub-areas where regional investment sites are needed to support growth and achieve a closer relationship between jobs and homes could deliver many benefits, such as minimising commuting, promoting more sustainable communities and maximising the use of public transport. However, this will be greatly influenced by economic factors outside the influence of the West Midlands regional strategy and through behavioural change.

**Mitigation Measures**

None proposed.

**Assumptions**

It is assumed that local planning authorities will operate in accordance with their statutory duties to promote the regeneration strategies and the identification of regional investment sites in their localities through the preparation of their local plans to support the vitality of the region’s economy.

**Uncertainty**

The outcome of this policy is dependent on the decisions of individual local authorities.
responding to a wide range of factors, some outside the control of the West Midlands Regional Strategy, such as the general economic climate, the development of particular business sectors and the travel patterns between new and existing housing and new economic development opportunities centred around particular employment nodes, including regional investment sites.

Likely Significant Effects of Revocation

The National Planning Policy Framework has clear policies on promoting sustainable growth across all sectors of the economy, integral to economic growth and employment generation is the provision of sufficient amounts of employment land, designated as regional investment sites or not. Paragraphs 18-22 of the framework, sets out the need to plan proactively to meet the development needs of business. This combined with the Duty to Cooperate provides the policy framework to deliver similar outcomes to policy PA7. In addition the National Planning Policy Framework makes clear that local planning authorities should ensure that their assessment of and strategies for housing, employment and other uses are integrated, and that they take full account of relevant market and economic signals.

The RSS did not set specific targets for the provision of employment land or jobs, leaving this to individual Core Strategies, although a hierarchy of types of site is specified as part of a strategic approach to economic development. The implications of the loss of this co-ordinated approach are difficult to judge given the relatively long timeframe required to measure tangible outcomes. Consequently, there could be longer-term uncertainty in respect of economic growth.

Mitigation Measures

None proposed.

Assumptions

It is assumed that local planning authorities will operate in accordance with their statutory duties to promote the regeneration strategies and the provision of an adequate number of regional investment sites in their localities through the preparation of their local plans to...
Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of West Midlands Regional Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</th>
<th>Population &amp; human Health</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air</th>
<th>Climatic factors</th>
<th>Material assets</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Commentary

support the vitality of the region’s economy.

**Uncertainty**

The outcome of this policy is dependent on the decisions of individual local authorities responding to a wide range of factors, some outside the control of spatial planning, such as the general economic climate, the development of particular business sectors and the travel patterns between new and existing housing and new economic development opportunities centred around particular employment nodes, including the regional investment sites.
### PA8: Major Investment Sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</th>
<th>Population &amp; human Health</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air</th>
<th>Climatic factors</th>
<th>Material assets</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retention</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Likely Significant Effects of Retention**

Policy PA8 encourages local planning authorities in liaison with other relevant agencies to identify two major investment sites in the region, capable of accommodating large-scale investment by a single user with an international choice location, but which have the potential to support the region’s economic development and growth. Identifying broad locations where major investment sites can be sited and are needed to support growth and achieve a closer relationship between jobs and homes could deliver many benefits, such as minimising commuting, promoting more sustainable communities and maximising the use of public transport. However, this will be greatly influenced by economic factors outside the influence of the West Midlands regional strategy and through behavioural change.

**Mitigation Measures**

None proposed.

**Assumptions**

It is assumed that local planning authorities will operate in accordance with their statutory duties to promote the regeneration strategies and the identification of major investment sites in their localities through the preparation of their local plans to support the vitality of the region’s economy.

**Uncertainty**

The outcome of this policy is dependent on the decisions of individual local authorities.
responding to a wide range of factors, some outside the control of the West Midlands Regional Strategy, such as the general economic climate, the development of particular business sectors and the travel patterns between new and existing housing and new economic development opportunities centred around particular employment nodes, including major investment sites.

**Likely Significant Effects of Revocation**

The National Planning Policy Framework has clear policies on promoting sustainable growth across all sectors of the economy, integral to economic growth and employment generation is the provision of sufficient amounts of employment land, designated as major investment sites or not. Paragraphs 18-22 of the framework, sets out the need to plan proactively to meet the development needs of business. This combined with the Duty to Cooperate provides the policy framework to deliver similar outcomes to policy PA8. In addition the National Planning Policy Framework makes clear that local planning authorities should ensure that their assessment of and strategies for housing, employment and other uses are integrated, and that they take full account of relevant market and economic signals.

The RSS did not set specific targets for the provision of employment land or jobs, leaving this to individual Core Strategies, although a hierarchy of types of site is specified as part of a strategic approach to economic development. The implications of the loss of this co-ordinated approach will be difficult to judge given the relatively long timeframe required to measure tangible outcomes.

Overall, the effects of revocation are uncertain on population in the long term (although likely to be positive), but although lessened in the short and medium term are likely to be similar to retaining the West Midlands Regional Strategy.

**Mitigation Measures**

None proposed.

**Assumptions**
### Commentary

It is assumed that local planning authorities will operate in accordance with their statutory duties to promote the regeneration strategies and the provision of an adequate number of major investment sites in their localities through the preparation of their local plans to support the vitality of the region’s economy.

**Uncertainty**

The outcome of this policy is dependent on the decisions of individual local authorities responding to a wide range of factors, some outside the control of spatial planning, such as the general economic climate, the development of particular business sectors and the travel patterns between new and existing housing and new economic development opportunities centred around particular employment nodes, including the major investment sites.
PA9: Regional Logistic Sites

Likely Significant Effects of Retention
Policy PA9 sets out criteria to be considered when planning for strategic regional logistic sites and lists the character and features which regional logistic sites should have to be considered for development by local planning authorities. Policy PA9 attempts to direct development of regional logistics sites to areas that have good access to labour, good connectivity and that are appropriate for the type of development. However, the West Midlands Regional Strategy does not allocate specific sites against which an assessment can be made. As with other forms of economic development, the impacts are likely to be positive for population and health and negative for the environment due to potential greenfield land take and transport impacts.

Mitigation Measures
None proposed.

Assumptions
It is assumed that local authorities will work together making use of the Duty to Cooperate to plan the development of regional logistic sites and related infrastructure as required across the West Midlands region.

Uncertainty
The outcome of this policy is dependent on the decisions of individual local authorities responding to a wide range of factors, some outside the control of the West Midlands.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</th>
<th>Population &amp; human Health</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air</th>
<th>Climatic factors</th>
<th>Material assets</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revocation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Commentary**

Regional Strategy, such as the general economic climate, the location of potential new regional logistics sites and the pattern of new economic development in the region which may not be so reliant upon distribution logistics.

**Likely Significant Effects of Revocation**

The revocation of Policy PA9 will have similar effects as retention.

Paragraphs 18-22 Building a strong, competitive economy and paragraphs 29-41 Promoting sustainable transport in the National Planning Policy Framework provide the national policy context in which to bring forward the development of regional logistical sites in the West Midlands. However it is acknowledged that economic development impacts are likely to be positive for population and health and negative for the environment due to potential greenfield land take and transport impacts.

The RSS did not set specific targets for the provision of employment land or jobs, leaving this to individual Core Strategies, although a hierarchy of types of site is specified as part of a strategic approach to economic development. The implications of the loss of this co-ordinated approach will be difficult to judge given the relatively long timeframe required to measure tangible outcomes.

**Mitigation Measures**

None proposed.

**Assumptions**

It is assumed that local authorities will work together making use of the Duty to Cooperate to plan the development of regional logistic sites and related infrastructure as required across the West Midlands region.

**Uncertainty**

The outcome of this policy is dependent on the decisions of individual local authorities responding to a wide range of factors, some outside the control of the West Midlands.
### Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of West Midlands Regional Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</th>
<th>Population &amp; Human Health</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air</th>
<th>Climatic factors</th>
<th>Material Assets</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Commentary**

Regional Strategy, such as the general economic climate, the location of potential new regional logistics sites and the pattern of new economic development in the region which may not be so reliant upon distribution logistics.
PA10: Tourism and Culture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</th>
<th>Population &amp; human Health</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air</th>
<th>Climatic factors</th>
<th>Material assets</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retention</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commentary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy PA10 encourages local planning authorities when preparing their local plans to encourage the West Midlands cultural offer and as a tourist destination, by for example providing new facilities such as tourist accommodation, visitors centres, safeguarding and promoting the region’s historic, cultural and natural assets which would attract visitors. Job creation, rural regeneration and diversification and promotion of the regional image could be beneficial to the population and human health in the long term. However, increased visitor numbers are likely to have negative environmental impacts, such as on air quality associated with greater air travel, for example. Revenue generated through tourism could assist with the upkeep of some heritage assets.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mitigation Measures
None proposed.

Assumptions
None.

Uncertainty
The actual effects will depend on the amount and nature of tourism attracted to the West Midlands region and the distribution of tourists and the tourist industry infrastructure within the region, particularly in relation to effects on biodiversity, air and landscape.
### Likely Significant Effects of Revocation

The National Planning Policy Framework strongly supports sustainable economic growth across all sectors, which would include the tourism sector as set out in paragraphs 18-21 of the framework and it also contains specific policies on tourism, linked to the vitality of town centres paragraph 23 and supporting a prosperous rural economy paragraph 28 of the framework. National Planning Policy Framework policies protecting the historic environment are set out in paragraphs 126-141, provide strong protection for local features and assets.

It is recognised that increasing visitor numbers can have negative environmental effects, paragraph 28 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that local and neighbourhood plans should support sustainable rural tourism developments that benefit businesses in rural areas, communities and visitors, and which respect the character of the countryside.

### Mitigation Measures

None proposed.

### Assumptions

None.

### Uncertainty

The effects of an increase in tourism will depend upon the amount and nature of tourism attracted to the West Midlands region and the distribution of tourists and the tourist industry infrastructure within the region, particularly in relation to effects on biodiversity, air and landscape.
## PA11: The Network of Town and City Centres

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</th>
<th>Population &amp; human Health</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air</th>
<th>Climatic factors</th>
<th>Material assets</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retention</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Commentary

**Likely Significant Effects of Retention**

Policy PA11 states that city, town and district centres and in particular those centres identified in the network of town and city centres, should be enhanced to play a leading role in urban renaissance programmes in order to provide services for local communities, a sense of identity and as drivers of economic growth.

Policy PA11 identifies the key role of towns and cities in the West Midlands, the role they will play to host new development, where this development should be concentrated and delivered focusing on the 25 towns and cities identified in policy PA11 of the West Midlands Regional Strategy. The principles aims and types of development to be located in these 25 towns and cities are set out in policy PA11. A strategy to concentrate growth and development in the identified 25 towns and cities forming the region’s settlement hierarchy, could help to positively address the environmental pressures stemming from development in the region through efficient use of land and urban greening initiatives, for example. As a consequence, positive effects on biodiversity, population, soil and air have been identified.

