

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of North West Regional Strategy

Score Key:	++ Significant Positive effect		+ Minor positive effect		0 No overall effect		- Minor negative effect		-- Significant negative effect	? Score uncertain
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)										

Policy DP 1 - Spatial Principles

Alternative	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	
Retention	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	<p><u>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</u></p> <p>Policy DP1 is a high level framework tying together the sustainable development principles expanded on in policies DP2-DP9. It points to more detailed policies elsewhere, but states that all principles listed may be appropriate to development management. As the principles can be used in development management they are potentially applicable straight away and will maintain significance as core strategies take them into consideration in policy development. There are significant effects with regard to population and health given explicit reference to improving the health of the region's population.</p> <p>The RES is structured around a number of themes which are Business; Skills and Education; People and Jobs; Infrastructure; Quality of Life. Within these themes are a concern for the protection and enhancement of the environment. As such they represent a broad approach to sustainable development similar to that represented by Policy DP1.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measure</u></p> <p>None proposed.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u></p> <p>None.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of North West Regional Strategy

Alternative	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	
	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	<p><u>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</u></p> <p>The RSS principles set out a regional approach to sustainable development. Sustainable development is the overarching principle behind the NPPF and as such the effects of revocation are considered to be the same as for retention. The NPPF defines sustainable development by reference to twelve planning principles and the policies in paragraphs 18 to 219, taken as a whole, constitute the Government's view of what sustainable development in England means in practice for the planning system.</p> <p>The principles and policies set out in the paragraphs referenced above reference similar topics to those set out within Policy DP1 such as economic development, conserving and enhancing the natural environment, managing patterns of growth, mitigating and adapting to climate change and supporting thriving rural communities amongst others. Furthermore specific sections within the NPPF provide additional policy guidance reflecting Policy DP1 such that the policy reference to promoting sustainable economic development is reflected within paragraphs 18-22 (Building a strong competitive economy), promoting sustainable communities is supported in paragraphs 47-55 (delivering a wide choice of high quality homes) and paragraphs 69-78 (Promoting healthy communities). Support for policy objectives such as mitigating climate change is found in NPPF paragraphs 93-108 and for marrying opportunity and need within paragraphs concerned with economic development, housing delivery and minerals provision. The NPPF is also a material consideration for development management, hence the timeframe for effects is the same also.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p> <p>None proposed.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u></p> <p>None.</p>

Policy DP 2 – Promote Sustainable Communities

Alternative	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	
Retention	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>Policy DP2 sets out a series of principles for the promotion of sustainable communities and states that building sustainable communities is a regional priority in both urban and rural areas. The policy also includes reference to the Housing Market Renewal Areas (HMRs). It is therefore assumed that Core Strategies will have to put into place a policy framework which meets this regional priority. Reference is made to addressing the regional inequalities in health with consequential population and health benefits. The policy references improvement to the built and natural environment, promoting recreation and protecting communities for flood risk.</p> <p>Under the Theme of Housing the RES provides support to this policy 87 by seeking to set Housing Market Renewal (HMR) within a strong economic context and ensure key strategies & investment plans align with HMR priorities. Whilst HMRs have ended, under both the retention and revocation options the Duty to Cooperate will enable local authorities of Oldham-Rochdale, Manchester-Salford for example to continue to operate to resolve issues of housing market failure which extend across boundaries.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures None proposed.</p> <p>Assumptions None.</p> <p>Uncertainty None.</p>
Revocation	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the objective of achieving sustainable development (as set out in section 39(3) in the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004). . Specific reference is made in the NPPF to the five 'guiding principles' of sustainable development set out in the UK Sustainable Development Strategy Securing the Future. These are: living within the planet's environmental limits; ensuring a strong, healthy and just society; achieving a sustainable</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of North West Regional Strategy

Alternative	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	
																												<p>economy, promoting good governance; and using sound science responsibly. The delivery of good governance and a strong, healthy and just society in particular supports the Policy intention of promoting sustainable communities.</p> <p>The NPPF supports development that is sustainable and there are considered to be no differences between the implications of retention or revocation. Policy guidance within the NPPF which reflects Policy DP2 includes reference to support for market and affordable housing (paragraph 47), specific support for housing to support identified rural needs (paragraph 54 and 55) a requirement for good, inclusive design (paragraph 56 and 57) and the promotion of healthy communities (paragraph 69).</p> <p>Whilst the HMR programme has ended, the duty to cooperate provides a format for Councils to continue to operate in partnership.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p> <p>None proposed.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u></p> <p>None.</p>

Policy DP 3 - Promote Sustainable Economic Development

Alternative	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	
Retention	0	0	0	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>DP3 establishes that it is fundamental principle of the Regional Strategy to seek to improve productivity, and to close the gap in economic performance between the North West and other parts of the UK as well as communities within the region.</p> <p>DP3 supports sustainable economic growth and reductions in economic, environmental, education, health inequalities between different parts of the North West, within the sub-regions, and at local level.</p> <p>The RES Vision also supports a sustainable economy supporting the development of skills for those who are looking to take advantage of employment opportunities (Action 31). It also sets out to deliver intensive support for those groups with low employment rates (Action 44) and develop job brokerage to link employers with vacancies and workless individuals (Action 45).</p> <p>As with policies DP1 and DP2, DP3 is a high level policy setting a framework for the other policies in the Strategy. As with the earlier policies the impact on outcomes is likely to be limited, though the strength of the principle of reducing equalities at all levels in the region should set a philosophical framework for local planning, and, assuming it is fully implemented, would be likely to lead to social and economic benefits across the medium to long term. Unlike DPs it does not contain any reference to the environment and it is therefore considered to have a neutral effect across a range of receptors.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>None proposed.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>Definition of sustainable economy development should be clarified.</p>
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	0	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>The NPPF explicitly supports the securing of sustainable economic growth, and provides clear guidance to local authorities on achieving this. This support is found within paragraphs 7 to 9 which define what</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of North West Regional Strategy

Alternative	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	
																												<p>the government considers to be <u>the key roles</u> for sustainable development which includes an economic role and making it easier for jobs to be created in cities, towns and villages. Furthermore, support is provided for sustainable economic development at paragraph 17, bullet point three and in more detail within paragraphs 18-22 under the heading 'Building a strong, competitive economy'.</p> <p>The overarching principles of the NPPF that should underpin plan-making and decision-making include that '<i>every effort should be made objectively to identify and then meet the housing, business and other development needs of an area (paragraph 17)</i>'. Whilst the NPPF does not explicitly refer to reducing inequalities, it is reasonable to assume that when implementing this principle, together with the more detailed policies on economic growth (paragraphs 18-22 referenced above), housing delivery (paragraph 47) and healthy communities (paragraphs 69-78), the effect will be to address inequalities where they exist within individual local authority areas, and potentially sub-regionally via the duty to co-operate and other mechanisms such as LEPs.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u> None proposed.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u> None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u> Whether the inequalities between sub-regions will be addressed in the absence of an over-arching regional policy focus.</p>

Policy DP 4 - Make the Best Use of Existing Resources and Infrastructure**Policy DP 5 - Manage Travel Demand; Reduce the Need to Travel, and Increase Accessibility****Policy DP 6 - Marry Opportunity and Need**

Alternative	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	
Retention	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>Policies DP4, DP5 and DP6 are closely related, and together underpin the broad spatial goals of the RS.</p> <p>DP4 sets out that priority should be given to developments in locations consistent with the regional and sub-regional spatial frameworks set out in Chapter 5 (notably policy RDF1) and sub regional policies in Chapters 10-13; that development should follow a sequential approach prioritising development in existing buildings and previously developed land within settlements, then other suitable infill opportunities within settlements, and finally other land where this is well-located in relation to housing, jobs, other services and infrastructure; and that sustainable construction and efficiency in resource use (including reuse and recycling of materials) should be promoted.</p> <p>DP5 sets out broad transport goals that marry with the spatial approach of DP4. DP5 states that development should be located so as to reduce the need to travel, especially by car; that sustainable travel provision, particularly by public transport, between homes and employment and a range of services and facilities should influence locational choices and investment decisions; that major growth should, as far as possible, be located in urban areas where strategic networks connect and public transport is well provided; that all new development should be accessible by public transport, walking and cycling; that in rural areas accessibility by public transport should also be a key consideration in providing services and locating new development, and that an integrated approach to managing travel demand should be encouraged, and road safety improved.</p> <p>DP6 sets out that priority should be given, in locational choices and investment decisions, to linking areas of economic opportunity with areas in greatest need of economic, social and physical, restructuring and regeneration, particularly by public transport.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of North West Regional Strategy

Alternative	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	
																												<p>DP policies are supported by the RES which seeks to maximise the use of existing infrastructure, promoting increased use of public transport and reducing peak traffic volumes. With regard to marrying opportunity and need it seeks under Action 52 to encourage employment creation in or near deprived areas.</p> <p>The overall effect of these policies is to focus development in the largest urban areas first, taking advantage of existing infrastructure as far as possible, with priority for development generally lessening with increasing rurality. This approach to development is likely to lead to benefits in the medium to long term over other approaches to development by maximising the efficiency of the use of existing land, transport, water etc, with benefits in a number of topic areas. The linking of areas of economic opportunity with areas in greatest need of regeneration also brings economic and social benefits to residents. Impact in the short term are less significant, as it depends greatly on plans being in place which reflect the policies in the Strategy. At the present time there are 16 out of 40 local authorities (including former local authorities) with plans in conformity with the North West of England Plan..</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u> None proposed.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u> The quantum of development is established through other policies, so it is assumed that this would take place in any case. It is also assumed that other policies in the Regional Strategy on protection for landscape and cultural heritage result in no impact in these areas irrespective of approach.</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u> None.</p>
Revocation	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	+	+	<p><u>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</u></p> <p>Revoking the strategy will enable local authorities to work together, in accordance with the duty to co-operate set out in the NPPF and as required under the Localism Act, to determine their own strategic development needs (paragraph 14 of the NPPF states that local planning authorities should positively seek opportunities to meet the development needs of their areas). As part of this, authorities will need to assess available evidence to determine what those priorities should be, including the evidence base underpinning the regional strategy. The NPPF requires authorities to assess and plan for meeting their needs, and it is therefore reasonable to assume that the level of development will be broadly similar. This will take some time, making it likely that the benefits of a strategic approach will take longer to come through.</p> <p>It is difficult to assess with certainty what the results of the strategic needs assessment will be, and how</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of North West Regional Strategy

Alternative	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	
																												<p>authorities will work across boundaries to deliver strategic priorities. The assessment assumes that residential development continues to be focussed on the major centres, but, based on the assumption that developers will seek to maximise the potential of more attractive market locations, that more of the development takes place in smaller towns and villages than would have been the case were DP4 retained as some authorities decide to promote their settlements for development, rather than the main centres promoted by existing policy. Some of the benefits which arise from resource savings under DP4 do not therefore arise unless a strategic approach is put in place by authorities (or groups of authorities using the duty to co-operate) which is unlikely to be delivered until the medium term. .</p> <p>The NPPF provides clear guidance on the promotion of sustainable transport (paragraph 29-41), requiring local plans to protect and exploit opportunities for the use of sustainable transport modes for the movement of people or goods (paragraph 35), and that plans or decisions should ensure that developments that generate significant movement are located where the need to travel will be minimised and the use of sustainable transport modes can be maximised (paragraph 34). Whilst these policies provide more flexibility than those in the RS in terms of the location of development, it is reasonable to assume that the NPPF policies on sustainable transport, properly implemented, make it unlikely that the revocation of DP5 will have a significant impact. The NPPF also provides support for the re-use of buildings and encourages changes in use from commercial to residential (paragraph 51) which can promote the acceptable re-use of historic buildings.</p> <p>The NPPF does not provide a direct replacement for Policy DP6. It is reasonable to assume that local authorities will seek to maximise the opportunities for development in their areas, and where an area is identified as needing regeneration and seek the best opportunities to achieve this. Furthermore the statutory duty to cooperate provides authorities with encouragement to work with other authorities to the same end and paragraph 156 of the NPPF sets out the five areas for which council's should set out strategic priorities. Because the goal in DP6 of marrying opportunity and need is not explicitly contained within the bullet points set out under paragraph 156 of the NPPF, the benefits of this approach are slightly less than if the policy were to be retained.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p> <p>None proposed.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>This assessment assumes that the quantum of development is similar for both alternatives, and whilst</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of North West Regional Strategy

Alternative	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	
																											<p>the overall patterns of development are likely to be similar, under the revocation alternative there is more development in smaller towns and villages than would have been the case had the policy been retained.</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u></p> <p>None.</p>	

Policy DP 7 - Promote Environmental Quality

Alternative	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	
Retention	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>DP7 sets out high level policy on promoting environmental quality, which should be protected and enhanced. DP7 sets out a range of measures by which this should be achieved, such as the protection and enhancement of the historic environment, promoting good quality design in new development, reclaiming derelict land and remediating contaminated land, maximising opportunities for the regeneration of derelict or dilapidated areas, promoting policies relating to green infrastructure and the greening of towns and cities, maintaining and enhancing the tranquillity of open countryside and rural areas and the quantity and quality of biodiversity and habitat including water and water quality. Mitigating the impacts of road traffic on health is considered a significant benefit resulting in significance for both population and health.</p> <p>This policy is likely to have an effect, increasing as the number of plans are adopted within the region. It is therefore unlikely to have a significant short term effect, but in the medium and long term will have benefits in a range of topic areas.</p> <p>The RES recognises the importance of a high quality environment to the economy. Under its 'Conditions for Sustainable Growth' it aims to invest in quality public realm, greenspace and environmental quality (Action 119).</p> <p>Mitigation Measures None proposed.</p> <p>Assumptions None.</p> <p>Uncertainty None.</p>
Revocation	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>Section 11 of the NPPF provides clear and robust policies on protection and enhancement of the natural environment which in most cases match or improve in the policies set out in DP7.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of North West Regional Strategy

Alternative	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	
																												<p>Paragraphs 117 and 118 provide powerful protection for biodiversity. Paragraphs 123 and 125 seek to mitigate the impact on health arising from new development, including achieving EU and national air quality policies and targets. Paragraph 112 seeks to ensure that where agricultural land is required for development, the land of lowest quality is preferred for development.</p> <p>Section 11 does not directly address bullet 6 of DP7, but it is reasonable to assume the local authorities, when assessing and addressing the needs of their areas, will seek to maximise opportunities for regeneration.</p> <p>Section 12 of the NPPF provides detailed policy on the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment. A significant level of advice is provided with regard to development management, hence significant effects are identified in a shorter timescale than in comparison to some other receptors.</p> <p>Whilst the NPPF does not directly require an assessment of the impact of managing traffic growth, as per bullet 7 of DP7, it is reasonable to assume that the requirements of paragraph 123 of the NPPF could not be properly implemented without such an assessment.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p> <p>None proposed.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u></p> <p>None.</p>

Policy DP 8 – Mainstreaming Rural Issues

Alternative	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	
Retention	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>DP8 sets out a high level policy on the mainstreaming of rural issues. The rural areas of the North West should be considered in a way which is integrated with other decision making, and not seen as a separate topic. Plans and strategies should acknowledge the particular problems faced by rural areas, and respond to spatial variations in rural need and opportunities. This policy sets out a framing principle which does not have a direct bearing on planning decisions, and therefore has no direct impact. Indirect support to communities in rural areas however. Policies relating to specific rural areas are set out and assessed in the sub-regional policies below.</p> <p>Policy is also supported by RES Action 4 which is to improve support to business including those in the rural areas of the region.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>None proposed.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>None.</p>
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	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>One Core Planning Principle of the NPPF is to support thriving rural communities (paragraph 17). This is a similar over-arching commitment to that set out within Policy DP8. With regard to the economic support provided within the RES, the NPPF supports the development of a strong, competitive economy (paragraph 28). The Cumbria Local Economic Partnership has a focus upon rural areas and includes a</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of North West Regional Strategy

Alternative	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	
																											sector group addressing agriculture. <u>Mitigation Measures</u> None proposed. <u>Assumptions</u> None. <u>Uncertainty</u> None.	