**Mitigation Measures**

None proposed.

**Assumptions**

That a coordinated approach to planning is taken to promote high standards of development in and adjacent to the identified 25 town and city centres identified in policy PA11 related to the implementation of policy UR3 through the preparation of local plans and Development...
### Commentary

Plan Documents by local authorities, informed by working with their neighbouring local authorities through the Duty to Cooperate.

**Uncertainty**

In relation to climate, material assets and cultural heritage there are uncertainties as to precisely how this policy might have an effect on the concentration of development in urban areas.

**Likely Significant Effects of Revocation**

The effects of revocation are similar to that of retention.

The policy provides the basis for the distribution of new development, including concentration in the 25 town and city centres identified in policy PA11. Revocation of the West Midlands Regional Strategy will mean that it will be for local planning authorities to determine the priorities and location for growth and regeneration, working with other local authorities, business partners and their communities in their town and city centres. The Localism Act places a Duty to Cooperate on local authorities and the National Planning Policy Framework sets out clear policy on the Duty to Cooperate at paragraphs 178-181. In addition the National Planning Policy Framework sets out that local plans will be examined by an independent inspector whose role is to (amongst other things) assess whether the plan has been prepared in accordance with the Duty to Cooperate. Any significant environmental effects of the proposed distribution of new development in the region’s town, city and district centres should be identified and addressed through sustainability appraisal and strategic environmental assessment of local authorities local plans.

Given the legislative and policy framework in place, removing this policy PA11 is unlikely to have a negative effect in the medium to long term. However, in the short term while local plans are at different stages of development and do not all reflect the spatial distribution of policy PA11 and policy UR3, and given that achieving the right spatial distribution involves challenging cooperative working with a wide range of partners, there is a risk of negative
### Mitigation Measures

None proposed.

### Assumptions

As above.
### Commentary

**Uncertainty**

As with retention, there are uncertainties associated with the climatic factors, material assets and cultural heritage related to how local policies are implemented which seek to achieve similar aims of urban concentration.
### PA11A: Brierley Hill and Dudley

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</th>
<th>Population &amp; human Health</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air</th>
<th>Climatic factors</th>
<th>Material assets</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retention</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Likely Significant Effects of Retention**

Policy PA11A designates a new strategic town centre at Brierley Hill; to include Brierley Hill High Street, the commercial centre at the Waterfront and Merry Hill shopping centre. The new town centre will play an important role in the regeneration of the Black Country and will develop as part of a balanced network of the four strategic town and city centres in the sub region.

The development and definition of the new town centre will be through an Area Action Plan. Dudley will continue to perform an important role as a non-strategic town centre in the Black Country.

**Mitigation Measures**

None proposed.

**Assumptions**

That the Black Country Joint Core Strategy prepared by the four Black Country local planning authorities (Dudley, Sandwell, Walsall, Wolverhampton) is in place and that Dudley Metropolitan Borough Council have a up to date Area Action Plan for Brierley Hill town centre also in place.

**Uncertainty**

None identified
**Likely Significant Effects of Revocation**

The revocation of policy PA11A will have no negative impacts. This is because the Black Country Joint Core Strategy prepared by the four Black Country local planning authorities (Dudley, Sandwell, Walsall, Wolverhampton) was adopted in February 2011. Further Dudley Metropolitan Borough Council adopted an Area Action Plan for Brierley Hill town centre on 5 August 2011, including the Merry Hill, Brierley Hill High Street and the Waterfront. The Brierley Hill Area Action Plan forms part of Dudley’s statutory planning framework, and is the starting point for making decisions on planning applications in the area.

The Brierley Hill Area Action Plan was prepared within the regional planning policy framework set out in the West Midlands Regional Strategy. This has ensured that the sub-regional high level strategic planning approach to the designation of Brierley Hill as a town centre means its role as a town centre will contribute to the regeneration of the Black Country which has effectively been coordinated by the four Black Country local planning authorities through their joint core strategy.

Given the existence of the Brierley Hill Area Action Plan the environmental effects of revocation would be the same as retention.

**Mitigation Measures**

None proposed.

**Assumptions**

As above.

**Uncertainty**

None identified.
## PA12: Birmingham’s Role as a World City

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</th>
<th>Population &amp; human Health</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air</th>
<th>Climatic factors</th>
<th>Material assets</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retention</td>
<td>S S S</td>
<td>M M L</td>
<td>L M L</td>
<td>M M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>M M L</td>
<td>M M L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Commentary

#### Likely Significant Effects of Retention

Policy PA12 identifies Birmingham’s role beyond the West Midlands as a regional capital of European and international standing and that this role has to be supported by the provision of new infrastructure (including housing provision) and the various economic and social functions and associated environmental assets required to support Birmingham as a city of international standing.

Policy PA12 addresses the provision of housing, employment, services, for example retail and cultural facilities in Birmingham. This provides the greatest scope to re-use brownfield and degraded land and buildings; best utilise existing infrastructure and investment; reduce the need to travel whilst maximising accessibility and use of public transport; reducing social exclusion; and reducing greenhouse gas emissions. Consequently retention of this policy will have positive environmental effects relating to population, air, climate and cultural heritage, particularly over the longer term.

#### Mitigation Measures

None proposed.

#### Assumptions

Implementation will be delivered through close cooperation between local planning authorities in the West Midlands within the context of the West Midlands Regional Strategy.

#### Uncertainty
### Likely Significant Effects of Revocation

Revocation of policy PA12 will still mean that local authorities will need to comply with legal requirements and have regard to national policy. The National Planning Policy Framework sets out key Government objectives covering a range of topics including the delivery of strategic priorities, housing, employment, transport, and provision of local services. Furthermore local authorities are required to work together, under the Duty to Cooperate, to ensure that strategic policies are properly coordinated and reflected in local plans. Revocation of this policy is likely to have similar effects as retention with potential positive effects on population, air, climatic factors and cultural heritage. In the longer term there may be wider environmental effects if individual local authorities reverse the pattern of dispersal of development envisaged in policy PA12.

### Mitigation Measures

None proposed.

### Assumptions

Local authorities will meet their statutory and policy requirements, including those on air quality, climate change and biodiversity.

### Uncertainty

Effects will depend heavily on actions of local authorities, who will have the freedom to set their own local priorities within the context of national policy set out in the National Planning Policy Framework, but will still have to work with other local planning authorities in the area of the Birmingham conurbation through the Duty to Co-operate.
## PA13: Out-of-Centre Retail Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</th>
<th>Population &amp; human Health</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air</th>
<th>Climatic factors</th>
<th>Material assets</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retention</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Likely Significant Effects of Retention
Policy PA13 states that there is no need for the development of further large-scale out-of-town retail developments or extensions in the West Midlands, further that existing developments of this nature should not be redefined as town centres. Policy PA13 reflects current national policy set out in the National Planning Policy Framework, for the protection of town centres. The outcome of the policy would have been positive, as directing development to town centres would reduce greenfield land take, reduce travel, and have positive effects on population.

### Mitigation Measures
None proposed.

### Assumptions
None.

### Uncertainty
The outcome of the policy PA13 would depend on the economic climate and opportunities for development both within and outside town centres in the West Midlands.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revocation</th>
<th>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</th>
<th>Population &amp; human Health</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air</th>
<th>Climatic factors</th>
<th>Material assets</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Likely Significant Effects of Revocation
The National Planning Policy Framework includes clear policy at paragraphs 23-27 that replaces the town centre first policy in the now replaced PPS4 and provides the same level of
## Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of West Midlands Regional Strategy

### Alternative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</th>
<th>Population &amp; human Health</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air</th>
<th>Climatic factors</th>
<th>Material assets</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Commentary

Commentary

Protection. However, there could be more pressure for out-of-town development although it is likely that the outcome of revocation of policy PA13 will have no overall negative environmental effects and be similar to retention.

**Mitigation Measures**

None proposed.

**Assumptions**

None.

**Uncertainty**

The outcome of the policy PA13 would depend on the economic climate and opportunities for development both within and outside town centres in the West Midlands.
PA14: Economic Development and the Rural Economy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</th>
<th>Population &amp; Human Health</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air</th>
<th>Climatic factors</th>
<th>Material assets</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retention</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Commentary**

**Likely Significant Effects of Retention**
Policy PA14 seeks to diversify the rural economy in the West Midlands particular diversification of the region’s market towns and major settlements which provide services for their rural hinterland. PA14 also informs the farm diversification objectives set out in policy PA15. The policy supports rural diversification and development of the rural economy, and identifies broad rural areas to which particular attention should be given. Consequently, there are likely to be positive effects on population through greater employment opportunities. However, there are uncertainties as to the effects on biodiversity and landscape in these environments where new development could be required.

**Mitigation Measures**
None proposed.

**Assumptions**
None.

**Uncertainty**
The outcome of this policy is dependent on the decisions made by individual local authorities responding to a wide range of factors, some outside the control of the West Midlands Regional Strategy, such as the general economic climate and the opportunities for rural diversification in the areas highlighted for example Market Towns, major settlements and their rural hinterlands. Resources such as biodiversity and landscape could be
### Likely Significant Effects of Revocation

The revocation of policy PA14 will have a neutral impact on the environment. The National Planning Policy Framework contains strong policy supporting economic growth and diversification in rural areas as set out in paragraph 28. It says that local and neighbourhood plans should support the sustainable growth and expansion of all types of business and enterprise in rural areas, and promote the development and diversification of agricultural and other land-based rural businesses. It does not contain a list of rural areas requiring particular attention, beyond identifying Market Towns and major settlements as appropriate broad locations for economic development. However, local authorities will need to work together under the Duty to Cooperate to ascertain which areas need particular support. Given that the West Midlands Regional Strategy does not identify specific sites, and it is not possible to predict where development will be directed in the region’s local plans the outcome is uncertain, although we would expect effects to be broadly similar to retention.

#### Mitigation Measures

None proposed.

#### Assumptions

None.

#### Uncertainty

The outcome of this policy is dependent on the decisions of individual local authorities responding to a wide range of factors, some outside the control of the spatial planning system, such as the general economic climate and the opportunities for diversification in the areas highlighted such as Market Towns and major settlements as opposed to other areas.
### PA15: Agricultural and Farm Diversification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</th>
<th>Population &amp; human Health</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air</th>
<th>Climatic factors</th>
<th>Material assets</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retention</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revocation</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Likely Significant Effects of Retention**
Policy PA15 seeks to diversify and strengthen the region’s rural economy in a sustainable manner, by encouraging farm diversification so as to promote the sustainable development of the rural economy and agricultural development in the countryside, hence employment opportunities. Policy PA15 is likely to deliver longer term positive biodiversity and landscape benefits, and will also support the implementation of Policy QE8, with one element of farm diversification will be to encourage farmers to give over more of their land to woodlands and associated forestry industries.

**Mitigation Measures**
None proposed.

**Assumptions**
None.

**Uncertainty**
None identified.
### Commentary

Need to drive and support sustainable economic development. This is supplemented by a range of policies which impact on the ability to promote rural development, including paragraph 28 on supporting a prosperous rural economy in the framework. Revocation of policy PA15 is therefore thought to be the same as retention as the planning policy objectives set out in policy PA15 are covered by national policies in the National Planning Policy Framework as illustrated.

**Mitigation Measures**

None proposed.

**Assumptions**

None.

**Uncertainty**

None identified.
### Quality of the Environment

#### QE1: Conserving and Enhancing the Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</th>
<th>Population &amp; human Health</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air</th>
<th>Climatic factors</th>
<th>Material assets</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retention</td>
<td>S M L S M L S M L S M L S M L S M L S M L S M L S M L S M L S M L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Commentary

**Likely Significant Effects of Retention**

Policy QE1 is the West Midlands Regional Strategy’s overarching environmental quality policy, and states that environmental improvement is a key component of the Regional Strategy which underpins its overall approach improving the quality of life and supporting wider economic and social objectives. It is assessed as having positive effects on nearly all SEA topics, with significantly positive effects recorded for biodiversity, population and landscape.

Policy QE1 also provides the policy context for environmental policies in the Regional Strategy such as QE3, QE9, EN1, EN2 and M3. One of its objectives is to enhance the environmental quality of the region’s urban areas. Improving and conserving the region’s environment will result in the expansion of wildlife habitats and will positively affect biodiversity, helping to restore range of species and populations within the West Midlands region.

**Mitigation Measures**

None proposed.

**Assumptions**

None.
### Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of West Midlands Regional Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</th>
<th>Population &amp; human Health</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air</th>
<th>Climatic factors</th>
<th>Material assets</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revocation</td>
<td>S M L S M L S M L S M L S M L S M L S M L S M L S M L S M L S M L S M L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Commentary

**Uncertainty**

None.

**Likely Significant Effects of Revocation**

The effects of revocation will be similar to retention due to the existence of national planning policy expressed through the National Planning Policy Framework and existing statutory requirements.

The legal requirement for local planning authorities to ensure that internationally and nationally designated sites are given the strongest level of protection and that development does not have adverse effects on the integrity of sites of European or international importance for nature conservation would be unchanged by revocation of policy QE1.

The National Planning Policy Framework contains policies relating to planning positively for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure, and planning for minimising the impacts of development on biodiversity and geodiversity. The magnitude of any enhancement will depend on local circumstances and decisions, meaning that there could be uncertainty over the extent to which significant biodiversity enhancement, for example, could be delivered at a meaningful (i.e. landscape) scale over the longer term.

**Mitigation Measures**

None proposed.

**Assumptions**

It is assumed that nature partnerships continue in the absence of the regional plan.

**Uncertainty**

The extent of joint authority initiatives which might deliver region-wide change over the longer term, particularly in relation to biodiversity, population and human health and landscape.
**QE2: Restoring degraded areas and managing and creating high quality new environments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</th>
<th>Population &amp; human Health</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air</th>
<th>Climatic factors</th>
<th>Material assets</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention</td>
<td>0 + +</td>
<td>0 + + + + + + + + + + + + + + 0</td>
<td>0 0 + + + + 0 + + + +</td>
<td>+ +</td>
<td>+ +</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revocation</td>
<td>0 + +</td>
<td>0 + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + 0</td>
<td>0 0 + + + + 0 + + + +</td>
<td>+ +</td>
<td>+ +</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Commentary**

**Likely Significant Effects of Retention**
Policy QE2 is a generic and aspirational policy which encourages local authorities, agencies and local communities to work together to develop strategies to restore degraded land and promote a good quality built and natural environment. It makes provision for schemes for remediating contaminated and degraded land and to adopt more sustainable technologies than at present, improving the overall effectiveness of remediation and reducing carbon impacts. This results in benefits to population and human health and climatic factors over the medium to long term.

**Mitigation Measures**
None proposed.

**Assumptions**
Success will depend on full implementation of the strategy.

**Uncertainty**
None identified.

**Likely Significant Effects of Revocation**
The effects of revocation will be similar to retention due to the existence of national planning policy expressed through the National Planning Policy Framework. The National Planning Policy Framework provides full support for the remediation of degraded land.
### Commentary

- Contaminated and degraded land such that it is suitable for new uses, and as a minimum, not be capable of being determined as contaminated under Part 11A of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 (paragraph 109 and 121). However, the National Planning Policy Framework is silent on which remediation technologies should be preferred.

**Mitigation Measures**

- None proposed.

**Assumptions**

- Local planning authorities in cooperation through the provisions set out in the Duty to Cooperate will implement the policy on the remediation of contaminated land set out in the National Planning Policy Framework.

**Uncertainty**

- None identified.
### QE3: Creating a high quality built environment for all

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</th>
<th>Population &amp; human Health</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air</th>
<th>Climatic factors</th>
<th>Material assets</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention</td>
<td>+ + + + + + + + + + 0 0 0 0 0 + 0 0 + 0 0 0 + + + + + +</td>
<td>Commentary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Likely Significant Effects of Retention **

Policy QE3 is a generic and aspirational policy, encouraging local authorities through the preparation of their local plans to promote high quality natural and built environments in the West Midlands cities, towns and villages. Creation of attractive urban and natural environments bring benefits to the population and human health. Making efficient use of land should contribute to the sustainable use of soil, by reducing the amount of greenfield land required to provide for the level of development provided for. Increased access to local facilities, shops and services will reduce car reliance and need to travel, having positive impacts on air quality. Maximising opportunities for the built heritage and conservation assets of the region and the promotion of a heritage led regeneration initiatives should make a positive contribution to enhancing the region’s cultural heritage.

** Mitigation Measures **

None proposed.

** Assumptions **

None.

** Uncertainty **

The policy QE3 is generic, high level and aspirational. The actual impacts will depend on decisions made locally which will be a matter for local authorities when preparing their own local plans and taking development management decisions.
## Likely Significant Effects of Revocation

The effects of revocation will be similar to retention due to the existence of national planning policy expressed through the National Planning Policy Framework. Achieving good quality in the natural and built environment is one of the core principles of the planning system, and if delivered as planned should provide benefits across the majority of the SEA topics by mitigating to an extent the adverse environmental effects of development.

The National Planning Policy Framework devotes a whole section to good design in Section 7 of the framework and taken together with other policies in the framework should help to minimise the adverse effects of delivering the necessary development required to support the sustainable development of localities in the West Midlands.

The policies in the National Planning Policy Framework should also contribute to the adaptation of the build environment to climate change.

### Mitigation Measures

None proposed.

### Assumptions

It is assumed that English Heritage will continue to work with local authorities exploit sensitively the heritage assets identified in the West Midlands Regional Strategy.

### Uncertainty

As with retention of the policy, the actual impacts will depend on decisions made locally which will be a matter for local authorities when preparing their own local plans and taking development management decisions.
## QE4: Greenery, Urban Greenspace and Public Spaces

### Likely Significant Effects of Retention

Policy QE4 encourages local authorities and agencies to develop strategies for the adequate provision of accessible high quality urban green infrastructure. The provision and improvements to networks of green infrastructure could have benefits for biodiversity through the creation and enhancement of habitats. As it can also enhance the landscape and heritage assets within urban areas as specifically identified in policy QE4, there should be benefits in these areas. Green infrastructure can also provide flood attenuation, reduce carbon emissions, and protect the soil resource. Benefits might increase with time as the newer elements of greenspaces and green infrastructure mature. The overall significance of the effects of the retention of policy QE4 will depend on the extent to which the network joins together and enhances existing assets, and facilitates public access in a way that prevents deterioration of habitats, for example through recreational pressure. While the policy refers to some existing areas of green infrastructure in urban areas, it leaves it up to local authorities working with other agencies and partners to identify suitable land for the green spaces and development of green infrastructure.

### Mitigation Measures

None proposed.

### Assumptions

None.
### Likely Significant Effects of Revocation

The effects of revocation will be similar to retention due to the existence of national planning policy expressed through the National Planning Policy Framework. Paragraph 114 of the National Planning Policy Framework provides the same broad policy approach as the West Midlands Regional Strategy to the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of green infrastructure. However, paragraph 117 of the National Planning Policy Framework goes further stating that planning policies should:

- plan for biodiversity at a landscape-scale across local authority boundaries;
- identify and map components of the local ecological networks, including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity, wildlife corridors and stepping stones that connect them and areas identified by local partnerships for habitat restoration or creation;
- promote the preservation, restoration and re-creation of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species populations, linked to national and local targets, and identify suitable indicators for monitoring biodiversity in the plan;
- aim to prevent harm to geological conservation interests; and
- where Nature Improvement Areas are identified in local plans, consider specifying the types of development that may be appropriate in these areas.

Local plan policies are supported by the development management requirements set out in paragraph 118 of the National Planning Policy Framework. In addition, the introduction of Local Nature Partnerships announced in the Natural Environment White Paper, which will complement existing local partnerships which deal with...
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#### Commentary

- **Mitigation Measures**
  - None proposed.

- **Assumptions**
  - It is assumed that local authorities will work together making use of the Duty to Co-operate and the Local Nature Partnerships to optimise the benefits of green infrastructure.

- **Uncertainty**
  - The long term benefits for biodiversity could fail to be realised through locally-specific approaches to this policy area.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</th>
<th>Population &amp; human Health</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air</th>
<th>Climatic factors</th>
<th>Material assets</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Matters such as provision of green infrastructure will improve the chances of the delivery of the policy. Such partnerships will be able to work across administrative boundaries enable planning of networks at the geographical scale that has the most impact.
# QE5: Protection and enhancement of the Historic Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</th>
<th>Population &amp; human Health</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air</th>
<th>Climatic factors</th>
<th>Material assets</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S M L S M L S M L S M L S M L S M L S M L S M L S M L S M L S M L S M L S M L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention</td>
<td>+ + + + + + 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 + + + + + +</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy QE5 encourages local authorities working with partners to prepare local plans which contain strategies for the protection, conservation and enhancement of the region’s historic environment and to develop regeneration strategies which build upon the region’s historic assets whether in or outside the region’s Major Urban Areas. The identification, protection, conservation and enhancement of the historic environment, both built environment and wider landscape help to strengthen the historical regional character of the West Midlands. This also has positive impacts upon population and human health in terms of encouraging a sense of identity and well being amongst the residents of the region as well as securing the region’s material assets.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Mitigation Measures          | None proposed. |
| Assumptions                 | None. |
| Uncertainty                 | None. |

| Revocation                   | + + + + + + 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 + + + + + + |
| Likely Significant Effects of Revocation |
| The effects of revocation will be similar to retention due to the existence of national planning... |
### Commentary

- Policy expressed through the National Planning Policy Framework and existing statutory requirements.
- Legislation protecting listed buildings, scheduled monuments, conservation areas and registered historic parks and gardens remain in place.
- Paragraphs 126-141 of the National Planning Policy Framework set out strong national policy on conserving and enhancing the historic environment. It states that local planning authorities should set out in their local plans a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment, including heritage assets most at risk through neglect, decay or other threats.
- When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the conservation of historic assets. The more important the historic asset, the greater the weight should be given to its protection, conservation and enhancement.