Policy DP 9 - Reduce Emissions and Adapt to Climate Change

Alternative	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	
Retention	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	<p><u>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</u></p> <p>DP9 states that, as an urgent regional priority, plans, strategies, proposals, schemes and investment decisions should contribute to reductions in the Region's carbon dioxide emissions from all sources, including energy generation and supply, buildings and transport in line with national targets to reduce emissions to 60% below 1990 levels by 2050. They should in particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> take into account future changes to national targets for carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gas emissions; identify, assess and apply measures to ensure effective adaptation to likely environmental, social and economic impacts of climate change. <p>RES recognises also the threats posed by climate change and supports under Action 24 the development and implementation of a regional Climate Change Action Plan.</p> <p>Local authorities, when drawing up plans or taking decisions, are under a duty take account of the need to mitigate and adapt to climate change. This includes having regard to the UK targets for reducing emissions set out in the Climate Change Act 2008, and the recommendations of the Committee on Climate Change. Policy DP9 is therefore significant especially when applied in conjunction with these other plans, programmes and legislation. Effects are considered to be delivered quickly due to the reference to the 'urgent priority' with which this policy is to be implemented.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p> <p>None proposed.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u></p> <p>None.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of North West Regional Strategy

Alternative	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	
Revocation	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	<p><u>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</u></p> <p>DP9 includes a number of suggestions for reducing carbon emissions. The sustainable development measures set out in the NPPF, and particularly those in the section on climate change, flooding and coastal change, set out a series of requirements which provide a stronger framework for the mitigation of climate change impacts than offered by Policy DP9. Paragraph 99 of the NPPF states that local plans should take account of climate change over the longer term, including factors such as flood risk, coastal change, water supply and changes to biodiversity and landscape. New development should be planned to avoid increased vulnerability to the range of impacts arising from climate change. When new development is brought forward in areas which are vulnerable, care should be taken to ensure that risks can be managed through suitable adaptation measures, including through the planning of green infrastructure.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p> <p>None proposed.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u></p> <p>None.</p>

Policy RDF 1 - Spatial Priorities

Alternative	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	
Retention	?	?	?	+	+	+	+	+	+	?	?	?	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	?	?	?	+	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>The regional spatial priorities are to concentrate development within the regional centres of Manchester and Liverpool, followed by second, third and fourth tier centres. This concentration approach to development ensures that benefits are placed in those locations most accessible to the greater number of people. Concentration also prevents urban expansion which delivers indirect benefits to the landscape receptor in particular and also, potentially biodiversity by focusing development away from greenfield. However brownfield sites themselves can have biodiversity importance hence an assessment of uncertainty when considered in isolation of other policies. Centres do include areas of significant historic value and effects upon historic areas resulting from new development could be uncertain depending upon the extent to which they may affect setting. Some major centres have infrastructure issues surrounding water treatment and supply and it will be necessary for development to be phased with infrastructure provision. Development would therefore have to take place in conjunction with other RS policies that seek phased infrastructure development. Air quality within the region's main centres is poor in some locations and this may be exacerbated by substantial levels of development particularly as there is no specific RS policy concerned with air quality.</p> <p>A concentrated approach to development should maximise opportunities to use sustainable transport modes, ensure development is in the most accessible locations and promote opportunities for community heating systems. Furthermore it has the potential to support the more efficient use of materials and recycling of waste over a more dispersed approach. The assessment therefore concludes minor positive for climate and material assets.</p> <p>The RES recognises the importance of the regional centres specifically under Action 54 which seeks to capitalise on the strengths and assets of Manchester, Liverpool and Preston as drivers of city-regional growth. It also supports complementary development in other centres such as business start-up and survival in Barrow, Blackpool, Knowsley, St Helens and Wirral which is complementary to this policy.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of North West Regional Strategy

Alternative	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	
																												<p>Implementation alongside the environmental protection policies contained within North West of England Plan. Development in or close to AQMAs should not lead to increases in emissions.</p> <p>Assumptions None.</p> <p>Uncertainty Biodiversity, water and cultural heritage dependant upon the location of individual sites, their importance as habitats and the capacity of infrastructure.</p>
Revocation	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	?	?	?	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	?	?	?	+	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>The NPPF does not provide for any explicit locational policy concerning main centres. It states however that planning policies should aim for a balance of land uses within their areas in order to encourage people to minimise journey lengths (paragraph 37) and advises that large scale residential development where practical should be in walking distance of key facilities (paragraph 38). Locational advice is also provided for the siting of town centre uses (paragraphs 24-27). Often the locations indicated by the NPPF will correspond with the region's main centres, particularly the key centres of Manchester and Liverpool. The NPPF also continues to support the use of brownfield land for development but recognises that some may have high environmental value, leading to minor positive effects for biodiversity.</p> <p>Duty to co-operate should ensure that councils engage with one another and future sub-regional strategies may follow an approach similar to The Greater Manchester Strategy which recognises the importance of the City Centre and the implementation of this document would continue post revocation for example. Effects are therefore considered to be similar but in some instances slightly less significant based upon the lack of an explicit direction to prioritise regional centres within the NPPF.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>That local planning authorities take into consideration paragraph 120 of the NPPF that the effects of pollution upon health should be taken into consideration when considering development.</p> <p>Assumptions None.</p> <p>Uncertainty Water and cultural heritage because effects depend upon the phasing of infrastructure and the extent to</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of North West Regional Strategy

Alternative	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	
																											which development may take place in historic areas.	

Policy RDF 2 - Rural Areas

Alternative	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	
Retention	?	?	?	0	+	+	0	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	0	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	0	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>Policy RDF2 sets out the Plan priorities for rural areas, including supporting sustainable farming and food, ensuring fair access to services for rural communities and enhancing the value of the rural environmental inheritance.</p> <p>It aims to concentrate rural development around key service centres and local service centres, which should act as hubs for the provision of services, facilities and public transport. These will be defined in local development frameworks.</p> <p>In remoter rural areas more innovative and flexible solutions to meet particular development needs should be implemented, to achieve more equitable access to housing, services, education, healthcare and employment and a more diverse economic base, whilst maintaining support for agriculture and tourism. Reference to 'access to health' results in a significant score when considered against the Human Health receptor.</p> <p>New development would be permitted in the open countryside only in limited circumstances.</p> <p>The benefits of retaining this policy are most significant in respect of population by improving the economic potential of rural areas and improving access to affordable housing and key services. The progressively more stringent restrictions on development as rurality increases is likely to result in less development overall than would have been the case in the absence of this policy, with medium to long term benefits to climatic factors and landscape.</p> <p>Impacts upon biodiversity and soil are dependant upon the actual locations identified within land-use allocation DPDs.</p> <p>The RES references support to businesses in the rural economy and provides support to the Regional Rural Delivery Framework. The Lake District Economic Futures Policy Statement is also to be implemented under Action 114.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of North West Regional Strategy

Alternative	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	
																												<p>None proposed.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>Environmental effects will be dependent upon the actual location and quantum of development , which is defined by other RS policies.</p>
Revocation	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>The NPPF provides clear guidance on supporting a rural economy (paragraph 28), and on the provision of housing in rural areas supporting sustainable development including the vitality of rural communities (paragraphs 54 to 55). This is supported by the Defra Rural Development Programme for England, which supports aims to develop the connections between agricultural and economic development, environmental stewardship and community sustainability.</p> <p>Beyond this, it will be for local authorities, based on an assessment of need in their areas, and working together where appropriate, to determine how the particular needs of their rural communities should be supported. Meeting these needs could result in more land being used for development than would have been the case if RDF2 were retained but this would depend upon being supported by evidence. This could bring benefits to population, but negative effects on climatic factors and potentially landscape in the medium to long term, hence uncertain. However, the preference contained in the NPPF for development that protects soils and minimises impacts upon biodiversity (paragraph 109) should maintain existing biodiversity and soil conditions.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>None proposed.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>Additional uncertainty over the retention option dependant upon the amount of development proposed by authorities in rural areas which may lead to a more dispersed approach generating more emissions to atmosphere as a result of traffic (climate factors) and may lead to development on greenfield which could potentially affect the landscape.</p>

Policy RDF 3 - The Coast

Alternative	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	
Retention	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	0	+	+	<p><u>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</u></p> <p>Policy RDF3 sets out the non-spatial priorities to enhance the economic importance of the coast and the regeneration of coastal communities in ways that safeguard, restore or enhance and make sustainable use of the natural, built and cultural heritage assets of the North West coast and address issues of environmental and socio-economic decline.</p> <p>Whilst this policy is set at a high level, once reflected in local plans, policies aimed at enhancing the economy and regenerating the developed coast with a particular view to attracting inward investment and tourism is likely to lead to economic and social benefits to the population. The enhancement of the developed coast, alongside policies aimed at conserving and enhancing the undeveloped coast and protecting inter-tidal waters and estuaries; protecting historic assets are likely to bring improvements to landscape, water, cultural heritage and biodiversity as plans are adopted.</p> <p>The RES provides indirect support to this policy through actions to grow the Port of Liverpool and coastal towns such as Southport which would promote the economic diversification of these settlements supported by this regional strategy policy. The RES also promotes the tourism offer of the coast and in addition references regional parks which include the North West coastline.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p> <p>It is assumed that any coastal development will be subject to policies in the North West of England Plan aimed at climate change adaptation, including flood risk and coastal change.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u></p> <p>None.</p>
Revocation	+	+	+	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	0	+	+	<p><u>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</u></p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of North West Regional Strategy

Alternative	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	
																												<p>The NPPF does not provide explicit guidance on the development needs of coastal areas other than in the context of flooding and coastal change. The NPPF requires local authorities to assess and address the development needs of their areas, and this will necessarily apply to coastal areas as to any other area.</p> <p>Authorities will therefore need to respond to the environmental and economic development needs of coastal areas, and it is therefore reasonable to assume that a certain quantum of development will take place to improve economic performance and provide for additional homes as necessary. It is therefore reasonable to expect medium to long term benefits to population and human health, but that this will not be of a very significant order. Other policies in the NPPF on conserving and enhancing biodiversity (as set out above) are likely to lead to immediate benefits to biodiversity whilst generic protectionist policy for cultural heritage and townscape (landscape) should ensure that effects post revocation are similar to retention. Paragraph 114 of the NPPF states that local authorities through their local plans should maintain the character of the undeveloped coast, protecting and enhancing its distinctive landscapes, particularly in areas defined as Heritage Coast, and improve public access to and enjoyment of the coast.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p> <p>None proposed.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>That other impacts are likely to be mitigated by other policy contained within the NPPF, however assessed as neutral as not specifically linked to any coastal policy guidance.</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u></p> <p>None.</p>

Policy RDF 4 - Green Belts

Alternative	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		
Retention	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	?	<p><u>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</u></p> <p>The policy maintains the strategic Green Belt across the region but identifies local areas where review of the boundaries may be necessary. RDF4 allows for revisions to Local Plans should it be necessary to accommodate the development of Manchester Airport and Liverpool John Lennon Airport; and an inter-modal freight terminal at Newton-Le-Willows.</p> <p>Maintaining the Green Belt at the strategic level will provide benefits across the SEA criteria. In areas of review, subject to the outcome of the review there could be some localised negative effects as development may come forward. However this would be subject to the local plan process and so it likely to be in the longer term. Maintaining the Green Belt should protect landscape quality.</p> <p>Minerals development is not precluded from the Green Belt.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p> <p>None proposed.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u></p> <p>Potential long-term uncertainty for landscape dependant upon whether local authorities undertake a review of Green belt boundaries.</p>
Revocation	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	?	<p><u>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</u></p> <p>The NPPF contains strong policies to protect for Green Belt land, which marry well with the protections provided by policy RDF4.</p> <p>RDF4 allows for revisions to Local Plans should it be necessary to accommodate the development of</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of North West Regional Strategy

Alternative	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	
																												<p>Manchester Airport and Liverpool John Lennon Airport; and an inter-modal freight terminal at Newton-Le-Willows. The NPPF provides policy advice on Green Belts in paragraphs 79-92. It states that once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of a local plan. The requirement for a review of plans in both cases makes it highly unlikely that the revocation of policy RDF4 will have a significant different impact from its retention.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p> <p>None proposed.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u></p> <p>Potential for uncertainty in the long term upon landscape depending upon whether local authorities decide to review boundaries.</p>

Policy W 1 - Strengthening the Regional Economy

Alternative	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	
Retention	?	?	?	0	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	?	?	?	?	?	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>Policy W1 sets out the key priorities for strengthening the economy of the North West region, (mainly around the main cities of Liverpool, Manchester and Central Lancashire), increasing prosperity at Carlisle and Lancaster; economic regeneration in Barrow-in-Furness, and West Cumbria (Workington and Whitehaven). Support is given to the diversification and development of the rural economy through the growth of existing businesses and the creation of new enterprise, prospects for growth in tourism, food and energy sectors should be developed. W1 also acknowledges the importance of the region's transport networks in achieving the aims of the overall policy, and supports growth in the service sector and an improvement in the region's skills base.</p> <p>Much of the benefit from W1 is to people, who benefit from economic diversification and growth, as well as enhanced skills. The policy makes explicit reference to the Housing policies L2 to L5 which set out housing numbers for the region. Impacts accrue across a number of SEA topics because the development envisaged by the policy or by explicit policy reference to the housing policies will require additional land and materials, will affect air quality and emissions, and require additional water to be provided over baseline conditions. W1 is closely related to policies W3 and W4, the impacts of which are captured here.</p> <p>The policy is supported by a range of RES Actions which include the development of higher value added sectors within the regional economy examples including biomedical, advanced engineering and tourism under RES Actions 8-10. Other Actions include the implementation of the North West Science Strategy with its support for science clusters.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>None proposed.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of North West Regional Strategy

Alternative	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	
																												<u>Uncertainty</u> Effects upon biodiversity, cultural heritage and landscape will be localised and site specific.
Revocation	?	?	?	0	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	?	?	?	?	?	?	<u>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</u> <p>Policy W1 contains high level policy direction which seeks to ensure that plans take account of the need to build on the strengths of the City Regions, and take advantage of opportunities for sustainable development and regeneration elsewhere.</p> <p>The NPPF places significant weight on the need to support economic growth through the planning system, and requires (at paragraph 21) that local authorities, when drawing up local plans:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • set out a clear economic vision; • set criteria, or identify strategic sites, for local and inward strategic investment; • support existing business sectors and where possible and plan for new or emerging sectors; • plan positively for the location, promotion and expansion of clusters or networks of knowledge driven, creative or high technology industries; • identify priority areas for economic regeneration, infrastructure provision and environmental enhancement; • facilitate flexible working practices. <p>In addition the NPPF also identifies a policy requirement to support a prosperous rural economy at paragraph 28. Taken together it is unlikely that the revocation of this policy will have a significantly different effect from retention.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p> <p>None proposed.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u></p> <p>Effects upon biodiversity, cultural heritage and landscape will be localised and site specific.</p>

Policy W 2 – Locations for Regionally Significant Economic Development

Alternative	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	
Retention	?	?	?	+	+	+	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	-	-	-	?	?	?	?	?	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>Policy W2 provides a framework for the location of employment sites in the North West, taking account of RDF1 and DP1-9 policies.</p> <p>The policy states that regionally significant economic development will be located close to sustainable transport nodes within the urban areas of Manchester, Liverpool and Central Lancashire city regions and Lancaster, Carlisle, Barrow-in-Furness and Workington and Whitehaven.</p> <p>Sites for development should be highly accessible, well related to areas of worklessness or in need of regeneration.</p> <p>Sites for regionally significant office development should be located in accordance with the sequential approach in PPS6.</p> <p>Sites for regionally significant knowledge-based services may also be clustered close to universities, major hospitals or other research establishments, with related manufacturing well connected to these facilities by transport and ICT links.</p> <p>Sites for regionally significant logistics and high-volume manufacturing should be well connected to the primary freight transport networks.</p> <p>The RES also supports the delivery of designated Strategic Regional Sites (Action 80). These sites provide a portfolio of opportunities to support knowledge-based growth, key sectors, sustainable freight distribution and economic restructuring.</p> <p>The thrust of policy W2 is that development should be located so as to maximise existing transport link and reduce the need for additional travel. This is likely to minimise the need to travel per se, and maximise sustainable transport possibilities where journeys must be made. This is likely to result in benefits in terms of air quality and fewer carbon emissions particularly over a more dispersed approach to development, although at the local level, particularly as the inner urban areas often include areas of poorest air quality localised negative effects will apply. Locating development sites close to areas of worklessness or in need of regeneration should bring about social and economic improvements for</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of North West Regional Strategy

Alternative	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	
																												<p>residents of those areas.</p> <p>For many of the SEA topic areas the effects are dependent upon the sensitivities of individual sites The effects on soils is assessed as positive given the urban bias and implicit encouragement to brownfield development.</p> <p>Significant development has taken place in the major urban centres since the adoption of the RS hence benefits are considered significantly positive for population over the whole timeframe.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p> <p>None proposed.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>That the quantum of development is established through other policies in the Regional Strategy, and therefore remains the same irrespective of policy W2.</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u></p> <p>The benefits of a centralised approach to development, benefiting from sustainable transport would be positive for air quality and climate change across the region although this is off-set by the potentially negative effects which could be felt in some localised areas (such as the inner urban cores of the regional centres) As such the conclusion is that the policy has uncertain effects upon the site specific receptors (biodiversity, water, cultural heritage and landscape).</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of North West Regional Strategy

Alternative	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	
Revocation	?	?	?	+	+	+	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	-	-	-	?	?	?	?	?	?	<p><u>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</u></p> <p>Policy W2 contains high level policy which aims to direct the location of regionally significant economic development. The key thrust of the policy is that development should be accessible, in terms of transport, links with related institutions, and links to areas of economic opportunity and need.</p> <p>The NPPF provides high level policy support for this. One of the core planning principles set out in paragraph 17 of the NPPF is that patterns of growth should be actively managed 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. Further policy advice is provided within the NPPF paragraphs 18 to 22.</p> <p>Paragraph 34 of the NPPF states that plans and decisions should ensure developments that generate significant movement are located where the need to travel will be minimised and the use of sustainable transport modes can be maximised. Paragraph 35 states that plans should protect and exploit opportunities for the use of sustainable transport modes for the movement of goods or people. The NPPF does not employ a sequential approach to development, other than for retail, although it continues to support town centres as the heart of communities.</p> <p>It is reasonable to assume that, fully implemented, these policies will have a similar profile of benefits in terms of air quality and carbon emissions as Policy W2.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p> <p>None proposed.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>As above.</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u></p> <p>The benefits of an approach to development which promotes accessibility, benefiting from sustainable transport modes, would be positive for air quality and climate change across the region although this is off-set by the potentially negative effects which could be felt in some localised areas (such as the inner urban cores of the regional centres) As such the conclusion is that the policy has uncertain effects upon the site specific receptors (biodiversity, water, cultural heritage and landscape).</p>

Policy W 3 - Supply of Employment Land**Policy W 4 - Release of Allocated Employment Land**

Alternative	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	
Retention	?	?	?	+	+	+	0	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	?	?	?	0	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>Aims to secure the supply of employment land, for significant economic development, sub-regional and local sites, focussing on allocations for B1, B2 and B8 land use. W3 sets out the quantity of employment land likely to be needed up to 2021, envisaging the need for an additional 1179 hectares of employment land in that period above the amount allocated at 2005 (5475ha).</p> <p>W3 is not spatial. The criteria governing the location of sites is assessed in policy W2, and the impact of the additional land take in W1. Policy W3 does not have any impact independent of these.</p> <p>Policy W4 sets out the principles guiding the release of allocated employment sites for other uses, in particular housing and retail development.</p> <p>Policy W4 states that where sites are to be de-allocated in plans and strategies, consideration should be given to a range of alternative uses, which should include housing, and soft end uses, particularly where this will contribute to the delivery of Green Infrastructure networks. The de-allocation of sites, which W3 expects to be necessary in Cheshire and Cumbria and Warrington (nearly 800ha de-allocated), is therefore likely to lead to additional green infrastructure in the region over the medium to long term with potentially limited positive effects for landscape and soil. W3 also seeks to maximise brownfield land thereby indirectly protecting soils and landscape. Biodiversity and cultural heritage is more dependent upon ensuring that green infrastructure is designed for biological enhancement (as opposed to recreational activities for example), and cultural heritage is dependent upon the location of the sites brought forward for employment use.</p> <p>Only 16 of the 40 local authorities in the region (excluding waste and minerals authorities) have plans in conformity with the North West of England Plan hence population benefits arising from potential employment provision are minor rising to significant positive.</p> <p>The RES Actions 81 and 82 require the identification of reserve sites for major investment that would</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of North West Regional Strategy

Alternative	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	
																												<p>not otherwise take place in the Northwest together with the development of a portfolio of sub-regionally important employment sites. The RES also seeks new uses for brownfield land although referencing housing and open space as opposed to employment.</p> <p>The requirement for additional land, is assumed to lead to its take-up and hence a requirement for minerals and aggregates with a corresponding negative effect upon material assets. Increases in water also required to service the new land allocations.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p> <p>RES reference to brownfield land not being potentially appropriate for employment uses to be mitigated by development with other uses such as green infrastructure and housing if this is appropriate within the context of the site.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u></p> <p>Biodiversity and cultural heritage effects depend upon the locations of allocation land, and their proximity to heritage assets, and the intended after-uses for de-allocated sites.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of North West Regional Strategy

Alternative	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	
Revocation	?	?	?	?	+	+	?	?	+	?	-	-	?	-	-	?	-	-	?	-	-	?	?	?	?	?	?	<p><u>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</u></p> <p>The NPPF provides high level policy support for the identification of sites to meet the local authority's economic vision for an area with advice set out in building a strong, competitive economy at paragraphs 18-23. The Framework also encourages the regular review of strategic site allocation, and re-allocation where there is no reasonable prospect of a site being used for the allocated employment use (paragraph 22).</p> <p>The NPPF seeks to ensure plans remain flexible and capable of responding effectively to market signals and other factors which determine how land should be used. The NPPF therefore encourages a flexible approach where sites are de-allocated. This therefore follows the approach set out in Policy W4. The uncertainty lies with the time it will take for councils to de-allocate land in Cumbria and Cheshire/Warrington particularly as in Cumbria, only Eden, Lake District National Park and South Lakeland have adopted Core Strategies, with none adopted in Cheshire and Warrington.</p> <p>The RS Policy sets out employment land targets at the County, rather than individual authority level. Those authorities that have Core Strategies in place do apportion an amount, based upon the County target for their area. However the overwhelming majority of Councils currently have no targets given that they are often operating with saved policies from a local plan which expired in or around 2006. In the short and medium terms following revocation therefore the effect will be uncertain in these 24 (out of 40) authorities without a plan in conformity with the North West of England Plan. For these authorities, the North West of England of Plan provided clarity on the quantum of development required; however, in the short and medium term following its revocation, there is likely to be a temporary period where some local authorities revert to the original local plan which as noted above is silent, or reflects an outdated position on the amount of employment land required whilst it develops a replacement.</p> <p>The majority of employment land allocations are targeted towards the three regional centres and particularly Greater Manchester, Merseyside and Lancashire. Of the three 'regional centres' Manchester has an adopted core strategy, together with Oldham, Stockport, Trafford and Bolton in Greater Manchester and the Central Lancashire Core Strategy of Preston, Chorley and S Ribble was adopted in July. There are no adopted Core Strategies in Merseyside.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p> <p>That sites are identified in accessible locations and of lower environmental quality, Council's therefore paying heed to other policy guidance within the NPPF.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of North West Regional Strategy

Alternative	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	
																												<p>Assumptions</p> <p>That Councils continue to allocate land broadly within the range of that set out within the RS.</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>The flexibility allowed by the NPPF where sites are de-allocated leads to uncertainty regarding the impacts of revoking policy W4 upon certain receptors (biodiversity, soil, cultural heritage and landscape), potentially compounded in the short to medium term by the lack of adopted core strategies that would have otherwise have de-allocated land in Cumbria, Cheshire and Warrington.</p>

Policy W 5 - Retail Development

Alternative	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	
Retention	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	+	+	0	+	+	-	-	-	?	?	?	0	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>Policy W5 promotes retail investment where this assists the regeneration and economic growth of the North West's towns and city centres.</p> <p>The policy includes a table of centres in which comparison retail facilities should be enhanced and encouraged, whilst investment of an appropriate scale in other centres is encouraged in order to maintain and enhance their vitality and viability.</p> <p>Manchester/Salford and Liverpool city centres are identified as the region's primary retail centres. This is compatible with the RES Action 54 which seeks to capitalise on the strengths and assets of Manchester, Liverpool and Preston.</p> <p>The policy seeks to restrict major new retail development to those cities and towns which are identified in the policy as regional centres and major town centres. A key purpose of the policy is to ensure that the retail sector is an important driver of the regional economy. There is a presumption against new out-of-centre regional or sub-regional comparison retailing facilities, and also a presumption against large-scale extensions to such facilities unless they are fully justified in line with the sequential approach established in PPS6.</p> <p>The key environmental effects of the policy are linked to reduced travel (particularly through opportunities for more public transport) and the benefits that this has for air quality and climatic factors. Preventing out of town development should also support the protection of the landscape and soil and be broadly supportive (indirectly) of biodiversity the effects of which manifest themselves over the medium and long term as more Core Strategies are adopted. The quantum of development identified will lead to an effect upon material assets with water being neutral providing development is phased with infrastructure.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>It is assumed that other policies in the North West of England Plan promoting an increase in the use of sustainable transport networks results in no overall increase in car usage.</p> <p>Assumptions</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of North West Regional Strategy

Alternative	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	
																												<p>None.</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>City and town centres can include historic areas and buildings. Effects upon cultural heritage are therefore likely to be site specific..</p>
Revocation	+	+	+	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	-	-	?	?	?	0	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>Paragraph 23 of the NPPF seeks to promote competitive town centres and leaves it to local planning authorities to define the extent of town centres and primary shopping areas and set policies that make clear which uses will be permitted in such locations. Paragraphs 29-41 deal with sustainable transport and seek to reduce the need to travel and make greater use of public transport. Benefits to climatic factors and air quality would be expected following revocation given the continued preference for retail development in town centre locations. Overall effects are the same as retention although timing slightly longer given the time taken for councils to adopt core strategies, and implications for reversion back to previous local plans in the short term.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>It is assumed that NPPF policies promoting an increase in the use of sustainable transport networks results in no overall increase in car usage.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>City and town centres can include historic areas and buildings. Effects upon cultural heritage are therefore likely to be site specific.</p>

Policy W 6 - Tourism and the Visitor Economy

Policy W 7 - Principles for Tourism Development

Alternative	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	
Retention	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	?	?	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>Policy W6 seeks to strengthen the tourism economy in the North West, focusing on the regeneration of Blackpool and the North West's coast, the regional centres of Manchester, Liverpool and Preston, the historic towns of Chester, Carlisle, Bolton, Birkenhead, Lancaster and Kendal, national and regional parks, and Hadrian's Wall.</p> <p>Policy W7 sets out the principles for improving the tourism offer in the North West in a sustainable manner. The RES also recognises the importance of the tourism economy to the region. Specific actions include improvements to the product associated with tourism 'attack brands' and 'signature projects', the development of Southport as a "Classic Resort".</p> <p>And implementation of a Business Tourism Strategy, to develop the quality and range of facilities within the region.</p> <p>Job creation across the region, and the regeneration of Blackpool and the coast are likely to be beneficial to the population and human health. However, increased visitor numbers are likely to have localised negative environmental impacts. W6 states that development should be of an appropriate scale and be located where the environment and infrastructure can accommodate the visitor impact and this policy safeguard is considered to be sufficient to result in neutral effects. W7 says that attractions should be accessible by a range of sustainable transport means. Overall, the focus upon existing assets and in particular assets within existing centres and settlements does support a minimisation of effects arising from tourist travel.</p> <p>Revenue generated through tourism could assist with the upkeep of some heritage assets. Effects on landscape could be either positive (e.g. visitor management strategies) or negative (e.g. erosion of footpaths, caravans etc.). The protective policies in W7 are likely to result in no adverse impact on biodiversity.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of North West Regional Strategy

Alternative	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	
																												<p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p> <p>None proposed.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u></p> <p>Facilities include Hadrian's Wall and national parks which, if accompanied by new development could lead to localised landscape effects and additional journeys by car. However policy protection is provided through an encouragement to use public transport. The localised significance of effects is dependent upon the specifics of the site and development proposals.</p>
Revocation	0	0	0	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	?	?	?	<p><u>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</u></p> <p>The NPPF contains policy supporting sustainable rural tourism and leisure developments of benefit to rural areas which respect the character of the countryside (paragraph 28), but does not provide detailed policy on sustainable development through tourism.</p> <p>However, the NPPF requires authorities to set out a clear economic vision and strategy for their area which positively and proactively encourages sustainable economic growth, and to identify priority areas for economic regeneration, infrastructure provision and environmental enhancement. It is reasonable, therefore, to expect that authorities will seek to maximise the potential benefits of sustainable tourism.</p> <p>It is also reasonable to expect that NPPF policy on conserving and enhancing the natural environment will be implemented so as to ensure such development is undertaken with respect for environmentally sensitive locations.</p> <p>It is not clear that, in the absence of policy W6, authorities will conclude that the list of locations identified in policy W6 for development remains appropriate, hence a delay in the timings of effects. Nonetheless, it can be assumed that the development of further tourist facilities would bring benefits to population and to the sites which are enhanced. The profile of effects is therefore likely to be similar as for retention.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p> <p>None proposed.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of North West Regional Strategy

Alternative	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	
																											None. <u>Uncertainty</u> Facilities include Hadrian's Wall and national parks which, if accompanied by new development could lead to localised landscape effects and additional journeys by car. However the NPPF encourages the use of sustainable modes of transport. The localised significance of the effects is dependent upon the specifics of the site and development proposals.	

Policy L 1 - Health, Sport, Recreation, Cultural and Education Services Provision

Alternative	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	
Retention	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<p><u>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</u></p> <p>Policy L1 sets out principles for ensuring appropriate provision of health, cultural, recreational, sport, education and training provision for all members of the community in the region (including older people, disabled people and the black & minority ethnic population), improving access and addressing spatial disparities in services/facilities provision.</p> <p>This high level policy is likely to lead to social and health benefits by ensuring equal access to high quality services for all members of communities.</p> <p>The policy is complemented by the RES which includes actions to develop intermediate and higher level skills and linkages to workless people. It is considered within the RES that this will also ease recruitment and congestion, as employers are currently recruiting from ever greater distances.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p> <p>None proposed.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u></p> <p>None.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of North West Regional Strategy

Alternative	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	
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	<p><u>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</u></p> <p>One of the overarching principles of the NPPF is that plans should take account of and support local strategies to improve health, social and cultural wellbeing for all, and deliver sufficient community and cultural facilities and services to meet local needs. It also provides policy support for healthy communities in paragraphs 69 to 78.</p> <p>The NPPF supports the involvement all sections of the community in the development of local plans and in planning decisions, and the provision of mixed-use developments and strong neighbourhood centres to provide opportunities for meetings between members of the community who might not otherwise come into contact with each other.</p> <p>The NPPF also provides protection for existing open space, sports and recreational buildings and land, including playing fields as set out in paragraphs 73 and 74.</p> <p>It is concluded that, properly implemented, the policies in the NPPF match the objectives of Policy L1.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p> <p>None proposed.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u></p> <p>None.</p>

Policy L 2 - Understanding Housing Markets**Policy L 3 - Existing Housing Stock and Housing Renewal**

Alternative	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	
Retention	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	-	+	0	?	?	?	?	?	0	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>Policy L2 requires local authorities to develop an understanding of local and sub-regional housing markets by undertaking strategic housing market assessments.</p> <p>Policy L3 identifies a number of areas in need of housing market regeneration. It sets out the principles for managing and improving the conditions of existing housing stock in the region, focusing on market renewal/pathfinder areas and areas in need of housing regeneration/market restructuring. L3 also seeks to reduce health inequalities.</p> <p>Housing regeneration is intended to form part of a broader course of action to regenerate local communities, reduce health inequalities, improve the sustainability and resource efficiency of the housing stock and its local environmental quality and increase numbers of and access to local jobs and services. Local circumstances will dictate whether clearance, renewal and refurbishment, or a mix of these, is appropriate.</p> <p>The RES provides significant support towards regeneration in areas of housing market failure by seeking to set renewal within a strong economic context. Complementary Actions such as 52; to encourage employment creation in or near deprived areas are also supportive.</p> <p>Significant benefits are likely to arise to population in terms of improvements to health, social and economic conditions. Significant number of replacement or refurbished homes are also likely to bring benefits to climatic factors in the long term, through an improvement in the efficiency of new housing, but impacts in the short to medium term due to the impacts of the development itself. Improvements in the urban landscape are also likely and the re-use of existing stock protects the landscape outside of settlements. Negative impacts of development are likely in terms of the use of material assets used in the refurbishment of dwellings although other RS policies which support the re-use of waste may be a mitigating opportunity, hence uncertain. Also uncertain for cultural heritage given that some housing</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of North West Regional Strategy

Alternative	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	
																												<p>renewal areas have historic merit.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p> <p>None proposed.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>That the overall numbers of new homes to be delivered are established through other policies.</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u></p> <p>Housing regeneration can involve the re-use of existing properties, or their replacement. Depending upon the options chosen and the historic merit of any areas selected for demolition, uncertain for material assets and cultural heritage.</p>
Revocation	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	+	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	0	+	<p><u>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</u></p> <p>The thrust of policies L2 and L3 are that authorities should undertake strategic housing market assessments so as to fully understand the housing needs of their areas, and then respond to those needs. Where necessary, areas should be designated for regeneration, and this should form part of a broader strategy to improve inequalities and increase access to jobs and services.</p> <p>Paragraph 159 of the NPPF 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. Housing Market Assessments are already being commissioned by authorities in the region such as Wirral (2010), Cheshire East (2010) and Rochdale (2010) for example .</p> <p>Strategic Housing Market Assessments 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. This should address the need for all types of housing, including affordable housing and the needs of different groups in the community, and cater for housing demand and the scale of housing supply necessary to meet this demand.</p> <p>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 the Framework, including identifying key sites which are critical to the delivery of the housing strategy over the plan period.</p> <p>These policies are summed up in the overarching principles in paragraph 17, which states that every</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of North West Regional Strategy

Alternative	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	
																												<p>effort should be made objectively to identify and then meet the housing, business and other development needs of an area.</p> <p>Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople plot and pitch requirements are to be identified by assembling an evidence base in line with Policy A of the 'Planning policy for travellers sites' (DCLG March 2012). To date only six local planning authorities in the region have targets for provision, four of which reflect the targets identified within the unadopted Partial Review 2009. Therefore whilst it is likely that in the long term targets will be adopted by local planning authorities (Policy B requires a five year supply of sites) there is likely to be a time lag whilst the evidence base is collated.</p> <p>Whilst some of the programmes referred to in policy L3 no longer exist, local authorities are nonetheless required to assess and respond to the objectively identified needs of their areas. A wide suite of tools are available, as stated in paragraph 51 of the NPPF, such as including bringing empty homes back into use and using compulsory purchase powers where appropriate. With the policies set out in the NPPF fully implemented, therefore, the overall profile of impacts and benefits is likely to be similar. However, it is likely to take local authorities some time to absorb, plan for and implement the policies in the NPPF, and the effects of development may take longer to arise.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p> <p>None proposed.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>That a similar level of development is likely – this will depend on the outcome of strategic housing market assessments.</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u></p> <p>Housing regeneration can involve the re-use of existing properties, or their replacement. Uncertainty identified for material assets and cultural heritage which will depend upon the options chosen and the historic merit of any areas selected for demolition.</p>