### Mitigation Measures
- None proposed.

### Assumptions
- None.

### Uncertainty
- None.
### QE6: The conservation, enhancement and restoration of the Region’s landscape

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</th>
<th>Population &amp; human Health</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air</th>
<th>Climatic factors</th>
<th>Material assets</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retention</td>
<td>+ + + + + + 0 0 0 0 + 0 0 + + 0 0 0 + + + + + + +</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Likely Significant Effects of Retention

Policy QE6 is a generic policy which encourages local authorities and other agencies through the preparation of their plans and proposals to help restore the quality, diversity and distinctiveness of the landscape character of the region’s urban and rural areas. The policy seeks the sustainable use of soils and where soil and land have been degraded, to maximise opportunities for restoration to beneficial after-uses.

The policy also encourages more sustainable water use by land owners which would contribute to a relatively small extent to reducing pressure on the availability of water in the West Midlands and would contribute to the maintenance of wetland habitats, providing biodiversity benefits. It also encourages sustainable land management methods which would reduce the vulnerability to climate change of the region’s urban and rural landscapes, although this is outside of the scope of control through the spatial planning system.

#### Mitigation Measures

None proposed.

#### Assumptions

The policy in part seeks to mitigate the effects of potential development on greenfield land, recognising that there is insufficient previously developed land in suitable locations to accommodate all forms of potential development. It is assumed that local planning authorities will make the most effective use of suitable brownfield land.
### Likely Significant Effects of Revocation

The effects of revocation will be similar to retention due to the existence of national planning policy expressed through the National Planning Policy Framework.

The aspirations and provisions of Policy OE6 are covered by the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework which recognises at Section 11 the importance of landscape conservation and enhancement and will in turn be reflected in local plan policies.

Paragraph 115 of the National Planning Policy Framework places great weight on the conservation of landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, which have the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty. Landscape character assessments should be prepared where appropriate as stated in paragraph 170 of the Framework.

### Mitigation Measures

None proposed.

### Assumptions

That local authorities will adopt a proactive approach towards landscape conservation and enhancement.

### Uncertainty

None.
Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of West Midlands Regional Strategy

### QE7: Protecting, managing and enhancing the Region’s Biodiversity and Nature Conservation Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</th>
<th>Population &amp; human Health</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air</th>
<th>Climatic factors</th>
<th>Material assets</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retention</td>
<td>+ + + + + + + + + + + + + + 0 0 0 + + + + + + + + + + + + + +</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Likely Significant Effects of Revocation

Policy QE7 is a generic policy which encourages local authorities when preparing their local plans to seek to draft policies which enhance the region’s biodiversity and conserve its natural resources.

A high level strategic approach to the conservation, restoration and enhancement of environmental assets brings an improvement in the overall management of environmental assets. Benefits increase over time, reflecting the time taken by local authorities to prepare their local plans. Few benefits are evident in the short term, but significant long term benefits are expected across the West Midlands.

Local plans clearly identify, protect, maintain and enhance natural, historic and other distinctive features that contribute to the character of landscapes and places within the West Midlands. Biodiversity, geological, and geomorphological resources are increased through the delivery of national, regional and local objectives and targets. Tree and woodland cover increases, with additional some benefits in terms access to countryside and carbon savings.

#### Mitigation Measures

None proposed.

#### Assumptions
### Likely Significant Effects of Revocation

Policy QE7 as illustrated is a generic policy which encourages local authorities when preparing their local plans to seek to draft policies which enhance the region’s biodiversity and conserve its natural resources. The environmental impact of the revocation of policy QE7 is largely the same as retention due to the existence of national planning policy expressed through the National Planning Policy Framework.

The Framework places great importance on the protection of the natural environment.

Paragraph 9 of the framework sets out a strategic policy approach, stating that the planning system should contribute to, and enhance, the natural and local environment by protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, geological conservation interests and soils.

Paragraph 113 of the framework carries forward the policy in PPS7 requiring local planning authorities to set criteria based policies against which proposals for any development on or affecting protected wildlife or geodiversity sites or landscape areas will be judged, with distinctions made between the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites. Paragraph 114 requires local planning authorities to plan positively for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure, and maintain the character of the undeveloped but distinctive landscapes.

Paragraph 109 of the framework states that the planning system should contribute to, and enhance, the natural and local environment by minimising impacts on biodiversity and providing net gains in biodiversity at a landscape-scale across local authority boundaries, identify and map components of the local ecological networks, including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</th>
<th>Population &amp; human Health</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air</th>
<th>Climatic factors</th>
<th>Material assets</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Commentary**

wildlife corridors and stepping stones that connect them and areas identified by local partnerships for habitat restoration or creation, and promote the preservation, restoration and re-creation of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species populations, linked to national and local targets.

**Mitigation Measures**

None proposed.

**Assumptions**

That local planning authorities will prepare their local plans within the policy context set by the National Planning Policy Framework, and hence bring forward local plans which promote the biodiversity and conserve the natural resources of their localities.

**Uncertainty**

None identified.
Policy QE8 encourages local authorities through the preparation of their local plans to develop strategies to increase the amount of woodlands and tree cover within the West Midlands. The strong presumption against development that would result in a loss or deterioration of ancient semi-natural woodland and other woodlands of acknowledged national or regional importance will have a positive impact on protecting biodiversity and contribute to maintaining cultural heritage.

Similarly, the requirement to replace woodland which is unavoidably lost to development with at least an equivalent area and composition, and targeting new woodland creation at schemes for the restoration of derelict or contaminated land and sites formerly used for mineral extraction or industry and green infrastructure projects associated with areas planned for significant growth could have positive effects on human health, the protection and enhancement of soil and contribute to improving the urban air quality.

**Mitigation Measures**
None proposed.

**Assumptions**
None.

**Uncertainty**
## Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of West Midlands Regional Strategy

### Alternative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</th>
<th>Population &amp; human Health</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air</th>
<th>Climatic factors</th>
<th>Material assets</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Commentary

None.

### Revocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The effects of revocation will be similar to retention due to the existence of national planning policy expressed through the National Planning Policy Framework.

The protection of ancient semi-natural woodland and other woodlands of acknowledged national or regional importance would remain in the absence of the West Midlands Regional Strategy as stated in paragraph 118 of the National Planning Policy Framework. This would maintain the positive effects on biodiversity and cultural heritage of the regions existing and new woodlands.

The creation and enhancement of green infrastructure is likely to include a woodland component where local planning authorities and their communities consider this to be appropriate. The specific outcomes will depend on decisions made by local planning authorities, private land owners and local communities and are therefore uncertain but still positive.

### Mitigation Measures

None proposed.

### Assumptions

Policy QE8 provides a steer towards woodland planting on derelict or contaminated land and sites formerly used for mineral extraction or industry. However, it is unlikely that revocation would result in local planning authorities discouraging woodland planting on such sites when they consider it to be appropriate. As most new woodlands are established by farmers linked to subsidies it is assumed that the overall area of woodlands in the region will continue to increase.

### Uncertainty

None.
## QE9: The Water Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</th>
<th>Population &amp; human Health</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air</th>
<th>Climatic factors</th>
<th>Material assets</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Commentary**

**Likely Significant Effects of Retention**
Policy QE9 itself has no environmental effects as it explains the roles of local authorities, the Environment Agency, Ofwat and water companies in meeting their legal requirements under the Water Framework Directive.

**Mitigation Measures**
None proposed.

**Assumptions**
None.

**Uncertainty**
None identified.

**Likely Significant Effects of Revocation**
The revocation of policy QE9 itself has no environmental effects as it explains the roles of local authorities, the Environment Agency, Ofwat and water companies in meeting their legal requirements under the Water Framework Directive.

**Mitigation Measures**
None proposed.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</th>
<th>Population &amp; human Health</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air</th>
<th>Climatic factors</th>
<th>Material assets</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Assumptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Uncertainty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>None identified.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## EN1: Energy Generation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</th>
<th>Population &amp; human Health</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air</th>
<th>Climatic factors</th>
<th>Material assets</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retention</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revocation</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Likely Significant Effects of Retention
Policy EN1 addresses the role local planning authorities can play through their local plans and subsequent new developments in promoting renewable energy resources, however it does not set any targets to do so. Growth in the region provides an opportunity to decouple growth from increased greenhouse emissions stemming from development by encouraging development through policies set out in local plans which promote sustainable renewable energy sources. The impact of policies found within the West Midlands Regional Strategy as well as those enacted at national and international level should have an effect in promoting the provision of renewable energy resources and seeking to lessen greenhouse gas emissions.

#### Mitigation Measures
None proposed.

#### Assumptions
None.

#### Uncertainty
None.

### Likely Significant Effects of Revocation
There is no impact from the revocation of policy EN1, because it does not set out renewable
### Commentary

energy targets which developments in the West Midlands should meet. However there is now a legally-binding target to ensure 15% of energy comes from renewable sources by 2020. The UK Renewable Energy Strategy 2009 set out the path to meet it and this legislation would apply to developments taking place in the West Midlands.

**Mitigation Measures**
- None proposed.

**Assumptions**
- None.

**Uncertainty**
- None.
## EN2: Energy Conservation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</th>
<th>Population &amp; human Health</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air</th>
<th>Climatic factors</th>
<th>Material assets</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retention</td>
<td>0 0 0 + + + 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 + + + + + 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The purpose of Policy EN2 for local plans to promote sustainable forms of development which maximise energy conservation and also promote the development of combined heat and power and district heating schemes. The material to fuel the combined heat and power district heating schemes would come from waste generated locally.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Mitigation Measures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None proposed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Assumptions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local planning authorities when preparing their local plans will wish to promote sustainable forms of development including the development of combined heat and power district heating schemes fuelled by locally generated waste.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Uncertainty</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None identified.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revocation</td>
<td>0 0 0 + + + 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 + + + + + 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Revocation of Policy EN2 will have similar effects as retention. Planning policy concerning any energy from waste plants would need to reflect PPS10 which seeks to promote local responsibility for waste, and encourages waste planning authorities to provide appropriate land for waste management facilities. Local authorities need to prepare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
plans based on relevant and up-to-date data, which they obtain through close cooperation through the Duty to Cooperate with the Environment Agency and neighbouring local authorities and other waste planning authorities, and are required to monitor performance against provisions in their local plan. Using this approach to waste planning, local authorities will be able to continue the promotion of the development of combined heat and power district heating schemes fuelled by locally generated waste.