Policy L 4 - Regional Housing Provision**Policy L 5 - Affordable Housing**

Alternative	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	
Retention	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	?	?	?	+	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>Policy L4 outlines the proposed housing provision for the region for 2003-2021, and the approach for monitoring and managing the availability of land to assist delivery of housing. L4 sets out a target of additional housing provision of 416,000 over the plan period 2003-2021, together with an indicative brownfield use target of 70%. These figures are then separated into specific targets for each local authority. Policy L5 identifies the number of housing required within the region, providing sub-regional apportionments.</p> <p>Only 16 of the 40 local authorities (including former authorities) in the region have plans in conformity with the North West of England Plan hence population benefits are minor rising to positive.</p> <p>The RES provides support which is complementary to the RSS Policies. Actions 85 and 86 seek to ensure that new housing provision is in locations which support wider regeneration or knowledge based economic growth, reflecting the considerable amount of housing identified by RSS policy to Manchester in particular. Policy L3 is supported by RES Action 86 which is to secure housing which is affordable to local people, in key locations, where this is critical to future growth prospects identifying in particular in areas of high economic growth such as South Manchester and Cheshire/Warrington.</p> <p>The increased provision of housing, including additional affordable housing as set out in policy L5, is likely to lead to significantly positive effects on the population and human health in the medium to long term. 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 policy is likely to have negative effects on the water resources of the region. Particular potential issues relating to water are the potentially indirect effects upon biodiversity as a result of water demand from North Wales (to supply Liverpool) and the Lake District (Manchester). Increased requirements for abstraction resulting from additional households could place these environmentally sensitive areas under stress. It is therefore critically important to</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of North West Regional Strategy

Alternative	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	
																												<p>require the phasing of development with infrastructure capacity, both water supply and water treatment. Insufficient treatment capacity can also impact upon biodiversity particularly the watercourses subject to discharge.</p> <p>The demand for construction materials and energy is likely to increase, as is traffic in the region, while the amount of waste generated is also likely to increase. These are likely to have a negative impact upon material assets (significant), air quality and climatic factors.</p> <p>The effects on cultural heritage are uncertain as they will depend on the location and nature of development whilst given the relatively high brownfield targets are likely to be positive for landscape as they reduce the requirement for greenfield sites and will encourage redevelopment of brownfield thereby supporting townscape.</p> <p>Whilst many of the additional homes are likely to be delivered in areas in need of regeneration, some greenfield land take is likely, which may have negative impacts upon soil, habitats and wildlife.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p> <p>Many of the policies in the 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, there statutory duties on organisations such as the Environment Agency and water companies to plan for and licence the necessary infrastructure in a sustainable way.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u></p> <p>The actual effects will depend on the location, nature and scale of development in different areas, linked to available transport modes and the uptake of less polluting forms of travel. In the short term, partly due to the fact that the policy is delivered through local plans, many of which are not yet in place and partly because of factors such as the current economic climate, the rate of delivery of houses is likely to be lower than provided for by the strategy and therefore the scale of the effects will be minimal in the short term.</p>
Revocation	?	?	-	?	?	+	?	?	-	?	?	-	?	?	-	?	?	-	?	?	-	?	?	?	?	?	-	<p><u>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</u></p> <p>The targets set out in the regional strategy are based on an assessment of need, and this need is</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of North West Regional Strategy

Alternative	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	
																											<p>unlikely to disappear. 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. These initiatives are intended to encourage a more positive attitude to growth and allow communities to share the benefits and mitigate the negative effects of growth.</p> <p>However, in the short and medium terms following revocation the impact will be uncertain in the 24 (out of 40) authorities in the region that do not have plans in conformity with the North West of England Plan. The remaining councils either have no explicit housing figures for the period, due to the age of their local plans or figures which fall significantly below that prescribed by the North West of England Plan. For these authorities, the Plan provided clarity on the quantum of development required; however, in the short and medium term following its revocation, there is likely to be a temporary period where some local authorities revert to the original local plan whilst it develops a replacement.</p> <p>The majority of new housing is targeted towards the three regional centres. Of the three regional centres identified as accommodating the majority of housing development Manchester and Central Lancashire (Preston, Chorley and South Ribble) have adopted Core Strategies. Manchester's Core Strategy was adopted in July 2012. Its housing figure is in line with the Regional Strategy and at over 60,000 represents a significant proportion of the regional figure (14%). Liverpool the third of the regional centres does not have an adopted Core Strategy and its adopted Local Plan does not provide for any housing post 2001 therefore there is the potential that it may revert to an approach which does not reflect the certainty provided by the Regional Strategy.</p> <p>Paragraph 159 of the NPPF states that local planning authorities should have a clear understanding of housing needs in their area. This requirement is backed up by paragraph 14 which states that local plans should meet objectively assessed needs. As a result there is a requirement 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 housing demand and the scale of housing supply necessary to meet this demand.</p> <p>Paragraphs 173- 177 of the NPPF 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</p>	

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of North West Regional Strategy

Alternative	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	
																											<p>period.</p> <p>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 the Framework, including identifying key sites which are critical to the delivery of the housing strategy over the plan period. The revocation of policy L4 does not, therefore, remove either the need for more homes, or the requirement for this need to be identified.</p> <p>In the short to medium term following revocation the impact for those local authorities that do not have a plan that was either in conformity with the Regional Strategy or which post-dates it is likely to be uncertain. For those authorities without an adopted plan, the Regional Strategy provided clarity on the quantum of development required; however, in the short term following its revocation, there is likely to be a temporary (short term) period where some local authorities revert to the original local plan whilst they develop a replacement. The amount of development anticipated in this period is likely to be lower than if the Strategy were in place.</p> <p>Much of the NPPF seeks to mitigate as far as possible adverse effects on the environment. The impacts on biodiversity are likely to be lessened by the preference set out in the NPPF for land of lowest environmental quality to be preferred for development. However this is potentially off-set by the difficulty which Water Companies may experience in attempting to understand the supply implications of individual authorities housing targets as they prepare them. Without a strategic target overview provided by the Regional Strategy, co-ordination may be more difficult for water companies and this may result in uncertainties upon biodiversity.</p> <p>With regard to landscape, the potential for additional housing numbers and the lack of a brownfield target combined with an encouragement for brownfield development where land is not of high environmental value results in the potential for landscape impacts which, depending upon individual locations, may be negative against the receptor.</p> <p>Overall, there are likely to be some short to medium term uncertainties arising from the revocation of these policies, but in the medium to long term, the effects are likely to be similar to retaining the Regional Strategy.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Measures in the NPPF as well as the requirement to meet legally binding standards for air and water pollution should provide at least the same level environmental protection as is the case with the retention of the North West of England Plan.</p>	

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of North West Regional Strategy

Alternative	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	
																												<p>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 the Strategy is revoked or retained.</p> <p>Uncertainty In the short to medium term, because of factors such as the current economic climate and the absence of a full suite of core strategies, the rate of delivery of houses is likely to be lower than provided for by the strategy and therefore the scale of the effects may be less.</p>

Policy EM 1 - Integrated Enhancement and Protection of the Region's Environmental Assets

Policy EM1 (A): Landscape

Policy EM1 (B): Natural Environment

Policy EM1 (C): Historic Environment

Policy EM1 (D): Trees, Woodlands and Forests

Alternative	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	
Retention	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>A high level strategic approach to the conservation, restoration and enhancement of environmental assets should lead to an improvement in their overall management. Benefits increase over time, reflecting the time taken for core strategies to be adopted (24 authorities in the region are still to adopt their core strategies). Fewer benefits are evident in the short term, but significant long term benefits are expected in the SEA receptors that have been identified within the assessment matrix.</p> <p>Plans clearly identify, protect, maintain and enhance natural, historic and other distinctive features that contribute to the character of landscapes and places within the North West.</p> <p>Biodiversity, geological, and geomorphological resources are increased through the delivery of national, regional and local objectives and targets.</p> <p>The historic environment in the region is protected and enhanced, leading to improvements in areas with regeneration potential which also contain historic assets.</p> <p>Tree and woodland cover increases, with indirect benefits in terms of access to countryside and carbon savings. RES is supportive of EM1(D) through Action 117 which sets out to implement the regional Forestry Strategy.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of North West Regional Strategy

Alternative	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	
																												Mitigation Measures None proposed. Assumptions Success will depend on full implementation of the strategy. Uncertainty None identified.
Revocation	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	Likely Significant Effects of Revocation Policy EM1 is in several parts. The first part sets out high level policy on the protection of the region’s environmental assets, stating that plans and strategies should define spatial objectives and priorities for conservation, restoration and enhancement [of environmental assets] as appropriate, and provide area-based guidelines to direct decisions and target resources. The NPPF places great importance on the protection of the natural environment. Paragraph 9 of the NPPF 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. EM1(A) seeks to protect landscape. Paragraph 113 of the NPPF carries forward the policy direction previously set out within 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. NPPF 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 coast, protecting and enhancing its distinctive landscapes. Paragraph 115 of the NPPF places great weight on the conservation of landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, which have the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty. National Parks and AONBs are explicitly mentioned within Policy EM1. Landscape character assessments should be prepared where appropriate (paragraph 170).

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of North West Regional Strategy

Alternative	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	
																												<p>On biodiversity, EM1(B) calls for a 'step-change' increase in the region's biodiversity resources by contributing to the delivery of national, regional and local biodiversity objectives and targets for maintaining extent, achieving condition, restoring and expanding habitats and species populations. Broad locations are identified to indicate where the greatest opportunities exist for delivering the biodiversity targets.</p> <p>A number of other areas are identified where active arrangements are needed to address ecological cross-boundary issues. The region's geological and geomorphological resources should also be protected and enhanced, including statutory and local sites by contributing to the delivery of national, regional and local geodiversity objectives and targets.</p> <p>Paragraph 109 of the NPPF 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 where possible'. Paragraph 117 states that local authorities 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, 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.</p> <p>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 EM1.</p> <p>The policies in the NPPF on protecting and enhancing the natural environment should also be understood in the wider context of the commitment in the Natural Environment White Paper to work towards a net gain in the value of nature and to assist with the delivery of green infrastructure.</p> <p>EM1(B) identifies areas where ecological cross-boundary issues need to be addressed. The revocation of this element of the policy is unlikely to have a significant effect on any action to address these, as it is a fundamental approach of the NPPF that the needs of an area should be identified and addressed. Where there is evidence of cross-boundary issues, such as that provided by the regional strategy, local authorities are expected to address these under the Duty to Co-operate.</p> <p>Policy EM1(C) links the protection, conservation and enhancement of the historic environment to the potential for exploiting the regeneration potential of certain locations with particular historic value based</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of North West Regional Strategy

Alternative	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	
																												<p>on key themes (such as the Pennine textile mill-town heritage that exists in East Lancashire and Greater Manchester, and the traditional architecture of rural villages and market towns of Cumbria, Cheshire and Lancashire).</p> <p>Paragraph 126 of the NPPF states that local planning authorities should set out in their Local Plan a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment, including heritage assets most at risk through neglect, decay or other threats. In doing, they should have regard to the wider social, cultural, economic and environmental benefits that conservation of the historic environment can bring. Given the importance of the key themes, and that the areas identified by EM1(C) are broad rather than specific, it is concluded that the NPPF links the conservation of the historic environment to the wider social, cultural, economic and environmental benefits of conservation sufficiently closely that the revocation of EM1(C) would be unlikely to have significant effects.</p> <p>EM1(D) is a high level policy which seeks to encourage a steady targeted expansion of tree and woodland cover and promote sustainable management of existing woodland resources. It supports the continued role of community forestry, and the identification and protection of ancient semi-natural woodland and veteran trees. It also supports the aims and priorities of the North West Regional Forestry Framework and sub-regional forestry strategies.</p> <p>The NPPF recognises the importance of community forests (paragraph 92), and maintains the protection for ancient woodland and aged or veteran trees previously found in PPS9 (paragraph 118). The North West Regional Forestry Framework's strategy paper 'Agenda for Growth' sets out a long term approach to significantly increasing tree planting and woodland cover in the region, which enjoys the support of a wide range of public and private organisations.</p> <p>Given all of the above, it is concluded that the revocation of EM1 is unlikely to have negative effects. Positive effects on biodiversity, flora and fauna, soil, and landscape are likely to arise due to the policy in paragraph 110 of the NPPF for plans to allocate land for development with the least environmental or amenity value, rather than slavishly preferring brownfield even where it is rich in biodiversity. Because this policy should be implemented immediately, benefits begin to arise in the short term, and carry forward indefinitely.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>None proposed.</p> <p>Assumptions</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of North West Regional Strategy

Alternative	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	
																												<p>That local planning authorities fully and faithfully implement the NPPF.</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u></p> <p>None identified.</p>

Policy EM 2 - Remediating Contaminated Land

Alternative	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	
Retention	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>Schemes for remediating contaminated land adopt more sustainable technologies than at present, improving the overall effectiveness of remediation and potentially reducing carbon impacts over and above traditional approaches to remediation. The policy also indirectly supports soil and water (remediation of contamination) and references natural greenspace, habitat and landscape creation which suggests positive for landscape and biodiversity.</p> <p>RES is also supportive of the re-use of brownfield land through Action 117 which supports new uses for brownfield land – including housing and the creation of new strategic greenspace.</p> <p>Impacts begin in the short term as programmes such as NWDA funded REMADE were underway at the time of the Regional Strategy adoption and they run through to the long term due to the retention of the policy which would continue to provide a framework to support future remediation initiatives.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>None proposed.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>Success will depend on full implementation of the strategy. Sustainable remediation is assumed to be defined as being where the benefit of undertaking remediation is greater than its impact and that the optimum remediation solution is selected.</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>None identified.</p>
Revocation	?	?	?	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	?	?	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>The NPPF provides full policy support for the remediation of contaminated land such that it is suitable for its new use, and as a minimum, not be capable of being determined as contaminated land under Part IIA of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 (paragraphs 109 and 121). However, the NPPF is silent on which remediation technologies should be preferred. The effects of revoking policy EM2 are therefore uncertain for key receptors (biodiversity, air, climate and landscape), and will depend on</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of North West Regional Strategy

Alternative	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	
																											<p>whether local planning authorities support sustainable remediation above traditional methods. Notwithstanding this conclusion however it is considered that remediation of contamination in whatever form will be beneficial for human health, soils and water.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p> <p>No significant effects identified, however local planning authorities and developers to be aware of SuRF-UK ‘A Framework for assessing the sustainability of soil and groundwater remediation 2010.’</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>The remediation, whatever technology used, improves soil, water and health.</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u></p> <p>There is no explicit reference to sustainable remediation techniques within the NPPF (unlike Policy EM2). Therefore it is considered uncertain that this will be pursued although there is nothing within the NPPF that would prevent this approach to remediation.</p>	

Policy EM 3 - Green Infrastructure

Alternative	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	
Retention	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	+	+	0	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This is a high level policy setting out how green infrastructure should be planned for and actively preserved, enhanced and increased. Embedding the policy in local plans is likely to bring about a number of benefits in the medium to long term:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The provision of new and more accessible open space is expected to result in health benefits to people. The enhancement and increase in green infrastructure should help to increase biodiversity and soil quality. Benefits in terms of adaptation to climate change are expected to arise though the use of green infrastructure as an adaptation tool. EM3 is also supported by RES Action 117 which recognises that it is important to nurture the natural resources of the region and to develop a strategy for green infrastructure and transport corridors. <p>Though EM3 references sites of national and international importance it is assumed that these are protected in any case through designation, and EM3 does not bring about any additional benefits.</p> <p>Benefits to landscape could be brought about if a significant increase in green infrastructure occurs, but this will depend on where and when development is brought forward.</p> <p>Green infrastructure can provide additional opportunities for outdoor activity which can support improvements in health.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>None proposed.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>Success will depend on full implementation of the strategy. Benefits accrue in the medium to long term</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of North West Regional Strategy

Alternative	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	
																												given that only 16 of the 40 authorities (including former authorities) have plans in conformity with the North West of England Plan. Uncertainty None identified.
Revocation	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	+	+	0	+	+	Likely Significant Effects of Revocation Paragraph 114 of the NPPF states that local planning authorities should plan positively for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure. Paragraph 117 builds on this principle, stating that planning policies should: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. The plan policies are supported by the development management requirements set out in paragraph 118. In addition, the introduction of Local Nature Partnerships announced in the Natural Environment White Paper which will complement existing local partnerships which deal with matters such as provision of green infrastructure will improve the chances of the delivery of the policy intention. Such partnerships will be able to work across administrative boundaries enable planning of networks at the scale that has the most impact. Paragraph 99 of the NPPF notes that the creation of green infrastructure could be a suitable adaptation measure where new development is brought forward in an area which is vulnerable to the range of

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of North West Regional Strategy

Alternative	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	
																												<p>impacts arising from climate change.</p> <p>While the revocation of the RS policy would have no environmental effects with the NPPF in place, set alongside the wider policy to assist with the actual delivery of green infrastructure as announced in the Natural Environment White Paper, there will be benefits in the medium to long term across a number of environmental criteria.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p> <p>None proposed.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>That local planning authorities fully and faithfully implement the NPPF.</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u></p> <p>None identified.</p>

Policy EM 4 – Regional Parks

Alternative	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	
Retention	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	?	?	?	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>Policy EM4 is identified in the regional strategy as a key component of the policy on green infrastructure (EM3), and as such its benefits are similar. However, it is treated separately here because there are potential negative effects which could arise through an increase in car travel to access these parks as sustainable transport access is not referenced.</p> <p>The concept of regional parks is supported by the RES through Action 116. It recognises that the creation of such parks has the potential to deliver image and regeneration benefits to the region.</p> <p>Designation would be likely to result in an increase in visitor numbers. EM4 is clear that access should only be granted where no adverse impact on the integrity of protected sites would occur, but it remains possible that regional park designation could result in an increase in car journeys in the area, with possible impacts on air quality and, potentially upon protected sites. Such air quality impacts would however be at the local level because the formation of regional parks in close proximity to major conurbations may conversely reduce the tendency for people to drive longer distances (in some cases transboundary) to existing facilities such as the national parks of the Lake District, Peak District and Snowdonia for example. Overall score for air therefore uncertain. Positive environmental benefits are predicted to arise from an increase in biodiversity. Most of the regional parks are in place and as such the effects are considered to extend from the short to long term.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Accessibility to Regional Parks by sustainable modes of transport should be promoted above use of the private car.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>Assumed that regional parks will be supportive of cultural heritage and water.</p> <p>Uncertainty</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of North West Regional Strategy

Alternative	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	
																												Encouraging greater use of regional parks by visitors could increase travel by car, thereby leading to local increases in emissions to air along certain routes, however, encouraging travel within the region could be preferable to encouraging visitors to travel out of the region for recreation.
Revocation	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	?	?	?	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	<p><u>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</u></p> <p>In the absence of policy EM4 it is likely that the designation of regional parks will continue with Lancashire County Council promoting the three Central Lancashire Parks and the North West Coast Trail. Furthermore the Wigan Greenheart Park is established whilst Cheshire east continues to promote the Weaver valley for example</p> <p>The NPPF contains substantial and very positive policy on the protection and enhancement of green infrastructure and biodiversity in particular under section 11. It is therefore likely that regional parks will continue to be delivered if they are supported by individual local authorities or groups of authorities co-operating in the delivery of trans-boundary initiatives. Ultimately, it is assumed that the regional parks concept will continue therefore the effects of revocation are considered to be the same as for retention.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p> <p>None proposed.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>That local planning authorities fully and faithfully implement the NPPF.</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u></p> <p>Encouraging greater use of regional parks by visitors could increase travel by car, thereby leading to local increases in emissions to air along certain routes, however, encouraging travel within the region could be preferable to encouraging visitors to travel out of the region for recreation..</p>

Policy EM 5 - Integrated Water Management

Alternative	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	
Retention	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>Policy EM5 outlines the roles of local authorities, the Environment Agency and water companies in meeting the requirements of the Water Framework Directive. As the Directive is in place, effects are considered to arise in the short, medium and long-term.</p> <p>EM5 also states that development should be located where there is spare capacity in existing water supply, waste water treatment and sewerage, but if not that development must be phased so that new infrastructure capacity can be provided without environmental harm.</p> <p>RES Action 122 seeks to protect existing areas of high economic value from flooding, to appropriate standards whilst Action 90 seeks to ensure forward planning and investment for sustainable growth by the utilities companies and the planning system recognising that utility infrastructure could be a constraint on growth without appropriate planning and investment.</p> <p>Appropriate mitigation measures should be designed into any development which must take place in current or future flood risk areas, and new development should take advantage of sustainable drainage systems and water conservation and efficiency measures, with retrofitting of these encouraged for existing development. Mitigation measures will protect population from adverse impacts of flooding.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>None proposed.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>None identified.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of North West Regional Strategy

Alternative	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	
Revocation	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<p><u>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</u></p> <p>Broadly speaking, EM5 incorporates the requirements of the Water Framework Directive, the sequential test originally set out in PPS25 and now incorporated into the NPPF, and the Flood and Water Management Act 2010. The policy on phasing of development where necessary is judged to be a straightforward solution to problems that can arise where development is brought forward in areas of flood risk, and its revocation, and the revocation of EM5 more generally, is therefore unlikely to have any effect. As the Directive is in place, effects are considered to be minor positive in the short term increasing to significant positive in the long-term.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p> <p>None proposed.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u></p> <p>None identified.</p>

Policy EM 6 - Managing the North West's Coastline

Alternative	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	
Retention	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	+	+	<p><u>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</u></p> <p>Policy EM6 promotes a strategic and integrated approach to the long term management of flooding and coastal erosion.</p> <p>A number of benefits arise:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> development is sited or re-sited to avoid the risk of future loss, unsustainable defence costs or damage to existing defences; provision is made over the medium to long term for mitigation of and adaptation to natural coastal change and the predicted effects of climate change, with some benefits in the medium term leading to significant benefits in the long term; loss of coastal habitats is minimised and eroded habitats recreated through the increased use of soft techniques such as managed realignment. This protects coastal soils. <p>RES is indirectly supportive through Actions to support regional parks (which include the North West Coastline) and Southport as a 'Classic' resort. This supports cultural heritage.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p> <p>None proposed.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Success will depend on full implementation of the strategy.</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u></p> <p>None identified.</p>
Revocation	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	+	+	<p><u>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</u></p> <p>Paragraph 168 of the NPPF states that Shoreline Management Plans should inform the evidence base</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of North West Regional Strategy

Alternative	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	
																												<p>for planning in coastal areas. The prediction of future impacts should include the longer term nature and inherent uncertainty of coastal processes (including coastal landslip), and take account of climate change.</p> <p>The NPPF contains comprehensive policy direction in relation to coastal development, and the duty to co-operate will ensure that local authorities act jointly in respect of coastal change.</p> <p>Paragraph 94 states that local planning authorities should adopt proactive strategies to mitigate and adapt to climate change, taking full account of coastal change.</p> <p>Paragraph 114 requires local planning authorities to maintain the character of the undeveloped coast, protecting and enhancing its distinctive landscapes.</p> <p>Paragraph 105 states that relevant local planning authorities should take account of the UK Marine Policy Statement and marine plans and apply Integrated Coastal Zone Management across local authority and land/sea boundaries, ensuring integration of the terrestrial and marine planning regimes.</p> <p>Paragraph 106 states that local planning authorities should reduce risk from coastal change by avoiding inappropriate development in vulnerable areas or adding to the impacts of physical changes to the coast, and should identify as a Coastal Change Management Area any area likely to be affected by physical changes to the coast. Where a CCMA has been identified, authorities should be clear as to what development will be appropriate in such areas and in what circumstances, and make provision for development and infrastructure that needs to be relocated away from CCMA.</p> <p>Paragraph 107 sets out circumstances in which authorities should consider development in a CCMA, including that it will be safe over its planned lifetime and will not have an unacceptable impact on appropriate coastal change, and the character of the coast including designations is not compromised and the development provides wider sustainability benefits.</p> <p>Paragraph 107 also references provision in the Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009 for continuous signed and managed route around the coast, by stating that development in a CCMA should not hinder the creation and maintenance of such a route.</p> <p>Paragraph 108 states that authorities limit the planned life-time of appropriate development in a CCMA through temporary permission and restoration conditions where necessary.</p> <p>Legislation relating to the conservation of designated habitats sites continues to apply.</p> <p>Revocation of policy EM6 is unlikely to have any significant effects. The new provision outlined in the Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009 for a continuous signed and managed route around the coastline</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of North West Regional Strategy

Alternative	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	
																											<p>is likely to lead to significant benefits to population and human health in the long term as access to the coast is improved.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p> <p>None proposed .</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>That local planning authorities will fully implement the NPPF.</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u></p> <p>None identified.</p>	

Policy EM 7 – Minerals Extraction**Policy EM 8 - Land-won Aggregates****Policy EM 9 - Secondary and Recycled Aggregates**

Alternative	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	
Retention	-	-	+	+	+	+	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	-	0	0	0	-	-	-	0	0	+	-	-	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>Policy EM7 seeks to provide for a steady and adequate supply of a range of minerals to meet the region's apportionments of land-won aggregates and the requirements of national planning guidance, taking into account the national significance of certain of the Region's mineral reserves, the contribution that substitute, secondary or recycled sources, or imports from outside the Region should make, and the potential supply of marine dredged aggregate in contributing towards overall regional aggregate needs. Policy EM7 states that minerals extraction forms an exception to the sequential approach set out in the Core Development Principles, and sets out some high level principles regarding the transportation of minerals and safeguarding resources. Policy EM8 requires minerals planning authorities to plan for a specific amount of aggregate minerals on the basis of MPG6. Policy EM9 states that the Regional Planning Body will work with the Regional Aggregates Working Party, mineral and waste planning authorities, and others to maximise the role played by secondary and recycled sources of aggregates in meeting the Region's requirements, setting out targets for 2010 and 2021.</p> <p>Retention of these policies will have benefits to the population through extraction of raw material to meet society's needs. Extraction can create noise and general disturbance which can lead to the potential for effects upon health therefore effects are not considered to be significant for this receptor. However, prudent use of minerals, such as maximising recycled or secondary aggregate, will minimise primary extraction and can therefore act as mitigation. Furthermore the policy encouragement to recycle and re-use results in a minor significant effect overall when assessed against the material assets receptor.</p> <p>Excavation of primary aggregate will have an adverse effects on soil and water. Excavation of mineral resources might have a localised adverse effect in the short to medium term whilst the site is under</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of North West Regional Strategy

Alternative	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				
																									<p>operation, although this may be mitigated by high quality working standards and the longer term restoration required under the National Planning Policy Framework and the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. Overall the effect on soil and water, is likely to be neutral in the longer term as existing quality pre-excitation is unlikely to be improved by restoration, but the effect on biodiversity, landscape and cultural heritage should be positive given the assumption that restoration schemes lead to habitat creation and that there is policy reference to the re-use of historic quarries to supply the needs of historic buildings.</p> <p>Policy EM7 also promotes the use of non-road transport modes (including the safeguarding of railheads and other transport facilities as required by the National Planning Policy Framework). However, given the reliance on the road network to transport, the impact on air quality is likely to be negative. Retention will have no overall effect for climate factors across the region.</p> <p>The abolition of the Regional Planning Body will have minimal impact on policy EM9.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p> <p>Policy EM9 promotes the use of recycled aggregates which has the potential to reduce the requirement to win virgin material as set out within EM8. Policies to also follow other environmental protectionist policies within the North West of England Plan.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>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 Plan period.</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u></p> <p>The environmental impact will depend on the scale, nature and location of the proposed sites, and the mitigation measures put in place. Any environmental impacts are likely to be localised.</p>			

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of North West Regional Strategy

Alternative	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	
Revocation	-	-	+	+	+	+	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	-	-	-	0	+	+	0	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>Paragraphs 143 to 149 of the National Planning Policy Framework provide the national framework for minerals extraction. The NPPF highlights the need to plan for minerals extraction, as part of the Government's overriding objective for securing a steady and adequate supply of minerals. However, paragraphs 143 and 144 provide strong protection 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. Furthermore mineral planning authorities are expected to encourage use of secondary and recycled material to consider recycled and secondary sources before the extraction of primary materials.</p> <p>Paragraph 145 of the Framework sets out national policy for aggregates. It requires each mineral planning authority to prepare a local aggregate assessment based on average sales, which gives local authorities greater control over how much mineral extraction they need to plan for, and how this should be provided. This includes secondary, recycled and marine sources. Technical advice will still be provided through Aggregate Working Parties, and the duty to co-operate should assist in ensuring mineral planning authorities work together with the industry to ensure the steady and adequate supply of minerals are provided in a sustainable manner.</p> <p>National Planning Policy Framework policies, including the focus on secondary and recycled material and sources, make it unlikely that the revocation of EM8 and EM9 will have significant negative effects. Since paragraphs 143 and 144 of the Framework provides environmental protection guidance within the section concerned with minerals, particularly in terms of human health and aftercare of sites, positive impacts arise from the revocation of policy EM7, over the medium to long term for landscape, heritage and biodiversity. Similarly policy protection for surface and groundwater, prevention of contamination and subsidence and dust should lead to neutral impacts on certain receptors in the longer term. With regard to material assets performance is negative in the longer term as minerals authorities seek to revise their targets to take account of the new approach to assessing minerals apportionment. For example Cumbria and Lancashire have delayed parts of their LDF preparation either as a response to the NPPF or indirectly in response to a need to divert resources to the preparation of other planning policy documents. Greater Manchester has already proposed revisions to its emerging document to reflect the policy in the Framework to not identify new sites or extensions to existing sites for peat extraction. Even so, each mineral planning authority contains planned provision which reflect the National and Regional guidelines for aggregates provision in place at the time their plan was adopted to ensure the overarching policy objectives are met.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of North West Regional Strategy

Alternative	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	
																											<p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p> <p>No significant effects identified however use of minerals should continue to take place within an overarching framework which promotes recycling and re-use.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u></p> <p>None identified.</p>	

Policy EM 10 – A Regional Approach to Waste Management

Alternative	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	
Retention	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>Policy EM10 delivers the requirements of the Landfill Directive, the Waste Framework Directive, and the Waste Strategy 2007 with the targets presented the same as those set out within the Waste Strategy for 2015 but 5% higher for household waste recycling by 2020. The need to drive waste up the waste hierarchy and reduce the amount of municipal waste going to landfill results in a number of indirect positive impacts upon soil and landscape and water (less landfill) and human health, air and climate change (less greenhouse gas emissions) as more waste is re-used and recycled. Greater recycling level supports the re-use of material assets and is therefore considered to be significantly positive.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>None proposed.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>That local authorities fully implement relevant legislation and national policy when undertaking their functions.</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>None identified.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of North West Regional Strategy

Alternative	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	
Revocation	0	0	0	+	+	?	+	+	?	+	+	?	+	+	?	+	+	?	+	+	?	0	0	0	+	+	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>The same European and National waste policy and targets remain in place. PSS10 also remains in place until such time as it is replaced by a new National Waste Strategy. The Government's Waste Policy Review in 2011 references the revised Waste Framework Directive Target of 50% recycling of municipal waste by 2020 which represents a 5% decrease in the target reflected by the RSS policy. Revocation of the RS policy may therefore lead to a lower target for compliance within the region with consequential effects upon certain environmental receptors. In the short-term revocation is unlikely to lead to a change in the assessment. A review of existing waste DPDs shows that many of the region's waste planning authorities are supportive of higher waste targets than those set out either at the national level, or within the RSS. For example Cumbria and Lancashire are operating to higher targets at 2015 than the RS. In the short to medium term, significant positive effects for material assets changing to uncertain at the long term as authorities review their individual waste targets.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>None proposed.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>That local authorities fully implement relevant legislation and national policy when undertaking their functions and that future replacement of PPS10 maintains the relevant targets set out within the Waste Framework Directive.</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>Longer term uncertainty as Councils review their waste targets which they may lower to reflect national rather than regional targets.</p>

Policy EM 11 – Waste Management Principles

Alternative	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	
Retention	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	<p><u>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</u></p> <p>EM11 is essentially a restatement of the Government's waste hierarchy, and as such has little impact in itself. An encouragement to minimise then recycle waste is considered to result in significant positive effects for material assets as it seeks to minimise our production of waste and to treat it as a resource for recycling or re-use. Reduction in the waste generated, and therefore required for treatment and disposal also have indirect environmental benefits at the regional scale across all environmental topics as it will reduce the requirement for new waste management facilities, a reduction in traffic volumes and less risk of water contamination (from landfill) and greenhouse gas emissions.</p> <p>RES Action 23 sets out to improve business resource efficiency and waste minimisation (BREW) through actions which include minimisation of waste and recycling which will increase productivity and lead to environmental benefits.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p> <p>None proposed.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>That local authorities fully implement relevant legislation and national policy when undertaking their functions.</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u></p> <p>None identified.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of North West Regional Strategy

Alternative	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	
Revocation	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	<p><u>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</u></p> <p>European legislation and national waste policy (currently the Waste Strategy for England 2007) will remain in place. This document as well as the its review of waste policies (published in June 2011) and existing national waste planning policy, all seek to maintain the waste hierarchy. The comments as for retention still apply and hence there is likely to be no change to the environmental effects caused by revocation. <u>Mitigation Measures</u></p> <p>None proposed.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>That local authorities fully implement relevant legislation and national policy when undertaking their functions and that they look beyond the NPPF to Government waste policy, particularly the implications of the waste hierarchy.</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u></p> <p>None identified.</p>

Policy EM 12 – Locational Principles

Alternative	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	
Retention	0	0	0	-	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	+	+	-	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>EM12 provides a high level approach to the siting of waste management facilities and the transportation of residual waste following treatment which meets the national policy requirement for more local responsibility for dealing with waste. Policy does not have an effect upon the amount of waste generated or its re-use per se (covered by policies above) therefore neutral with regard to Material Assets.</p> <p>The policy states that waste should be disposed of in one of the nearest appropriate installations. Waste management facilities are sited in such a way as to avoid the unnecessary carriage of waste over long distances. The location of new waste management facilities should take account of the availability of transport infrastructure that will support the sustainable movement of waste, seeking when practicable to use rail or water transport. The principal effect of this policy is to reduce the transportation of waste by road, with benefits over the medium to long term to air quality and climatic factors through a gradual reduction in exhaust emissions as facilities are brought forward, and corresponding benefits to human health.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>None proposed.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>That suitable facilities are brought forward in appropriate locations gradually over the life of the plan.</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>The impact of this policy will depend on the scale, location and type of facility.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of North West Regional Strategy

Alternative	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	
Revocation	0	0	0	-	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<p><u>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</u></p> <p>The NPPF does not set out waste policy and instead continues to rely upon PPS10 which contains policy advice including location criteria at Annex E. However these criteria are focussed upon protecting environmental receptors rather than the locational factors surrounding proximity to source. The main document also sets out locational factors to be taken into consideration by waste authorities when selecting appropriate sites from paragraph 20 onwards but these are similarly silent with regard to proximity to source.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p> <p>Local authorities should read the NPPF as a single document, taking into consideration the requirements to promote sustainable modes of transport when selecting sites for waste processing and treatment. Development of facilities is also likely to require EIA.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None proposed.</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u></p> <p>The impact of this policy will depend on the scale, location and type of facility .</p>