**Mitigation Measures**
None proposed.

**Assumptions**
As Above.

**Uncertainty**
None identified.
### M1: Mineral Working for Non-Energy Minerals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</th>
<th>Population &amp; human Health</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air</th>
<th>Climatic factors</th>
<th>Material assets</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Retention                    | +                           | +                         | +    | +     | +  | 0                | 0               | 0               | -         | -000000+++

**Commentary**

**Likely Significant Effects of Retention**

Minerals extraction is a temporary use of land (for a short or long period of time), after which time the land is restored for a further use. The length of time of the extraction and the period of time before restoration is completed will vary between different sites. Furthermore, mineral extraction is driven by geology and can only be extracted where it exists, which may include designated areas.

Policy M1 states that appropriate provision should be made in the West Midlands for mineral working of non-energy minerals and seeks to ensure the prudent use of the region’s indigenous energy minerals resources whilst maintaining an on-going adequate supply. This policy will have a negative impact on materials assets since it involves the extraction of non-renewable resources. Prudent use of minerals by recognising the contributory role of other sources will reduce the amount of primary extraction required.

However, retention of this policy will have significant population and health benefits through extraction of raw material to meet society’s needs. Protecting against adverse environmental impacts arising from extraction and associated activities, should have no change on soil, water and air. Whilst there might be some disturbance to the local landscape and biodiversity whilst the site is under operation, this may be fully mitigated by high quality working standards and restoration required under the National Planning Policy Framework and the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. Overall, the effect on biodiversity and landscape is likely to be minor positive.

The policy also promotes the use of non-road transport modes (including the safeguarding of
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</th>
<th>Population &amp; human Health</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air</th>
<th>Climatic factors</th>
<th>Material assets</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revocation</strong></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Commentary**

railheads and other transport facilities as required by the National Planning Policy Framework). The policy therefore results in no overall effect for air and climate factors.

**Mitigation Measures**

The environmental impact assessments should identify any significant effect which can be mitigated.

**Assumptions**

Minerals planning authorities continue to safeguard sites to prevent sterilisation of mineral, and continue to use secondary and recycled material to minimise the need for primary extraction throughout the Plan period.

**Uncertainty**

The actual environmental impact of mineral extraction will depend on the scale, nature and location of the proposed site, although these uncertainties cannot be attributed to specific topics.

**Likely Significant Effects of Revocation**

The effects of revocation will be similar to retention due to the existence of national planning policy expressed through the National Planning Policy Framework.

Paragraphs 143-149 of the NPPF set out the national policies for minerals extraction. Whilst it requires mineral planning authorities to plan for minerals extraction, it provides strong protections for the natural and historic environment, human health, and important landscapes, it provides for the restoration and aftercare of worked sites at the earliest opportunity and for it to be carried out to the highest standards. This may include restoration to a local wildlife site used to enhance biodiversity. It also actively encourages consideration of recycled and secondary sources before the extraction of primary materials and the safeguarding of known mineral resource to avoid unnecessary sterilisation of the mineral. Materials assets continues to be appraised negatively since it involves the extraction of non-
Paragraphs 143-149 of the National Planning Policy Framework set out the national policies for minerals extraction. Whilst it requires mineral planning authorities to plan for minerals extraction, it provides strong protections for the natural and historic environment, human health, and important landscapes. It also provides for the restoration and aftercare of worked sites at the earliest opportunity and for it to be carried out to the highest standards. This may include restoration of landscapes to biodiversity standards.

**Mitigation Measures**

The environmental impact assessments should identify any significant effect which can be mitigated.

**Assumptions**

Minerals planning authorities continue to safeguard sites to prevent sterilisation of mineral, and continue to use secondary and recycled material to minimise the need for primary extraction throughout the Plan period.

**Uncertainty**

The actual environmental impact of mineral extraction will depend on the scale, nature and location of the proposed site, although these uncertainties cannot be attributed to specific topics.
### M2: Minerals-Aggregates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</th>
<th>Population &amp; Human Health</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air</th>
<th>Climatic Factors</th>
<th>Material Assets</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Likely Significant Effects of Retention

Policy M2 sets out the minerals and aggregates apportionments across the West Midlands, requiring minerals planning authorities to plan for a specific amount of aggregate minerals from environmentally acceptable sources. Avoiding harm to designated sites and delivering high equality restoration of all minerals workings will also have a beneficial environmental effect on biodiversity, landscape and soils.

This policy should be read alongside Policy M1, and sets out sets out an apportionment for aggregate mineral over the plan period to ensure that the region contributes towards ensuring a steady and adequate supply of aggregates across the country. Retention of this policy will have population benefits through extraction of raw material to meet society’s needs. Prudent use of minerals, such as maximising recycled or secondary aggregate, will minimise primary extraction and result in minor negative effects for material assets.

#### Mitigation Measures

The environmental impact assessments for each proposal should identify any significant effect which can be mitigated.

#### Assumptions

Minerals planning authorities continue to safeguard sites to prevent sterilisation of minerals, and continue to use secondary and recycled material to minimise the need for primary extraction throughout the West Midlands Regional Strategy’s life. The full apportionment is...
### Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of West Midlands Regional Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</th>
<th>Population &amp; human Health</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air</th>
<th>Climatic factors</th>
<th>Material assets</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revocation</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Commentary**

Planned for and extracted over the plan period.

**Uncertainty**

The actual environmental impact of mineral extraction will depend on the scale, nature and location of the proposed site, although these uncertainties cannot be attributed to specific topics.

**Likely Significant Effects of Revocation**

Policy M2 apportions figures from the National and Regional Guidelines for Aggregate minerals 2001-2016, published in June 2003 as an amendment to Minerals Policy Guidance note 6, to each minerals planning authority taking account of the advice of the West Midlands Aggregate Working Party. An examination of the 9 minerals plans suggest that only three authorities (Herefordshire, Black Country and Solihull) have plans that reflect M2. Three other authorities who adopted plans before 2003 have higher apportionments. In contrast Staffordshire has not explicit apportionment figure, referring instead to policy M2.

Revocation of the policy will have no significant environmental effects as it will leave planned apportionments in place until such time as the plans are revised or updated. However, with no figure in Staffordshire, the policies in the Framework will be of significant weight in determining applications. The West Midlands Aggregate Working Party has agreed its apportionment of the most recent Government guidelines for 2005-2020, published in May 2009, and it is for each mineral planning authority to consider this apportionment in the context of the national approach for aggregate minerals set out in Paragraph 145 of the national Planning Policy Framework. This revised policy requires each minerals planning authority to prepare a local aggregate assessment which gives local authorities greater control over how much mineral extraction they need to plan for, and how this should be provided. Technical advice will still be provided through Aggregate Working Parties and the Duty to Cooperate should assist in ensuring minerals planning authorities work together with the industry to ensure the steady and adequate supply of minerals are provided in a suitable manner.
### Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of West Midlands Regional Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</th>
<th>Population &amp; human Health</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air</th>
<th>Climatic factors</th>
<th>Material assets</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Commentary**

The effects of revocation of this policy are likely to be similar to retention as each authority will still need to plan for aggregate extraction.

**Mitigation Measures**

The environmental impact assessments for each proposal should identify any significant effect which can be mitigated.

**Assumptions**

The full apportionment is planned for and extracted over the plan period.

**Uncertainty**

The actual environmental impact of mineral extraction will depend on the scale, nature and location of the proposed site, although these uncertainties cannot be attributed to specific topics.
**M3: Minerals – The Use of Alternatives Sources of Materials**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</th>
<th>Population &amp; human Health</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air</th>
<th>Climatic factors</th>
<th>Material assets</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Commentary**

*Likely Significant Effects of Retention*

Policy M3 encourages local authorities, the West Midlands Regional Aggregates Working Party and Regional Technical Advisory Body to work together to develop strategies so as to reduce the region’s reliance on land won aggregates. It intends to promote recycled and secondary sources of material as an alternative to primary extraction.

Retention of the policy will have a positive environmental effect on material assets as it seeks to limit the volume of extraction of raw material. It will also have a minor positive effect on biodiversity and landscape through less extraction. Furthermore, in line with paragraph 145 of the National Planning Policy Framework, each minerals planning authority is required to prepare a local aggregate assessment which sets out how much mineral extraction they need to plan for, and how this should be provided. This includes through the provision of secondary and aggregate resources. Technical advice will still be provided through Aggregate Working Parties. Duty to Cooperate should assist in ensuring minerals planning authorities work together with the industry to ensure the steady and adequate supply of minerals

**Mitigation Measures**

None proposed.
**Assumptions**

Minerals planning authorities continue to work together to reduce reliance on land won aggregates to minimise the need for primary extraction throughout the West Midlands Regional Strategy’s life.

**Uncertainty**

None identified.

**Likely Significant Effects of Revocation**

The effects of revocation will be similar to retention due to the existence of national planning policy expressed through the National Planning Policy Framework.

Local plans recognise the need to source aggregates from secondary as well as primary sources. This is reinforced by paragraph 145 of the National Planning Policy Framework, where each minerals planning authority to prepare a local aggregate assessment. This gives local authorities greater control over how much mineral extraction they need to plan for (including through the provision of secondary and aggregate resources), and how this should be provided.

Technical advice will still be provided through Aggregate Working Parties and the Duty to Cooperate should assist in ensuring minerals planning authorities work together with the industry to ensure the steady and adequate supply of minerals. In addition Planning Policy Statement 10 sets out an expectation that, through their policies, waste planning authorities and other local authorities should be driving waste up the waste hierarchy. The policy allows for the range, type, capacity and location of new waste and/or expanded waste management facilities and their operational arrangements to be decided at local level, and for local authorities to make appropriate arrangements to encourage better re-use or recycling of waste.

**Mitigation Measures**
## Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of West Midlands Regional Strategy

### Commentary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</th>
<th>Population &amp; human Health</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air</th>
<th>Climatic factors</th>
<th>Material assets</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

None proposed.

**Assumptions**

Minerals planning authorities continue to work together to reduce reliance on land won aggregates to minimise the need for primary extraction.

**Uncertainty**

None identified.
**M4: Energy Minerals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</th>
<th>Population &amp; human Health</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air</th>
<th>Climatic factors</th>
<th>Material assets</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retention</td>
<td>+ + + + +</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 - - - -</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Likely Significant Effects of Retention**

Policy M4 encourages local authorities to prepare development plans which develop strategies to address the need to provide for energy minerals extraction, but also for their sustainable utilisation.