Policy EM 13 – Provision of Nationally, Regionally and Sub-Regionally Significant Waste Management Facilities

Alternative	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	
Retention	0	+	+	0	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>Policy EM13 indicates at a sub-regional level the volumes of non-hazardous commercial and industrial waste, hazardous waste and municipal waste for which facilities should be provided up to 2020. EM13 mirrors the approach taken in EM12 by setting out expectations that transport should be minimised, the possibility of co-location explored, and existing sites re-used where possible. Similar impacts arise as for policy EM12, with some likely additional benefits arising in the medium to long term from the preference for the re-use of existing sites where possible (which is positive for material assets, health and soils, as well as landscape and biodiversity). National planning policies require individual planning authorities to plan for waste arising in their area, and to monitor progress in delivering the required facilities. Additionally, the duty to co-operate will ensure that waste planning authorities work together to ensure that waste is handled safely.</p> <p>The supporting text to the policy sets out indicative capacity requirement for various waste streams across the sub-regional areas which are set above the national targets.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Development of facilities is also likely to require EIA.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>None identified.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of North West Regional Strategy

Alternative	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	
Revocation	0	?	?	0	+	+	?	?	?	0	0	0	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	?	?	<p><u>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</u></p> <p>An examination of the 11 extant waste plans reveal that all plans seek to comply or even exceed European and national targets for recycling and diversion of municipal waste from landfill (although in some cases they are below the regional 2020 target). Tables 9.3 and 9.4 set out an indicative waste arisings and capacity which should be used as a basis for planning for sustainable waste management. Plans adopted in 2009 and emerging plans have been able to take these figures into account, drawing on additional evidence where appropriate. Waste planning authorities must still comply with national policy in Planning Policy Statement 10, the National Planning Policy Framework and the duty to co-operate. Waste planning authorities should continue to plan for the waste management needs in their area, taking into account capacity requirements, and that they should continue to monitor waste arisings.</p> <p>Revocation will therefore only have a limited effect. The effect of the removal of the preference for the re-use of existing sites is unclear – maintaining this principle accords well with the general expectation that the impact of providing additional facilities should be minimised, but it cannot be certain that authorities will always choose to do so. This has an uncertain effect on biodiversity, landscape and soil.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p> <p>Development of facilities is also likely to require EIA.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>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.</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u></p> <p>That waste planning authorities will maintain the principle that the re-use of existing sites should be preferred.</p>

Policy EM 14 – Radioactive Waste

Alternative	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	
Retention	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<p><u>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</u></p> <p>This is a high level policy which recognises the position of the North West region as a centre of national and international expertise in the fields of nuclear fuel fabrication, reprocessing, radioactive waste management and decommissioning.</p> <p>It is supported by RES Action which seeks to deliver the skills required by priority sectors including nuclear through the delivery of the National Nuclear Skills Academy. This is operational and it is based in Cocker mouth, Cumbria.</p> <p>Planning for new nuclear power generation is dealt with at a national level through the Planning Act 2008 (including National Planning Statements), whilst waste planning authorities must plan for the management and disposal of low level radioactive waste produced in their area having regard to national policy (including policy prepared by the Nuclear Decommissioning Agency and the Department for Energy and Climate Change). These recognise that certain types of radioactive wastes can be dealt with in the same facility as other waste. EM14 does not have a significant effect other than maintaining the workforce which is already a significant contributor to the economy in the north of the region. Regionally minor positive but within Cumbria, significant positive.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p> <p>Development of facilities is also likely to require EIA.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>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.</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u></p> <p>None identified.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of North West Regional Strategy

Alternative	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	
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	<p><u>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</u></p> <p>There are no significant effects of revocation. The Planning Act (including National Policy Statements) and national radioactive waste policies will continue to have effect.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p> <p>Development of facilities is also likely to require EIA.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>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</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u></p> <p>None proposed.</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u></p> <p>None identified.</p>

Policy EM 15 – A Framework For Sustainable Energy In The North West

Alternative	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	
Retention	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This is a high level policy which aims to ensure that local authorities promote sustainable energy production and consumption in accordance with the principles of the Energy Hierarchy and within the North West Sustainable Energy Strategy. EM15 also states that public authorities should, in their own proposals and schemes, lead by example to emphasise their commitment to reducing the annual consumption of energy and the potential for sustainable energy generation. The North West Sustainable Energy Strategy sets out a target to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by at least 60% by 2050 – a target which has since been surpassed by the more recent national target to reduce emissions by 80% by 2020. However, the Strategy also sets out an aspiration to deploy sufficient renewable electricity generating capacity to provide 15% of final demand by 2015 and 20% of final demand by 2020 with an emphasis on micro-generation. This exceeds the national target to achieve 15% of the UK's energy consumption from renewable sources by 2020 (30% electricity from renewable). Though the 20% target is only aspirational, the reference in EM15 to the Sustainable Energy Strategy makes it likely that the higher target will be given more weight in planning decisions than it would be in the absence of EM15. This additional weight is unlikely to have a significant impact in the short term, but in the medium to long term should have some impact in reducing carbon emissions.</p> <p>RES Action 90 is supportive of RSS policy in that it sets out to develop and implement the Northwest Energy Strategy with a focus on the promotion of energy efficiency, developing energy as a market and supporting alternative sources of energy.</p> <p>Renewable energy sources include photovoltaic energy, solar-powered and geothermal water heating, wind, energy crops and biomass (such as wood from existing woodlands, sawmill co-products, and organic waste products that might otherwise be destined for landfill) and energy from agricultural, plant and animal, domestic and industrial waste. It includes energy generated as a product of anaerobic digestion and energy gained on site and/or from a decentralised supply, including power from combined heat and power (but excluding renewable heat).</p> <p>There is however, potential for localised adverse effects on the landscape from the siting of certain renewable energy technologies but these will be outweighed through the benefits that renewable energy</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of North West Regional Strategy

Alternative	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	
																												<p>generation brings to the mitigation of climate change and the effects that that would otherwise have on the landscape, biodiversity etc.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p> <p>EIA of the installations likely to have significant effects on the environment should address mitigation measures.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>It is assumed that gaseous emissions from any renewable source are controlled through environmental permits and have no significant effects.</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u></p> <p>None identified.</p>
Revocation	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	<p><u>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</u></p> <p>One of the 12 core principles of planning set out in paragraph 17 of the NPPF is to support the transition to a low carbon future, taking full account of flood risk and coastal change, and encourage the reuse of existing resources, including conversion of existing buildings, and encourage the use of renewable resources (for example, by the development of renewable energy).</p> <p>Paragraph 94 of the NPPF states that local planning authorities should adopt proactive strategies to mitigate and adapt to climate change in line with the provisions of the Climate Change Act 2008.</p> <p>Paragraph 95 of the NPPF seeks to support the move to a low carbon future, by stating that local planning authorities should plan for new development in locations and ways which reduce greenhouse gas emissions; actively support energy efficiency improvements to existing buildings; and when setting any local requirement for a building's sustainability, do so in a way consistent with the Government's zero carbon buildings policy and adopt nationally described standards. Specifically, local planning authorities are expected to identify opportunities where development can draw its energy supply from decentralised, renewable or low carbon energy supplies (paragraph 97).</p> <p>There is 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. This is 5% lower than the target set out in the North West Sustainable Energy Strategy, and it is likely that revoking this target will have some effect on the costs and benefits associated with the provision of renewable energy generation facilities. Hence in the longer term the assessment has reduced from significant to minor positive.</p> <p>Whilst all local authorities will be required to support delivery of the national target a review of existing plans in the region suggests that only five authorities make an attempt to define targets for their area,</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of North West Regional Strategy

Alternative	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	
																												<p>(Hyndburn, Lancaster, Rossendale, Salford and Wyre) or reference RSS targets. Even then some targets are below the national target of 15%. Despite the strong policy support within the NPPF and the legally binding target referenced above, there has to be some level of residual uncertainty over the longer term with regard to the extent that local authorities will ensure delivery within their area.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p> <p>EIA of the installations likely to have significant effects on the environment should address mitigation measures.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>As above.</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u></p> <p>With very few local authorities identifying renewable energy targets and a lack of a regional target post revocation there is uncertainty with regard to the extent that individual authorities will support applications for renewable energy based upon an assessment of what they should reasonably be achieving within their geographical area.</p>

Policy EM 16– Energy Conservation & Efficiency

Alternative	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	
Retention	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	?	?	?	+	+	+	<p><u>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</u></p> <p>EM16 sets out a high level, aspirational approach to energy, based on minimising consumption and demand, promoting maximum efficiency and minimum waste. EM16 also states that Distribution Network Operators and local planning authorities should make provision for required energy network upgrades, and that plans and strategies should actively facilitate reductions in energy requirements and improvements in energy efficiency by incorporating robust policies which support the delivery of the national timetable for reducing emissions from domestic and non-domestic buildings.</p> <p>Supported by RES Action 91 which includes for the promotion of energy efficiency.</p> <p>This policy is only partly deliverable through the Planning system. For example Green Deal provides an opportunity to improve efficiency of existing building stock. EM16 essentially restates national policy. However, the encouragement to local authorities to plan for network upgrades and actively support national policy should have some benefits over the medium to long term.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p> <p>EIA of the installations likely to have significant effects on the environment should address mitigation measures.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u></p> <p>Cultural Heritage uncertain, as certain energy efficiency measures such as solar panels, external insulation can harm historic buildings.</p>
Revocation	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	<p><u>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</u></p> <p>Paragraph 95 of the NPPF states that local planning authorities should plan for new development in locations and ways which reduce greenhouse gas emissions, actively support energy efficiency</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of North West Regional Strategy

Alternative	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	
																												<p>improvements to existing buildings; and when setting any local requirement for a building's sustainability, do so in a way consistent with the Government's zero carbon buildings policy. Paragraph 96 states that, in determining planning applications, local planning authorities should expect new development to take account of landform, layout, building orientation, massing and landscaping to minimise energy consumption. Paragraph 97 states that local planning authorities should have a positive strategy to promote energy from renewable and low carbon sources, design their policies to maximise renewable and low carbon energy development while ensuring that adverse impacts are addressed satisfactorily, and support community-led initiatives for renewable and low carbon energy. These policies are likely to provide benefits in the medium term, with significant benefits arising over the long term. Although certain energy efficiency measures can harm historic buildings the wider benefits to the historic environment resulting from a reduction in emissions and hence the mitigation of climate change is positive.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p> <p>EIA of the installations likely to have significant effects on the environment should address mitigation measures.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u></p> <p>None.</p>

Policy EM 17 – Renewable Energy

Alternative	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	
Retention	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>EM17 expands on the targets for renewable energy outlined in policy EM15, for at least 10% of the electricity which is supplied within the Region to be provided from renewable energy sources by 2010, rising to at least 15% by 2015 and 20% by 2020. Indicative targets set out the number of schemes expected to be brought forward for each type of renewables technology across the three phases, including expected generation capacity. These are broken down to sub regional level.</p> <p>EM17 maintains the position set out in PPS22 (which has been replaced by the NPPF), that meeting these targets is not a reason to refuse otherwise acceptable development proposals, and sets out a general expectation that plans and strategies should seek to promote and encourage the use of renewable energy resources. Local planning authorities should give significant weight to the wider environmental, community and economic benefits of proposals for renewable energy schemes.</p> <p>EM17 sets out an expectation that local authorities will work with stakeholders to undertake sub-regional studies of renewable energy resources, which would inform future strategies and targets for renewable energy.</p> <p>EM17 also sets out matters that should be taken into account when considering renewables development proposals. The detailed targets set out for sub-regions are aspirational, and depend on schemes coming forward from industry. There can be no certainty that the mix of technologies or capacities aspired to would be brought forward, and the effect of this element of EM17 is unclear. However, the principal effects of EM17 arise from the targets for the provision of renewables, and benefits are therefore similar to those for EM15.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Facilities are only delivered where any impacts can be made acceptable. EIA of the installations likely to have significant effects on the environment should address mitigation measures.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>It is assumed that gaseous emissions from any renewable source (e.g. EFW) are controlled through</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of North West Regional Strategy

Alternative	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	
																												environmental permits and have no significant effects. Uncertainty None identified.
Revocation	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	Likely Significant Effects of Retention The effects of revoking EM17 are broadly similar to the effects of revoking EM15, as set out above. The NPPF sets out detailed policies in support of the move to a low carbon future, which are supported by targets for renewables and carbon reductions deriving from EU and UK legislation. The revocation of EM17 and its higher target for renewables provision over and above the national 15% target for 2020 would probably have an impact upon the significance of the amount of renewable energy to be provided. Mitigation Measures As above. Assumptions As above. Uncertainty None identified.

Policy EM 18 - Decentralised Energy Supply

Alternative	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	
Retention	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>EM18 sets out a 'Merton Rule' expectation that local authorities should set targets for the energy to be used in new development to come from decentralised and renewable or low-carbon energy sources, based on appropriate evidence and viability assessments; and the type and size of development to which the target will be applied. In advance of such targets being set, the Merton Rule criteria apply. This policy reinforces the provision of decentralised, renewable, and other low-carbon energy sources in the planning system, and as such complements policies EM15 and EM17, with a similar profile of benefits.</p> <p>No explicit RES support, although Action 91 references alternative energy sources.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>None proposed.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>None identified.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of North West Regional Strategy

Alternative	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	
Revocation	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	<p><u>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</u></p> <p>Paragraph 95 of the NPPF states that, to support the move to a low carbon future, local planning authorities should, when setting any local requirement for a building's sustainability, do so in a way consistent with the Government's zero carbon buildings policy and adopt nationally described standards. NPPF Paragraph 96 states that, in determining planning applications, local planning authorities should expect new development to comply with adopted Local Plan policies on local requirements for decentralised energy supply unless it can be demonstrated by the applicant, having regard to the type of development involved and its design, that this is not feasible or viable. The NPPF therefore preserves the force of existing Merton Rule policies in existing plans, and reinforces this with a stronger requirement for the sustainability of new buildings which embeds the Government's zero carbon buildings policy. It is expected that, in the longer term, this will lead to significant benefits in terms of carbon savings.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p> <p>None proposed.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u></p> <p>None identified.</p>

RT1: Integrated Transport Networks

Alternative	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	
Retention	0	0	0	?	+	+	0	+	+	0	0	0	?	+	+	?	?	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>A high-level approach to transport policies, ensuring a multi-modal focus to reduce reliance on any one type of transport aiming to develop sustainable, integrated and accessible solutions for all users. Transport is also a key RES Theme and it includes actions (nos 77, 78 and 79) designed to link areas of opportunity to need. Specific projects supported include those aimed at more sustainable modes of travel such as the expansion of the Manchester Metrolink and public transport improvements in east Lancashire which would increase connectivity between deprived areas and areas of opportunity.</p> <p>Significant positive effects of reducing congestion and thereby enhancing accessibility of the region's gateways and interchanges - through capitalising on developments in intelligent transport systems and information and communications technology. The focus is on environmental and economic sustainability through the use of existing highway infrastructure. The policy is also likely to benefit local economies and the productivity of businesses and industry. Focus upon better use of existing facilities is likely to reduce the requirement for new infrastructure with potential consequential effects upon the natural environment and material assets that are therefore considered to be neutral.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>None proposed.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>Success will depend on full implementation of the strategy. This policy can not be viewed in isolation since success will also depend on reducing the need for car travel (see RT 2).</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>The extent to which success will reduce emissions to atmosphere, particularly in relation to climate change, in view of the fact that the transport sector has seen the greatest increase in carbon dioxide emissions. Also the extent to which effects in the short term will be beneficial as works underway to construct improved transport systems, such as the extension to the Greater Manchester Tram (Metrolink) system, can cause short term disturbance.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of North West Regional Strategy

Alternative	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	
Revocation	0	0	0	?	+	+	0	+	+	0	0	0	?	+	+	?	?	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<p><u>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</u></p> <p>Policy RT 1 relates to two areas of transport policy. The first is using a multi-modal approach to solving transport issues and problems and the second is making best use of existing infrastructure and developments in intelligent transport systems to improve journey time reliability.</p> <p>Paragraph 29 of the NPPF encourages the use of sustainable transport modes to give people a real choice about how they travel and paragraph 30 advocates solutions which reduce congestion. There are specific spatial outcomes with this policy which may be lost if the RSS is revoked, although they centre around reducing congestion and increasing accessibility by sustainable modes in key transport areas, which may still be addressed through paragraphs 29 and 30.</p> <p>Policy on and planning for strategic transport infrastructure (road, rail, airports, ports) is principally carried out at the national level and will be guided by National Policy Statements although policy advice on how to respond to their growth and role in servicing business is contained within paragraph 33 of the NPPF.</p> <p>Given all of the above, it is concluded that the revocation of RT 1 is unlikely to have significant negative effects although the effects are uncertain at this current point in time, as it is too early to tell whether the specific spatial outcomes will be met by future planning projects.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p> <p>None proposed.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>That local planning authorities fully and faithfully implement the NPPF to the extent that specific spatial outcomes are centred around reducing congestion and increasing accessibility by sustainable modes.</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u></p> <p>As for retention. The extent to which success will reduce emissions to atmosphere, particularly in relation to climate change, in view of the fact that the transport sector has seen the greatest increase in carbon dioxide emissions. Also the extent to which effects in the short term will be beneficial as works underway to construct improved transport systems, such as the extension to the Greater Manchester Tram (Metrolink) system, can cause short term disturbance.</p>

Policy RT 2 Managing Travel Demand

Alternative	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	
Retention	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	0	0	0	+	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy has significant positive effects as a result of its focus to reduce private car use, and in addition, tackling the most congested parts of the motorway network and relieving the pressure visitors place on major rural tourist areas (having potentially positive effects upon biodiversity and the landscape). There is a corresponding emphasis on improving and promoting the use of public transport and walking and cycling and on greater use of parking planning restrictions and on-street parking controls and enforcement.</p> <p>The relevant RES Theme sets out to improve and better manage road and rail infrastructure. Specific infrastructure projects supported by the RES include rail, light rail and bus enhancements together with limited road improvements in support of key gateways such as the Port of Heysham, improved access into Liverpool and better links between Barrow and the Furness peninsular. Whilst some of these measures could produce local negative effects, (and require material assets), it is considered that better use of the existing infrastructure network within an over-arching policy which is to manage demand has positive benefits also.</p> <p>These policies will take some time to produce the positive effects but given that the RS has been in place since 2009, a short-term effect is noticeable and the effects will increase over time.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures None proposed.</p> <p>Assumptions Success will depend on full implementation of the strategy.</p> <p>Uncertainty None identified.</p>
Revocation	?	?	?	+	+	+	?	?	?	0	0	0	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	0	0	0	?	?	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>Whilst the NPPF advocates sustainable modes of transport, it recognises that different solutions will be required for different areas. It does not explicitly emphasise reducing the number of car journeys (and instead talks about meeting travel demand) but it does encourage developments to be planned so that</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of North West Regional Strategy

Alternative	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	
																												<p>they promote public transport use, walking and cycling so it could be assumed that the demand is to be met in sustainable ways (paragraphs 35 and 38). Parking is seen by the NPPF as a tool to boost the vitality of town centres, so this is less restrictive than the Policy in RT2 (paragraph 40). This may benefit the economy of town centres whilst improving accessibility will also have positive economic and social benefits.</p> <p>There are also some uncertain effects as it is difficult to predict whether the emphasis on sustainable transport modes will result in a reduction in the number of car journeys. However, the NPPF strongly suggests a travel plan to be drawn up for developments which generate a significant amount of movement (paragraph 36) and the impacts of revoking the RS will depend on what, if anything, is set out in these travel plans. The effects are unlikely to impact in the short term, as it will take time to put travel plans in place, change people's habits and ensure sustainable modes of transport are in place.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p> <p>Partner organisations should continue to work together to secure improved outcomes for transport using mechanisms introduced within the Local transport Act 2008. LTPs 2011-2026 should continue to follow government guidance, supporting economic growth and addressing climate change.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>That local planning authorities fully and faithfully implement the NPPF as evidenced by Central Lancashire's approved Core Strategy July 2012 (post NPPF) which does include for the management of travel demand.</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u></p> <p>The extent to which managing travel demand will result in reduced numbers of journeys and in addition, whether managing demand will lead to new infrastructure.</p>

RT 3: Public Transport Framework

Alternative	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	
Retention	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>The policy aims to make the best use of existing public transportation resources. As such it is likely to lead to a minimisation of new build with a consequential positive benefit recorded for material assets. Encouraging better use of existing public transport assets may encourage a shift away from car use with beneficial impacts upon air quality and climate change. The policy identifies a requirement to enhance walking and cycling in regional centres and to improve accessibility from rural areas into key settlements by public transport. This is considered to be significantly positive for population. The policy encourages local authorities to identify areas where public transport is deficient and the policy is clear that it is their responsibility to identify measures appropriate to resolve within their Local Transport Plans.</p> <p>RSS Appendix RTa and RTb set out the regional hierarchy of public transport corridors, the gateways and interchanges. The Appendices do not list specific public transport projects to be implemented at the regional level. The RES does list some public transport improvements such as the continued upgrade of the West Coast Mainline (complete) and provides support (under RES Action 69) to enhance public transport services between Liverpool/Manchester/Central Lancashire/Leeds/Sheffield</p> <p>Policy performance is the same for all time frames as local transport plans have been completed across the region and will continue to be updated based upon an assessment of local issues (e.g. Local Transport Plan 3 2011-2021 Lancashire, 2011-26 Cumbria, Merseyside, East Cheshire).</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>None proposed.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>Success will depend upon Local authorities co-operating with public transport service providers and setting out how they are to resolve identified deficiencies within their local transport plans. This policy cannot be viewed in isolation since success will also depend on reducing the need for car travel (see RT 2).</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>None identified.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of North West Regional Strategy

Alternative	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	
Revocation	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>Policy RT3 sets out policy guidance and identifies within the appendices a hierarchy of corridors and gateways for example but it does not list specific measures for adoption at either a regional or local level. It leaves the identification of deficiencies and the types of projects to be brought forward with the local authorities. It is concluded that local authorities will continue to prepare transport plans which will seek to identify deficiencies and actions to resolve them following policy guidance contained within paragraph 31 of the NPPF. Co-operation with sub-regional transport bodies such as Merseytravel which co-ordinates public transport in Merseyside and continued publication of strategies such as Local Transport Plan 3 which extends to 2012 or 2026 (as evidenced above) will continue. Encouragement at the national level for sustainable transport is to be found within the NPPF at paragraph 162 and through actions such as the Sustainable Local Transport Fund. The environment effects of revocation are considered to be the same as for retention.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures None proposed.</p> <p>Assumptions That local planning authorities fully and faithfully implement the NPPF and continue with the preparation of local transport plans.</p> <p>Uncertainty None identified.</p>

Integrated RT4: Management of the Highway Network

Alternative	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	
Retention	?	?	?	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	?	?	?	?	?	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>The policy recognises the importance of the region's road network and encourages local highway authorities and the Highways Agency to co-operate in the preparation of Route Management Plans. Local authorities should also extend the concept of functional highways beyond the regional level which is set out within the Appendix to the plan, to the local level. Management of traffic should focus on road safety, reducing traffic growth and maintaining a high quality environment with new road building only coming forward after all other options have been examined. Major highway improvements are only to be included following an examination of all practical alternatives.</p> <p>The policy is considered to be significantly positive for population given that it seeks to reduce congestion, minimise the need for new infrastructure and support economic development. Significant positive effects also due to explicit recognition of need to reduce traffic growth to the benefit of health.</p> <p>The policy does not identify any schemes for implementation, leaving identification to the local level. Local Transport Plans 3 (2011 to 2026) have been published or are in preparation throughout the region hence a difference in timescale of effect until the point at which they are all adopted. Effects upon environmental receptors are therefore uncertain depending upon the nature, location and extent of any infrastructure improvement although it is assumed that some material assets will be used.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>None proposed.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>Success will depend on the identification and implementation of schemes within emerging Local Transport Plans 2011-2026.</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>The magnitude of effect is dependent upon the type of scheme implanted.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of North West Regional Strategy

Alternative	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	
Revocation	?	?	?	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	?	?	?	?	?	?	<p><u>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</u></p> <p>Similar support for reduction in congestion is to be found in the NPPF, paragraph 30. It also references the requirement for local authorities to work together with transport providers at paragraph 31. The NPPF also makes frequent reference to sustainable transport modes which are defined as 'any efficient, safe and accessible means of transport with overall low impact on the environment, including walking and cycling, low and ultra low emission vehicles, car sharing and public transport'. There is no reference to the management of traffic across the network with the NPPF being orientated more towards the interaction of land-use planning and transport. Direction to authorities with regard to network management is provided in the HA's Network Management Manual. Local Highway authorities continue to prepare Local Transport Plans for their networks, LTP3 running from 2011-2026.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p> <p>None proposed.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>That LTP3's focus upon the management of travel and with greater emphasis towards sustainable transport modes.</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u></p> <p>The same uncertainties as those identified for retention.</p>

RT 5: Airports

Alternative	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	
Retention	?	?	?	+	+	+	?	?	?	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	?	?	?	0	0	0	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy emphasises that plans and strategies should support the economic activity generated and sustained by the region's airports. It has specific spatial outcomes as it identifies three key airports, Manchester, Liverpool John Lennon and Blackpool, as vital for the region. The future operational and infrastructure requirements and the environmental impacts for each should be included in Airport Masterplans. RT 5 advocates banning development within airport boundaries (existing or as proposed) if it would impede operational requirements. Any proposed expansion of an existing airport should firstly consider alternatives to expansion and environmental impacts and the impacts on health and wellbeing could be carefully considered for proposed developments.</p> <p>The RES (Action 72) supports development at the region's airports in line with the 2003 Future of Air Transport White Paper recognising that they act as the drivers for the knowledge based economy of the region, for tourism and are important to the region's image.</p> <p>This policy requires careful examination of the environmental impacts and the extent to which these can be mitigated which should be taken into account when considering applications for development however the economic benefit of airports is a strong consideration for applications and therefore it is considered likely that airport development would be supported by this policy with slightly positive effects given the environmental mitigation requirement put in place by policy. Reference is made within the policy supporting text to the proximity of Liverpool Airport to the Liverpool Bay and Carlisle to the Solway and the possibility of Habitat Regulations Assessment related to any proposals for expansion, hence uncertain for biodiversity.</p> <p>Manchester Airport's Masterplan to 2030 proposes relatively modest additions to the Operational Area with no 3rd runway or major new terminal. Liverpool Airport Masterplan 2030 includes for expansion in the form of new employment areas. Additional operational space is confined to new aprons north and south of the runway to accommodate additional aircraft. In both cases impacts upon the landscape are unlikely to occur whilst the limited expansion proposed is on a mixture of brown and greenfield land, hence uncertain with regard to soils, depending upon phasing.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of North West Regional Strategy

Alternative	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	
																												<p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>None proposed.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>Success will depend on full implementation of the strategy.</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>Uncertainty recorded as the presence of cultural heritage features whose setting may be affected by intensification of activity at the airport, for example Speke hall, Liverpool.</p>
Revocation	?	?	?	+	+	+	?	?	?	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	?	?	?	0	0	0	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>Paragraph 33 of the NPPF provides policy consideration for ports, airports and airfields that are not subject to a separate national policy statement (see reference to National Policy Statement for Ports under Policy RT6). The NPPF states that plans should take account of their growth and role in serving business, leisure, training and emergency service needs. It also states that plans should take account of the NPPF as well as the principles set out in the relevant national policy statements and the Government Framework for UK Aviation.</p> <p>The Aviation White Paper, The Future of Air Transport is still current Government Policy. It provides a similar level of support to proposals for expansion at the North West's airports as Policy RT5. It states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Significant growth at many airports in the North of England is anticipated and supported. Additional terminal capacity should be provided at Manchester Airport, but should be accompanied by measures to minimise the number of people affected by noise and a strategy for enhancing access to the airport. Development of increased capacity at Liverpool John Lennon Airport within its existing boundary is supported, to be accompanied by improved access. There may also be a case for extending the runway provided this does not encroach on environmentally sensitive sites. Any proposals to develop Blackpool and Carlisle Airports should be decided locally. <p>It is therefore assumed that certainly in the short to medium term, before the publishing of an Airports NPS that effects will remain the same.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of North West Regional Strategy

Alternative	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	
																												<p>Preparation of an NPS for airports.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>That local planning authorities fully and faithfully implement the NPPF and that the aviation framework is published in its current form.</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>Uncertainty recorded as the presence of cultural heritage features whose setting may be affected by intensification of activity at the airport, for example Speke hall, Liverpool.</p>

RT 6: Ports and Waterways

Alternative	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	
Retention	?	?	?	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	?	?	?	?	?	?	<p><u>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</u></p> <p>This policy seeks to optimise the region's use of its ports and waterways assets, for trade and leisure whilst also protecting, it states, the integrity of their biodiversity and environment. It has a specific spatial outcome in that it identifies the Port of Liverpool, the Manchester Ship Canal and the Port of Heysham and Fleetwood as being of particular strategic importance for the region. As such, it strongly recommends that the future capacity and requirements should be assessed as part of Port Masterplans and other relevant plans and strategies.</p> <p>The policy recommends a strong presumption in favour of safeguarding land close to ports, if the development fulfils certain conditions outlined. For expansion of existing ports, the policy advocates that plans and strategies should take account of the scope for alternatives to expansion. There is a presumption in favour of using existing infrastructure where possible. For development at ports, emphasis should be placed on the effect of the proposed development on assisting the transfer of port traffic from road to rail and/or water and on the effect of the proposed development on the health and well-being of local communities and the local environment. The policy also requires consideration of available parking at proposed developments.</p> <p>Policy is supported by the RES at Action 73 which seeks to grow the Port of Liverpool, including facilities for deepwater berths, and at Action 75, the Port of Heysham.</p> <p>This policy aims to reduce the amount of freight haulage undertaken by road, thereby reducing CO2 emissions but there may be increased traffic around the port area as a result. Also, the waterways are likely to have increased pollution as more shipping is undertaken and shipping itself does lead to emissions to atmosphere. Expansion of port facilities will require the use of material assets.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p> <p>Water impacts to be mitigated through other North West of England policies.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of North West Regional Strategy

Alternative	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	
																												<p>Success will depend on full implementation of the strategy.</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>Uncertainty around a number of environmental receptors based upon the specific details of individual port proposals.</p>
Revocation	?	?	?	?	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	+	?	?	+	?	?	-	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>The NPPF at paragraph 33 states that for ports that are not subject to a separate national policy statement, plans should take account of their growth and role in serving business, leisure, training and emergency service needs. Furthermore all port development whether or not it is nationally significant should take into consideration the UK's Marine Policy Statement 2011 which states that Marine plan authorities will also need to take account of the need to protect the efficiency and resilience of continuing port operations, as well as further port development. The National Policy Statement (NPS) for Ports was published in 2012. It provides policy advice for nationally significant infrastructure projects in the ports sector. It is also a material consideration for the assessment of Town and Country Planning applications.</p> <p>The NPS includes clear environmental protection measures but it also includes a presumption in favour of development unless significant concerns/environmental issues cannot be appropriately addressed. There is no specific spatial outcome if the RS is revoked, although it may be the case that the areas identified in RT 6 have been identified by the industry and relevant local authorities as being vital for economic development. There are no particular references to car parking in the NPS but this would link to the car parking policies discussed for policy RT 2.</p> <p>The effect of revoking the RS is uncertain in the short term with regard to economic (population)at this time due to the removal of policy support for specific spatial outcomes that may have resulted in a transfer of freight from road to water in the shorter term. Similarly advantages resulting from a modal shift upon air and climate receptors are deferred.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>None proposed.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of North West Regional Strategy

Alternative	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	
																												Uncertainty Effects may be dependent upon individual port developments which may come forward in greater number given the Government's positive stance towards infrastructure development.

RT 7: Freight Transport

Alternative	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	
Retention	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	<p><u>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</u></p> <p>This policy encourages partnership working between local authorities and the freight transport industry to find solutions to local distribution problems, Emphasis is placed on a consistent approach to lorry management and signing strategies as well as increasing the proportion of water-borne freight transport. The development of air freight, in line with 'The Future of Air Transport' White Paper, should have particular regard to the need to minimise and mitigate environmental impacts.</p> <p>The impacts of this policy are mixed in that there is promotion of water-borne freight transport, to reduce road based transport and there is particular regard to reducing the environmental impact of air transport. On the other hand, the policy states that Heavy Goods Vehicles should not be restricted from any of the routes in the strategic road network and air transport movements cannot be controlled by the policy. The policy is considered to be uncertain, depending upon the balance of the projects taken forward.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p> <p>None proposed.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Success will depend on full implementation of the strategy.</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u></p> <p>Effects dependent upon the balance of projects taken forward.</p>
Revocation	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	<p><u>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</u></p> <p>The Civil Aviation Act 2006, which sets out the legislative powers available to control noise and the environmental impacts of aerodromes. Local Transport Plans are statutory requirements as set out in the Local Transport Act 2008 and NPPF paragraph 31 requires local authorities to work together and with transport providers to develop strategies. The Government has Water-borne Freight Grants available to assist companies with operating costs associated with running water freight transport</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of North West Regional Strategy

Alternative	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	
																											<p>instead of road, where water is more expensive than road. This is evidence of the Government's desire to encourage the use of water freight transport over road transport, where feasible.</p> <p>Thus there is unlikely to be any significant impact either way as a result of revoking the RS and actual environmental effects will be dependent upon the types of project brought forward.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p> <p>None proposed.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Funding grants continue to be made available.</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u></p> <p>Effects dependent upon the balance of projects taken forward.</p>	