With the region having significant coal and other hydrocarbon resources, this policy sets the overall framework for identifying areas of resource and governing its extraction. This policy is reinforced by paragraph 149 of the National Planning Policy Framework, including which sets out the criteria for determining individual applications.

Retention of this policy will ensure that the region still plans for extraction of energy minerals. As a fossil fuel, coal extraction will have a negative impact on climatic factors, but positive effects on human health through the provision of employment and contributing to meeting the country’s energy needs. The intention of the policy is to ensure that proposals are environmentally acceptable, but the actual impact of extraction will vary depending on the scale, and location.

**Mitigation Measures**

EIA of opencast works likely to have significant effects on the environment should address mitigation measures.

**Assumptions**

Minerals planning authorities continue to work together to sustainable manage the...
### Likely Significant Effects of Revocation

As illustrated, policy M4 encourages local authorities to prepare development plans which develop strategies to address the need to provide for energy minerals extraction, but also for their sustainable utilisation. The effects of revocation will be similar to retention due to the existence of national planning policy expressed through the National Planning Policy Framework.

Paragraphs 143, 147 and 148 of the National Planning Policy Framework set out Government policy on extraction of energy minerals. Minerals planning authorities are required to plan for extraction of energy minerals, including energy from worked and unworked coal resources. Paragraph 149 of the framework sets out updated policy on coal extraction. Planning policy for coal mining remains unchanged and there is still a clear expectation that the environmental effects of coal mining are properly considered in the planning process. However, the wording of the policy has been refined to provide greater clarity given that the framework includes a presumption in favour of sustainable development.

### Mitigation Measures

None proposed.

### Assumptions

None proposed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</th>
<th>Population &amp; human Health</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air</th>
<th>Climatic factors</th>
<th>Material assets</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minerals planning authorities continue to work together to sustainably manage the exploitation of energy minerals.

**Uncertainty**
None identified.
### WD1: Targets for Waste Management in the Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</th>
<th>Population &amp; human Health</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air</th>
<th>Climatic factors</th>
<th>Material assets</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Commentary

**Likely Significant Effects of Retention**

Policy WD1 sets out targets which seek to retain regional self-sufficiency in waste management but also seek to drive waste up the waste hierarchy and contribute to meeting European Union obligations and national objectives. The policy specifically commits each local plan to meet the requirements set out in Waste Strategy 2000. Delivering this policy will require investment in new waste management facilities. Ensuring timely provision of appropriate facilities will have benefits on human health whilst the reduction in the amount of waste disposed of to landfill and greater recycling/reuse will emission of greenhouse gases (i.e. methane) and have carbon benefits. It should also reduce the need to travel. The reduction in the amount of waste disposed of to landfill will reduce the risk of water contamination and emission of greenhouse gases (i.e. methane) although modern waste management practice seeks to prevent this. The target may be more challenging if waste is not decoupled from economic growth.

Viewing waste as a resource will have benefits to material assets from example by replacing primary aggregate with recycled construction waste and making effective use of recovered energy.

**Mitigation Measures**

Waste management can have significant adverse effects across the SEA topics if not properly managed. The Environment Agency’s permitting regime address these issues.

**Assumptions**
## Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of West Midlands Regional Strategy

### Likely Significant Effects of Revocation

The effects of revocation will be similar to retention due to the existence of national planning policy expressed through the PPS10. All plans in the region recognise the need to use more waste as a resource and the need to deliver more sustainable waste management and driving waste up the waste hierarchy. Furthermore achievement of the targets will require a step change in provision for recycling, composting and recovery is needed, but decisions about how targets are met should take account of local circumstances. National planning policy allows for the range, type, capacity and location of new waste and/or expanded waste management facilities and their operational arrangements to be determined by the waste planning authority (or authorities) concerned, informed by relevant appraisals. The Duty to Co-operate will assist to ensure waste planning authorities work together, whilst ensuring waste is handled safely, and enabling waste to be disposed of in one of the nearest appropriate installations. Targets set may be more challenging if waste is not decoupled from economic growth.

### Mitigation Measures

Waste management can have significant adverse effects across the SEA topics if not properly managed. The Environment Agency’s permitting regime address these issues.

### Assumptions

Waste planning authorities produce up-to-date plans to provide sites to facilitate movement up the waste hierarchy.

### Uncertainty

None.

### Waste planning authorities produce up-to-date plans to provide sites to facilitate movement up the waste hierarchy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</th>
<th>Population &amp; human Health</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air</th>
<th>Climatic factors</th>
<th>Material assets</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revocation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>+ + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of West Midlands Regional Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</th>
<th>Population &amp; human Health</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air</th>
<th>Climatic factors</th>
<th>Material assets</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Commentary**

None.
WD2: The Need for Waste Management Facilities – by Sub-Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</th>
<th>Population &amp; Human Health</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air</th>
<th>Climatic factors</th>
<th>Material Assets</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Commentary**

**Likely Significant Effects of Retention**

Waste Planning Authorities will still be required to comply with national policy in Planning Policy Statement 10 and the National Planning Policy Framework, as well as its legal obligations under the Waste (England and Wales) Regulations 2011. Waste planning authorities should plan for the waste management needs in their area, driving waste management up the hierarchy, helping to implement the international and national waste legislation and take more responsibility for their own waste. Each waste planning authority should set out its ambitions for additional waste management capacity required, based on an assessment of existing and forecast waste arisings, and should monitor to enable it to adapt if required. Furthermore, waste planning authorities should assess the suitability of land against criteria set out in PPS10, including the physical and environmental constraints on development and the cumulative effect of previous waste disposal facilities on the well-being of the local community. In doing so, waste planning authorities are required to meet their targets under the Landfill Allowance Trading Scheme, and to monitor waste arisings and waste facilities. It should have benefits to air quality and contribute positively to climatic factors reducing the distance waste should travel for recovery or disposal.

The need to develop additional waste management capacity might have an impact on local landscape and biodiversity, depending on where the sites are located. Provision of additional landfill capacity if required may also have a negative impact on the environment, including on climate change.

Close co-operation with neighbouring authorities is in line with the duty to co-operate under...
### Commentary

Section 110 of the Localism Act 2011. This will ensure the safe handling of waste, but its impact will depend on the distance the waste will have to travel.

**Mitigation Measures**
- None proposed.

**Assumption**
- Waste management can have significant adverse effects across the SEA topics if not properly managed. The Environment Agency's permitting regime, covering the operation
- Waste planning authorities produce up-to-date plans to provide sites to facilitate movement up the waste hierarchy and the development of waste management facilities accordingly.

**Uncertainty**
- Forecasts of waste arisings may be higher or lower than that assumed in developing this policy and as set out in Tables 4 and 5.

### Revocation

Revocation of policy WD2 is likely to have similar effects to retention. Waste Planning Authorities will still be required to comply with national policy in Planning Policy Statement 10 and the National Planning Policy Framework, as well as its legal obligations under the Waste (England and Wales) Regulations 2011. Waste planning authorities should plan for the waste management needs in their area, driving waste management up the hierarchy, helping to implement the international and national waste legislation and take more responsibility for their own waste. Each waste planning authority should set out its ambitions for additional waste management capacity required, based on an assessment of existing and forecast waste arisings, and should monitor to enable it to adapt if required. The Duty to Cooperate will assist to ensure that local authorities work together where appropriate. This includes those instances where there is a need for fewer, more specialised facilities.

Paragraph 8.87 of the Plan confirmed that the municipal waste data set out in Tables 4 and 5.
Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of West Midlands Regional Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</th>
<th>Population &amp; human Health</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air</th>
<th>Climatic factors</th>
<th>Material assets</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5, and which support WD2 are not fixed, should be used as benchmarks for the preparation of waste plans, rather than being detailed forecasts. An analysis of the 9 waste plans in the region only 3 – Staffordshire, Shropshire and the Black Country - have set out detailed capacity requirements and none of them rely totally on the data set out in the tables. However, in line with paragraph 218 of the Framework, waste planning authorities may also continue to draw on evidence that informed the preparation of regional strategies to support Local Plan policies, supplemented as needed by up-to-date, robust local evidence.

**Mitigation Measures**

None proposed.

**Assumption**

Waste planning authorities produce up-to-date plans to identify capacity required and provide sites to facilitate movement up the waste hierarchy and the development of waste management facilities accordingly.

As waste management can have significant adverse effects across the SEA topics if not properly managed it is assumed the Environment Agency’s permitting regime will adequately address these issues.

**Uncertainty**

The effects of the policy will depend on the waste management facilities and initiatives taken forward.
WD3: Criteria for Location of Waste Management Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</th>
<th>Population &amp; Human Health</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air</th>
<th>Climatic factors</th>
<th>Material assets</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retention</td>
<td>+ + + 0 0 0 + + + 0 0 0 + + + + + + + + 0 0 0 + + +</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Commentary

**Likely Significant Effects of Retention**

Policy WD3 sets out general locational criteria for waste management facilities. In doing so it reflects ambitions in national planning policy for communities to take more responsibility for managing their own waste, to encourage more sustainable modes of waste transport, and to identify, where possible, specific sites.

Read alongside other environmental policies it encourages waste planning authorities to provide waste management facilities on site or close to where the waste arises, and to promote on-site management where practicable. Furthermore policy A 1) is consistent with PPS10, which sets the criteria against which waste planning authorities should assess the suitability of land, including the physical and environmental constraints on development and the cumulative effect of previous waste disposal facilities on the well-being of the local community. Promoting on-site recovery and more sustainable transport modes should have air and climate change benefits by reducing the distance waste should travel for recovery or disposal.

Restricting the grant of planning permission of new landfill sites to specific areas should have positive effects on material assets and should have biodiversity, soil and landscape benefits by seeking to restore the land to a suitable condition.

**Mitigation Measures**

None
### Commentary

##### Assumptions
Waste Planning authorities provide up-to-date plans for, and monitor, additional waste capacity to manage waste arising in their local area.

The operation of individual waste management facilities will be governed by the environmental permitting regime to ensure that waste is managed in a manner which does not harm human health or the environment.

##### Uncertainty
None

#### Likely Significant Effects of Revocation
The revocation of this policy is likely to have similar effects to retention. Waste Planning Authorities are expected to draw up local plans which comply with PPS10. This national policy sets out key objectives to deliver sustainable waste management, and highlights the pivotal role of the planning system in putting in place the right facilities at the right time in the right place. It relates to location it includes the objective of ensuring waste is handled safely, and enabling waste to be disposed of in one of the nearest appropriate installations. Further the National Planning Policy Framework makes clear that waste planning authorities should continue to plan for the waste management needs in their area.

This policy allows for the range, type, capacity and location of new waste and/or expanded waste management facilities and their operational arrangements to be determined by the waste planning authority (or authorities) concerned, informed by relevant appraisals.

Furthermore revocation of this policy will not remove the need for waste planning authorities to have regard to the requirements of the 2004 Act, statutory duties particularly with regard to environmental protection, sustainable development and climate change, or due regard to the NPPF when preparing their waste management plans.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</th>
<th>Population &amp; human Health</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air</th>
<th>Climatic factors</th>
<th>Material assets</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Commentary**

**Mitigation Measures**
None proposed.

**Assumptions**
Waste Planning authorities provide up-to-date plans for, and monitor, additional waste capacity to manage waste arising in their local area

**Uncertainty**
None
## Transport & Accessibility

### T1: Developing accessibility and mobility within the Region to support the Spatial Strategy

### Commentary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</th>
<th>Population &amp; Human Health</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air</th>
<th>Climatic factors</th>
<th>Material assets</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retention</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Likely Significant Effects of Retention**

Policy T1 is a generic and aspirational policy, setting the overarching policy objectives for the West Midlands 11 individual transport policies. Policy T1 attracts positive scores for reducing the need to travel and reducing the transport intensity of economic activity, including freight, against criteria for reducing travel need, encouraging cycling and walking as well as reducing lack of mobility caused by income disparities, increasing resilience and providing opportunities and access to services for all. The policy also seeks to improve air quality and reduce greenhouse gas emissions, especially in the region’s Major Urban Areas.

**Mitigation Measures**

None proposed.

**Assumptions**

Many of the effects will depend on the ability to change travel behaviour and the demand for transport, which go beyond the reach of the spatial planning system as delivered through local plans prepared by the region’s local planning authorities.

**Uncertainty**

None.
## Commentary

### Likely Significant Effects of Revocation

None from the revocation of T1, it is the same impact as its retention given the generic and aspirational nature of policy T1. Paragraph 17 of the National Planning Policy Framework sets out a core principle of planning which is to actively manage patterns of development and growth to make the fullest possible use of public transport, walking and cycling, and focus significant development in locations which are or can be made sustainable. Paragraphs 29-41 of the National Planning Policy Framework also address how to promote sustainable transport modes. Many of the effects will depend on the ability to change travel behaviour and the demand for transport.

### Mitigation Measures

None proposed.

### Assumptions

It is assumed that local planning and transport authorities will operate under the Duty to Co-operate to deliver outcomes. Also local authorities will use their Local Transport Plans to promote the overall transport strategy set out in policy T1.

### Uncertainty

None.
### T2: Reducing the need to travel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</th>
<th>Population &amp; human Health</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air</th>
<th>Climates factors</th>
<th>Material assets</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retention</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 + + + 0 0 0 0 0 + + + + + 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revocation</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 + + + 0 0 0 0 0 + + + + + 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Commentary**

**Likely Significant Effects of Retention**
Policy T2 should result in less travel, particularly travel by private car and if travel is necessary, it should be by public transport, complimented by more cycling and walking and hence less dependency on private transport modes. This will have positive effects on population and human health, air quality and climatic factors.

**Mitigation Measures**
None proposed.

**Assumptions**
Success will depend upon the extent to which travel behaviour can be changed. Policy T2 is reliant on other parties which may not have same priorities or may lack resources to discourage private and promote public modes of transport if travel is required.

**Uncertainty**
None.

**Likely Significant Effects of Revocation**

The effects of revocation will be similar to retention due to the existence of national planning policy expressed through the National Planning Policy Framework.

Paragraph 17 of the National Planning Policy Framework sets out a core principle of planning which is to actively manage patterns of development and growth to make the fullest possible...
use of public transport, walking and cycling, and focus significant development in locations which are or can be made sustainable. Paragraphs 29-41 of the National Planning Policy Framework also address how to promote sustainable transport modes. There would be similar benefits to the population and human health, to air quality and climatic factors of the revocation as of the retention of policy T2, given the existence of national policy as illustrated set out in the National Planning Policy Framework.

**Mitigation Measures**
None proposed.

**Assumptions**
None.

**Uncertainty**
Demand management will be a matter for local authorities to consider in consultation with their communities and business partners. The legal powers available under the Transport Acts would not be affected by the revocation of the West Midlands regional strategy.
## T3: Walking and cycling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</th>
<th>Population &amp; human Health</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air</th>
<th>Climatic factors</th>
<th>Material assets</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retention</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>+ + +</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>+ + +</td>
<td>+ + +</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revocation</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>+ + +</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>+ + +</td>
<td>+ + +</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Commentary

**Likely Significant Effects of Retention**

Policy T3 seeks to increased walking and cycling levels amongst the West Midlands population and will have benefits to human health, while less motorised transport will reduce pollutant and greenhouse gas emissions.

**Mitigation Measures**

None proposed.

**Assumptions**

These modes of transport walking and cycling to replace other forms of transport rather than being additional to private car use for example.

**Uncertainty**

The extent of the effects will depend on the level of uptake and the shift from car use, which are often personal decisions made by individuals which go beyond the scope of spatial planning.

**Likely Significant Effects of Revocation**

The effects of revocation will be similar to retention due to the existence of national planning policy expressed through the National Planning Policy Framework.

One of the core principles of planning is to actively manage patterns of growth to make the fullest possible use of public transport, walking and cycling, and focus significant
## Commentary

Development in locations which are or can be made sustainable, as illustrated in paragraphs 17 and 29-41 of the National Planning Policy Framework. Revocation is not considered likely to change the approach taken by local authorities, especially through the preparation of their Local Transport Plans and should deliver the same benefits.

### Mitigation Measures

None proposed.

### Assumptions

As above.

### Uncertainty

As above.
## T4: Promoting travel awareness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</th>
<th>Population &amp; human Health</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air</th>
<th>Climatic factors</th>
<th>Material assets</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retention</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</td>
<td>Policy T4 seeks to bring about a shift from private car use to public transport, walking and cycling. The policy if necessary should help to improve human health and result in improvements in air quality, while contributing to tackling climate change.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Measures</td>
<td>None proposed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumptions</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertainty</td>
<td>The effects of this policy again will depend on the extent to which the public can be persuaded to make greater use of public transport and walk and cycle over the use of private modes of transport such as car use.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revocation</th>
<th>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</th>
<th>Population &amp; human Health</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air</th>
<th>Climatic factors</th>
<th>Material assets</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</td>
<td>Policy T4 sets out behaviour change aspirations that fit well with the broad thrust of paragraphs 29-41 in the National Planning Policy Framework and it is expected that similar benefits to the population and human health, to air quality and climatic factors would occur following revocation of this policy. As local planning authorities will in all probability pursue the policy objectives set out in policy T4 through the preparation of their Local Transport...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative</td>
<td>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</td>
<td>Population &amp; human Health</td>
<td>Soil</td>
<td>Water</td>
<td>Air</td>
<td>Climatic factors</td>
<td>Material assets</td>
<td>Cultural Heritage</td>
<td>Landscape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Commentary**

- Plans.
- **Mitigation Measures**
  - None proposed.
- **Assumptions**
  - None.
- **Uncertainty**
  - None identified.
# T5: Public Transport

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</th>
<th>Population &amp; Human Health</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air</th>
<th>Climatic factors</th>
<th>Material assets</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retention</td>
<td>0 0 0 + + + 0 0 0 0 0 + + + + + 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revocation</td>
<td>0 0 0 + + + 0 0 0 0 0 + + + + + 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Commentary**

### Likely Significant Effects of Retention

Policy T5 is a generic and aspirational policy with benefits to the population, air quality and climatic effects through increased use of public transport. All other effects would be neutral because of an absence of direct impacts.

**Mitigation Measures**

None proposed.

**Assumptions**

None.

**Uncertainty**

None identified.

### Likely Significant Effects of Revocation

Paragraphs 29-41 of the National Planning Policy Framework promote the increased use of sustainable transport and similar effects to retention on population, air and climatic factors are expected. All other effects are likely to be neutral because of an absence of direct impacts.

**Mitigation Measures**

None proposed.
## Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of West Midlands Regional Strategy

### Commentary

**Assumptions**

It is assumed that local planning and transport authorities will operate under the Duty to Co-operate to deliver positive outcomes as set out in policy T5 for public transport provision, especially through the preparation of Local Transport Plans by local authorities.

**Uncertainty**

None identified.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</th>
<th>Population &amp; human Health</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air</th>
<th>Climatic factors</th>
<th>Material assets</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

November 2012
# T6: Strategic Park & Ride

### Commentary

**Likely Significant Effects of Retention**
Policy T6 encourages local planning authorities and relevant regional organisations to work together to develop a network of Strategic Park and Ride sites to reduce congestion in major centres (with benefits for air quality and climatic factors). The implementation of these schemes if located in Green Belt should have regard to paragraph 3.17 of PPG2 (as revised by PPG13) which has been withdrawn and replaced by the National Planning Policy Framework.

**Mitigation Measures**
None proposed.

**Assumptions**
None.

**Uncertainty**
None identified.

**Likely Significant Effects of Revocation**
The effects of revocation will be similar to retention due to the existence of national planning policy expressed through the National Planning Policy Framework.

National policy on local parking standards is set out in paragraph 39 of the National Planning Policy Framework. This leaves decisions on standards and location to the discretion of local...
### Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of West Midlands Regional Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</th>
<th>Population &amp; Human Health</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air</th>
<th>Climatic factors</th>
<th>Material assets</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Commentary**

Planning authorities, whereas Policy T6 adheres to the parking policy in the now withdrawn PPG13 which set quantified maximum parking standards across England and allowed regional strategies and local planning authorities only to adopt more rigorous standards.

In line with the Duty to Cooperate local authorities are likely to consider setting consistent parking and strategic park and ride standards across local authority boundaries and when developing a network of Strategic Park and Ride sites where it makes sense to do so, and to utilise the range of powers to control parking provision and enforcement powers under Part 6 of the Traffic Act 2004.

**Mitigation Measures**

There is no significant overall change in the provision of parking resulting from revocation of policy T6.

**Assumptions**

None.

**Uncertainty**

None identified.
### T7: Car Parking Standards and Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</th>
<th>Population &amp; human Health</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air</th>
<th>Climatic factors</th>
<th>Material assets</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retention</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 + + + 0 0 0 0 0 + + + + + + 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 + + + 0 0 0 0 0 + + + + + + 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 + + + 0 0 0 0 0 + + + + + + 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 + + + 0 0 0 0 0 + + + + + + 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 + + + 0 0 0 0 0 + + + + + + 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 + + + 0 0 0 0 0 + + + + + + 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Commentary

**Likely Significant Effects of Retention**
Policy T7 encourages local authorities to work within maximum standards for parking associated with new development in line with the now replaced PPG13 and reflecting again the approach set out in the now replaced PPG3. Further local authorities, working together, should manage their car parking to reduce congestion and encourage more sustainable forms of public transport, complemented by walking and cycling. Hence this policy seeks to discourage unnecessary journeys, commuting, including by encouraging businesses to locate in areas accessible by non-car modes. This could reduce air pollution and provide beneficial effects on the climate.

**Mitigation Measures**
None proposed.

**Assumptions**
None.

**Uncertainty**
None identified.

---

### Revocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</th>
<th>Population &amp; human Health</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air</th>
<th>Climatic factors</th>
<th>Material assets</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 + + + 0 0 0 0 0 + + + + + + 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 + + + 0 0 0 0 0 + + + + + + 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 + + + 0 0 0 0 0 + + + + + + 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 + + + 0 0 0 0 0 + + + + + + 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 + + + 0 0 0 0 0 + + + + + + 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 + + + 0 0 0 0 0 + + + + + + 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Likely Significant Effects of Revocation
The effects of revocation will be similar to retention due to the existence of national planning policy expressed through the National Planning Policy Framework.
### National policy on local parking standards is set out in paragraph 39 of the National Planning Policy Framework. This leaves decisions on standards to the discretion of local authorities, whereas Policy T7 like policy T6 adheres to the parking policy in the now withdrawn PPG13 which set quantified maximum parking standards across England and allowed regional strategies and local planning authorities only to adopt more rigorous standards. In line with the Duty to Co-operate local authorities are likely to consider setting consistent standards across local authority boundaries where it makes sense to do so, and to utilise the range of powers to control parking provision and enforcement powers under Part 6 of the Traffic Act 2004.

Many local authorities in the West Midlands may opt to set rigorous maximum standards similar to those in Policy T7. Revocation will result in no significant difference in environmental effects where they do so. However, other local authorities may decide to take a less restrictive approach and allow higher parking provision where they consider this justified, for example by design considerations. The National Planning Policy Framework is clear that developments that generate significant movement should be located where the need to travel will be minimised and the use of sustainable public transport modes can be maximised.

**Mitigation Measures**

None proposed.

**Assumptions**

There is no significant overall change in the provision of parking resulting from revocation of policy T7.

**Uncertainty**

None identified.
## T8: Demand Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</th>
<th>Population &amp; human Health</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air</th>
<th>Climatic factors</th>
<th>Material assets</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Commentary                           | **Likely Significant Effects of Retention**
Policy T8 is again a generic and aspirational policy. If successful the policy T8 should result in less use of the private car and more cycling and walking. This would have benefits for the population and to human health and for air quality. Success of the policy is dependent upon the extent to which travel behaviour can be changed, as well as co-operative working (the supporting text comments that policy T8 cannot be implemented by the then Regional Planning Body working independently from other partners).

**Mitigation Measures**
None proposed.

**Assumptions**
None.

**Uncertainty**
None.

| Revocation                           | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | + | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | + | + | + | + | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Commentary                           | **Likely Significant Effects of Revocation**
The effects of revocation will be similar to retention due to the existence of national planning policy expressed through the National Planning Policy Framework. The National Planning Policy Framework has clear policies on sustainable transport, and gives encouragement to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</th>
<th>Population &amp; human Health</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air</th>
<th>Climatic factors</th>
<th>Material assets</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

and reduce congestion. Demand management will be a matter for local authorities to consider in consultation with their communities and business partners. The legal powers available under the Transport Acts would not be affected by the revocation of policy T8.

**Mitigation Measures**
None proposed.

**Assumptions**
None.

**Uncertainty**
None identified.
T9: The Management and Development of National and Regional Transport Networks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</th>
<th>Population &amp; human Health</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air</th>
<th>Climatic factors</th>
<th>Material assets</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retention</td>
<td>0 0 0 + + + 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 + + + + + 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</td>
<td>Policy T9 seeks the improved management and maintenance of the strategic and regional road networks, while mitigating environmental effects. Thus is likely to result in benefits to health resulting from improved safety measures, to air quality and climatic factors as a result of less congestion and fewer emissions of pollutants.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mitigation Measures</td>
<td>None proposed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assumptions</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Uncertainty</td>
<td>None identified.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revocation</td>
<td>0 0 0 + + + 0 0 0 0 0 0 + + + + + 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</td>
<td>The effects of revocation will be similar to retention due to the existence of national planning policy expressed through the National Planning Policy Framework. Paragraph 30 of the National Planning Policy Framework, supported by the Duty to Cooperate, states that local authorities should work with neighbouring local authorities and transport providers to develop strategies for the provision of viable infrastructure necessary to support sustainable development. Encouragement should be given as set out in paragraph</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Alternative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</th>
<th>Population &amp; human Health</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air</th>
<th>Climatic factors</th>
<th>Material assets</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
<td>S M L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Commentary

- 30 of the National Planning Policy Framework to develop solutions which reduce traffic congestion.

**Mitigation Measures**

None proposed.

**Assumptions**

It is assumed that local planning and transport authorities will cooperate under the Duty to Cooperate to deliver positive outcomes, resulting in the improved management and maintenance of the strategic and regional road networks, while mitigating environmental effects in the West Midlands.

**Uncertainty**

None identified.
### T10 Freight

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</th>
<th>Population &amp; human Health</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air</th>
<th>Climatic factors</th>
<th>Material assets</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revocation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Likely Significant Effects of Retention
Policy T10 seeks to reduce the amount of freight transported by road and move it onto rail and waterways in the West Midlands will result in lower emissions of air pollutants and greenhouse gases, contributing to improvement to human health. All other effects will be neutral given the absence of direct effects.

#### Mitigation Measures
None proposed.

#### Assumptions
None.

#### Uncertainty
None identified.

#### Likely Significant Effects of Revocation
The effects of revocation will be similar to retention due to the existence of national planning policy expressed through the National Planning Policy Framework.

Paragraph 31 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that local authorities should work with neighbouring local authorities and transport providers as illustrated to develop strategies for the provision of viable infrastructure necessary to support sustainable development, including large scale facilities such as rail fright interchanges and transport infrastructure.
## Alternative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</th>
<th>Population &amp; human Health</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air</th>
<th>Climatic factors</th>
<th>Material assets</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Commentary

- Investment necessary to support strategies for the growth of inland ports, airports or other major generators of travel and freight movement demand in their areas.

#### Mitigation Measures

None proposed.

#### Assumptions

- It is assumed that local planning and transport authorities will cooperate through the Duty to Cooperate to deliver positive outcomes, such as the sustainable development of freight interchanges and the onward sustainable movement of freight.

#### Uncertainty

None identified.
## Comment 11: Airports

**Likely Significant Effects of Retention**

Policy T11 identifies Birmingham International Airport as the region’s principal international airport and Coventry Airport, as primarily a freight airport, complementing Birmingham International Airport. There are likely to be benefits to the population through regeneration of the wider West Midlands region which Birmingham Airport helps to underpin as an International Airport. However, despite efforts to promote public transport-based access to the region’s airports, negative impacts on air quality and climate factors are likely due to the impacts of air travel. All other effects will depend on the location and type of provision of infrastructure to support the region’s airports in the future.

**Mitigation Measures**

None proposed.

**Assumptions**

Planning of airports will be governed by national policy set out in the National Planning Policy Framework in particular paragraph 33, in the absence of specific national policy statements, dealing with the air industry. It is also assumed that local planning and transport authorities will operate under the Duty to Co-operate to deliver positive outcomes, relating to the development of airports and air fields in their local authority areas.

**Uncertainty**

None identified.
Future development at, and related to, these airports will continue to be driven by evolving national aviation policy / strategy which is still as set out in the 2003 Aviation White Paper (until it is replaced) and commercial operators decisions with or without the regional strategy. The relevant local authorities will decide what policies are appropriate to support the airports (e.g. housing for employees) informed by local needs and national policies on sustainable development.

When planning for ports, airports and airfields that are not subject to a separate national policy statement paragraph 33 of the NPPF states that 'plans should take account of their growth and role in serving business, leisure, training and emergency service needs.' Plans are to take into account this Framework, as well as the principles set out in the relevant national policy statements and the Government Framework for UK Aviation. Paragraph 34 adds that plans and decisions should ensure development that generate significant movement are located where the need to travel will be minimised and the use of sustainable transport modes can be maximised. Similar effects to retention of the policy are considered likely.

The revocation of the regional policy is likely to result in similar environmental effects to retention.

**Likely Significant Effects of Revocation**

Paragraphs 29-41 of the National Planning Policy Framework promote sustainable transport. Paragraph 33 goes on to state that when planning for airports and airfields that are not subject to a separate national policy statement, plans should take account of their growth.

**Mitigation Measures**

None proposed.

**Assumptions**

As above.
### Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of West Midlands Regional Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</th>
<th>Population &amp; human Health</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air</th>
<th>Climatic factors</th>
<th>Material assets</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Uncertainty**

None identified.
### T12: Priorities for Investment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</th>
<th>Population &amp; human Health</th>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air</th>
<th>Climatic factors</th>
<th>Material assets</th>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>L</td>
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**Commentary**

**Likely Significant Effects of Retention**

Policy T12 sets out a list of transport investment priorities and the supporting text states that the list should be regularly reviewed to ensure the delivery of the transport infrastructure and services necessary to support the West Midlands regional economy. Partnership working, through the multi-agency transportation boards, identified in the supporting text is encouraged.

**Mitigation Measures**

None proposed.

**Assumptions**

It is assumed that local planning and transport authorities will co-operate through the Duty to Co-operate to deliver positive outcomes, such as the sustainable development of transport infrastructure and establish priorities for investment within the West Midlands, so as to support mobility in the region.

**Uncertainty**

As it is uncertain what schemes might emerge from the ongoing review of these investment priorities, the environmental effects are also uncertain.

**Likely Significant Effects of Revocation**

The revocation of Policy T12 as illustrated in the retention commentary box will have no
environmental impact because Policy T12 merely sets out a list of transport investment priorities and the supporting text states that the list should be regularly reviewed to ensure the delivery of the transport infrastructure and services necessary to support the West Midlands regional economy. Partnership working, through the multi-agency transportation boards, identified in the supporting text is encouraged.

**Mitigation Measures**
None proposed.

**Assumptions**
It is assumed that local planning and transport authorities will co-operate through the Duty to Co-operate to deliver positive outcomes, such as the sustainable development of transport infrastructure and establish priorities for investment within the West Midlands, so as to support mobility in the region.

**Uncertainty**
As it is uncertain what schemes might be pursued from the ongoing review of these investment priorities, the environmental effects are also uncertain.