RT 8: Inter-Modal Freight Terminals

Alternative	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	
Retention	0	?	?	0	+	+	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	-	-	0	?	?	0	-	-	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>This policy encourages plans and strategies to identify sites for inter-modal freight terminals. There is a specific spatial outcome to this policy as it identifies four broad areas in South West Greater Manchester, Widnes, Newton-le-Willows and Birkenhead Waterfront where consideration for sites should particularly be given. It also allows for the Green Belt boundary to be reviewed in order to accommodate an inter-freight rail terminal, although proposals for such terminals have to consider and address the effect of the development on the environment and the local population. The RES references intermodal freight terminals as Action 80. It does not list potential sites but states that they can support sustainable freight distribution.</p> <p>This policy has positive effects in that it seeks to facilitate the movement of freight by rail and/or water and whilst it requires full consideration of the environmental and health impacts of any terminal, it allows for the use of Green Belt land, without any requirement to provide replacement land. Given the likely time required to get development consent, the impact of this policy is not likely to take effect until at least the medium term.</p> <p>Effects upon soil and landscape are minor negative as the sites include a mix of greenfield and brownfield land (latter examples being the Birkenhead Waterfront and the Parkside Colliery, St Helens). Similarly the significant infrastructure which is proposed will consume material assets. Air and climate is considered to be uncertain depending upon the success of the modal split, if freight is removed from the road, then it may be positive.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>None proposed.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>Success will depend on full implementation of the strategy.</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>Level of certain effects dependent upon modal shift.</p>
Revocation	0	?	?	0	0	+	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	?	0	0	?	0	0	-	0	0	?	0	0	-	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>Inter-modal Freight Terminal policy is addressed in the Government's Strategic Rail Freight Interchange policy guidance which is an interim document produced ahead of the National Networks national policy</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of North West Regional Strategy

Alternative	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				
																									<p>statement. This guidance sets out the main objectives of Government policy for strategic rail freight interchanges. It does not have a particular spatial outcome but it does expect the location to be driven by the need of the industry and to be based around urban centres. There is no requirement laid out in the guidance to address the impacts of any development nor is the review of Green Belt boundaries discussed. It is likely, however, that many, if not most, applications for such interchanges will come under the major infrastructure planning regime and the environmental impacts would be addressed through this process. Concerns of the local communities will also be heard and any compulsory purchases of land considered.</p> <p>Revoking the policy may remove a strategic level of policy that would otherwise have been provided by local authorities when developing sub-regional freight strategies. However, the RS policy requirement to work with operators is reflected by the national interchange policy guidance listed above. Overall it is concluded that should there be demand, interchange facilities will still come forward bringing with them the benefits and disbenefits listed for the retention alternative albeit at a potential slower timeframe.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p> <p>None proposed.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>That many if not most Inter-modal Freight Terminals will fall under the major Infrastructure Planning regime as set out in the Planning Act 2008.</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u></p> <p>Level of certain effects dependent upon modal shift.</p>			

RT 9: Walking and Cycling

Alternative	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	
Retention	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	<p><u>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</u></p> <p>This policy has significant benefits for human health wider population (access to services) and the environment as it both seeks to develop integrated networks of continuous, attractive and safe walking and cycling routes, linking, in particular, residential areas, and places of employment and schools and leisure facilities. Dedicated cycleways can also act as ecological corridors as part of a wider green infrastructure programme.</p> <p>Providing that these paths can be built quickly, the benefits could start to be realised quickly.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p> <p>None proposed.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Success will depend on full and early implementation of the strategy.</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u></p> <p>None identified.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of North West Regional Strategy

Alternative	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	
Revocation	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	<p><u>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</u></p> <p>The NPPF requires that plans give priority to pedestrian and cycle movement (paragraph 35) and aim for a balance of land uses so that people can be encouraged to minimise journey lengths (paragraph 37). Furthermore paragraph 69 recognises that the planning system can play an important role in facilitating public interaction through a combination of policy measures including the creation of safe and accessible environment.</p> <p>It is therefore concluded that the revocation of RT 9 is likely to maintain the positive effects associated with the retention of RT9.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p> <p>None proposed.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>That local planning authorities fully and faithfully implement the NPPF and the aims and objectives of the Local Transport Plans 3.</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u></p> <p>None identified.</p>

RT10: Priorities for Transport Management and Investment

Alternative	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	
Retention	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>The Policy does not list transportation projects. It refers, under Policy RT10 to future prioritisation based upon the RES, RS and other regional and sub-regional policy prioritisation. Potential schemes are contained within a document, Regional Prioritisation of Major Transport Schemes Study Report, Atkins, January 2006. This document does not form part of the RS. At Appendix C and D the document lists a series of schemes which it assesses as warranting prioritisation and it sets out where they are reflected within the then, emerging RES. However not all of the projects listed in the RES, such as enhanced road access to Barrow and the Furness Peninsula, completed upgrade of the West Coast Mainline (which has been done) are recorded whilst Policy RT10 recognises that some of the schemes identified may not come forward as a result of changes in funding. The schemes are a mix of public transport improvements, which are potentially beneficial to receptors such as air and climate – if they encourage a modal switch, and target road improvement/congestion reduction schemes. Given the uncertainty surrounding delivery of the programmes and hence the magnitude of potential effects the conclusion is uncertain across the suite of environmental receptors.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p> <p>None proposed.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u></p> <p>As set out above, environmental effects will dependant upon the number and type of transport schemes which come forward for implementation.</p>
Revocation	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of North West Regional Strategy

Alternative	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	
																												<p>Revocation of the strategy will have no impact beyond maintaining uncertainty, for the reasons outlined above. For example, RES Action 71, proposals for a new high speed rail line will continue to be pursued via HS2. Metrolink Phase 3 (Action 77) is nearing completion.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p> <p>None proposed.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u></p> <p>As set out above.</p>

Policy MCR1 – Manchester City Region Priorities

Alternative	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	
Retention	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>MCR1 sets out the high level policy for the Manchester city region, on the basis of the strategic policies set out earlier, including W1, W2, RDF1 and DP1-9. It is aimed at achieving a significant improvement in the economic performance of the Manchester city region by encouraging investment and sustainable development in the Regional Centre, surrounding inner areas, the towns/cities and accessible suburban centres as set out in RDF1 and other key locations.</p> <p>MCR1 seeks to reduce sub-regional disparities by capturing investment in areas in need of regeneration, including the inner areas and the northern part of the City Region, through improvements in public transport and accommodating housing development in locations that are accessible by public transport to areas of economic growth. Significant residential development is encouraged in the inner areas to increase population of these areas, replace or refurbish obsolete housing stock, and attract and retain new population in order to support economic growth.</p> <p>MCR1 seeks to improve the City Region's internal and external transport links, maintain the role of Manchester Airport as the North of England's key international gateway, develop the role of Manchester as a national public transport gateway to the region, and enhance the accessibility of the Regional Centre by public transport to support economic growth.</p> <p>MCR1 sets the context for related policies such as MCR2, MCR4 and RT3, and seeks to focus environmental improvements where they have the greatest benefit in terms of the sustainable development of the Regional Centre and Inner Areas, including integrated flood management works, the remediation of contaminated land, and provision of high quality green infrastructure.</p> <p>The Regional Strategy also recognises the relevance of the Greater Manchester Strategy, a document endorsed by the Association of Greater Manchester Authorities in 2009 which sets out strategic priorities for the Manchester City-Region up to 2020. This is closely connected to the Greater Manchester LEP, in which the 10 authorities of the AGMA participate, and which will play a key role in shaping development priorities across the City-Region.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of North West Regional Strategy

Alternative	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	
																												<p>The RES recognises the importance of Manchester which, together with Liverpool is considered to be the economic driver for the region. Under infrastructure, reference is made to projects which would improve accessibility into the city and improve connections to other parts of the region and beyond. Further actions under the RES headings Achieving the Vision, recognise as Action 54 that Manchester is one of the three key drivers for growth.</p> <p>The development envisaged by MCR1 is likely to lead to benefits to population through economic growth and improvements to homes and transport networks. Policies on environmental improvements are also likely to bring benefits to biodiversity and soil, protect the landscape by encouraging brownfield development and support townscape improvements (Landscape). However, development is also likely to lead to an increase in carbon emissions, and an increased inner city population is likely to lead to more traffic movement, though some of this will be by public transport and walking and cycling. Development will also adversely affect material assets, generating more waste, and requiring more materials. Impacts are minimal in the short term, reflecting the scale of development, and accumulate over time.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the score for climate and material assets it should be recognised that a concentrated approach to development is preferable to one that advocates greater dispersal. Higher density development for example provides greater opportunities to introduce combined heat and power systems. Concentrated development can also support a more efficient use of minerals and aggregates. These points were noted within the original sustainability appraisal of the North West of England Plan.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p> <p>The negative impacts of development are mitigated through other policies in the Regional Strategy on reducing carbon emissions, the sustainability of new buildings and the shift to a more sustainable transport system. Continued expansion of the Manchester Tram network to towns within Greater Manchester is noted.</p> <p>Policy is assessed as neutral on water resources, based upon implementation in connection with RSS Policy EM5 (phasing of infrastructure).</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u></p> <p>None identified.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of North West Regional Strategy

Alternative	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	
Revocation	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	+	+	<p><u>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</u></p> <p>The Manchester Core Strategy was adopted in July 2012. The Core Strategy was drawn up in the context of the Regional Strategy, and though it sets out a plan for Manchester over a different timescale to the Regional Strategy, nonetheless reflects its policies. For example, the Core Strategy envisages housing delivery in Manchester averaging 3,333 per annum to 2027, which is not significantly lower than the Regional Strategy's target of 3,500 per annum to 2021. Policy SP1 seeks to concentrate residential development on the Central, North and East Manchester areas, as envisaged by Regional Strategy Policy MCR1. Core Strategy policy EN18 sets out an expectation that strategic locations will be a priority for the remediation of contaminated land, implementing a similar expectation in MCR1. It is therefore unlikely that the revocation of MCR1 will have significant effects, though the preference in the NPPF for the land of least environmental value to be preferred for development could bring additional protection to biodiversity, flora and fauna.</p> <p>Of the other 11 local authorities within the sub-region four have adopted Core Strategies with some others approaching the latter stages of plan preparation. There is also an adopted Greater Manchester Joint Waste DPD. The delay in Strategy adoption could result in some Council's falling back to development targets pre-Regional Strategy with consequential delays in the benefits otherwise identified for population.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p> <p>Development is mitigated by policies in the NPPF on minimising the impact of development, particularly on carbon emissions, and the development of sustainable transport networks. Water is assessed as neutral given the NPPF requirement that local planning authorities, working with others, should assess the quality and capacity of infrastructure and its ability to meet forecast demands. Local plans should include strategic policies to deliver infrastructure provision including for water supply.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None identified.</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u></p> <p>None identified.</p>

Policy MCR2 – Regional Centre and Inner Areas of Manchester City Region

Alternative	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	
Retention	?	?	?	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	0	0	+	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>MCR2 seeks to ensure that the Regional Centre of the Manchester City Region continues to develop as the primary economic driver, providing the main focus for business, retail, leisure, cultural and tourism development in the City Region. The regional centre is defined as Manchester and parts of Trafford and Salford. Two of the three authorities have adopted core strategies which suggests that the effects arising from this policy will commence in the short term and extend into the long term.</p> <p>The expansion of the knowledge economy is a particular priority. Proposals for residential development in the Regional Centre should form part of mixed use employment schemes that comprise a good range of housing sizes, types, tenures and affordability.</p> <p>In the inner areas, residential development should be focused in the areas adjacent to the Regional Centre to increase population, with an emphasis on varied size, type, tenure and affordability, a high quality environment and accessible local facilities and employment opportunities. The development envisaged by MCR2 is likely to have significant benefits to population and human health, whilst the regeneration of inner areas plus the provision of new, high quality commercial development should bring improvements to the urban landscape. The adverse impacts of development are to air quality owing to a likely increase in traffic, carbon emissions resulting from significant development, and an increase in the use of water (although mitigated by separate policy requirement to phase infrastructure provision) and material assets.</p> <p>RES is supportive of this policy. Actions include 54, a key driver to economic growth, 79, to link areas of need with opportunity, 83, development of workspace in areas of deprivation and HMRs, 84 re-use of brownfield land and 87, setting Housing Market Renewal within the context of a strong economy.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Development is mitigated by policies in the other policies in the regional strategy on minimising the impact of development, particularly on carbon emissions, minimisation of car usage, phasing of infrastructure and the development of sustainable transport networks.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of North West Regional Strategy

Alternative	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	
																												Assumptions None proposed. Uncertainty Biodiversity depending upon the environmental quality of redeveloped sites.
Revocation	0	+	+	+	+	+	0	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	+	+	Likely Significant Effects of Revocation <p>The Manchester Core Strategy meets the objectives of MCR2. Core Strategy policy SP1 implements the vision of the Regional Centre as the focus for economic and commercial development, retail, leisure and cultural activity, alongside high quality city living. The majority of new residential development will be in the Inner Areas. Core Strategy Strategic Objective 3 seeks a significant increase in high quality housing provision at sustainable locations throughout the City, to both address demographic needs and to support economic growth, with an emphasis will be on providing a good range of high quality housing, in terms of size, type, tenure, accessibility and price.</p> <p>SP1 states that new development should protect and enhance the built and natural environment, minimise emissions, ensure efficient use of natural resources and reuse previously developed land wherever possible, Improve access to jobs, services, education and open space by being located to reduce the need to travel and provide good access to sustainable transport provision. Core Strategy policy EC3 implements the Regional Strategy's vision for housing development in the Regional Centre, stating that housing will also be an appropriate use within the Regional Centre, although this should complement the development of mixed use employment areas.</p> <p>The Greater Manchester Strategy, which sets out strategic priorities for the Greater Manchester area, and which is endorsed by the Association of Greater Manchester Authorities (AGMA), acknowledges the importance to economic growth of Knowledge Based Industries.</p> <p>Given that MCR2 is fully taken account of in the Core Strategy, and given the importance of the Greater Manchester Strategy to the wider Greater Manchester area, it is unlikely that the revocation of MCR2 will result in significantly different impacts from retaining MCR2 except, as for MCR1, some additional benefits from the policy in the NPPF on preferring land (particularly brownfield) of least environmental value for development.</p> <p>Trafford also has an adopted Core Strategy which makes explicit reference to RSS Policy MCR2 in relation to North Trafford. Objectives for Trafford Park include support for a high quality mixed use residential area coupled with sustainable economic growth. Pomona Island is also identified as a</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of North West Regional Strategy

Alternative	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	
																												<p>Strategic Location for development.</p> <p>The Salford Core Strategy was published in February 2012 and submitted for examination in May. The Strategic objectives and policies contained within the document seek to support the continued growth and enhancement of Salford Keys (including Media City), increasing accessibility between areas of economic growth and residential areas. In response to the Inspector's written comments on the Strategy, the Council formally withdrew the document in November 2012. As one of the three authorities does not have an adopted core strategy, effects are likely to take place over a slightly longer timeframe.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p> <p>Development is mitigated by policies in the NPPF on minimising the impact of development, particularly on carbon emissions, and the development of sustainable transport networks.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>That a revised Salford Core Strategy is adopted in the medium term.</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u></p> <p>None identified.</p>

Policy MCR3 – Southern Part of the Manchester City Region

Alternative	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	
Retention	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	?	?	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>MCR3 pulls together a number of policies in the Regional Strategy which set out region-wide priorities, to the extent that they apply to the Manchester city-region, including RDF1, RDF2, W2 and W3. It reiterates other policies in the Strategy, including preferring sites which are accessible by public transport, walking and cycling, that residential development should support local regeneration strategies and to meet identified local needs, and supporting and diversifying the rural economy and improving access to services in the rural areas. The impacts of these policies were assessed by the SA of the RSS in combination with MCR1 and 2. As such the same performance is considered to apply.</p> <p>The RES is supportive of this policy through some of the actions listed against MCR1 above and in addition actions such as 118 which seek to support sustainable agriculture in rural areas.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>None proposed.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>Soil uncertain depending upon amount of development in rural area for local needs.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of North West Regional Strategy

Alternative	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	
Revocation	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	?	?	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	+	+	<p><u>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</u></p> <p>Stockport has an adopted Core Strategy (2011) which reflects the policies of the RSS. These include for a focus of development in towns (Stockport Central Area), on predominantly brownfield land (90%) with support and diversification for the rural economy this can protect the landscape by encouraging brownfield development and support townscape improvements (Landscape). Therefore the policy framework without the RSS is likely to continue within Stockport through the short to medium term and continuing into the long term (post 5 years). The lack of up to date policy for East Cheshire (at least reflecting the RSS) means that the revocation could permit councils to return to levels of construction below those identified within the RSS. Implementation of policy is likely to rely upon older local plans and the NPPF (which contains similar policy protection for environmental assets). In view of the current policy status of plans in Salford and east Cheshire it is concluded that the benefits ascribed under population may take slightly longer to deliver than under the RSS policy framework.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p> <p>None proposed.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u></p> <p>As for retention.</p>

Policy MCR4 – South Cheshire

Alternative	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	
Retention	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	?	?	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	+	+	0	?	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>MCR4 pulls together policies affecting Crewe and its surrounding area, which are set out in earlier in the Regional Strategy, including RDF1, policies DP1-9, W2 and W3, and MCR1. MCR4 seeks to promote the role of Crewe as a regional public transport gateway/interchange to the region, and provide for regeneration to improve the environment, economy and image of Crewe. MCR4 also seeks to protect and enhance the historic environment of Nantwich and its contribution to the sub-region's economy, tourism, quality of life and regeneration, and outlines the need to support and diversify the rural economy and improve access to services in the rural areas in accordance with RDF2. Because the Cheshire East Core Strategy has not yet been published in draft form there can be no certainty about how MCR4 might be reflected. However, assuming they were fully implemented, it is expected that Crewe railway station would be enhanced and its capacity increased, encouraging a modal shift away from the road which potential benefits for mitigation of climate change.</p> <p>The RES supports development at Crewe, which forms part of its vision for the north west which is to ensure that Growth opportunities around Crewe, Chester, Warrington, Lancaster and Carlisle are fully developed. The RES sets out a number of Actions some of which overlap with other sub-regions, in order to deliver this objective.</p> <p>Residential and commercial development in Crewe would be encouraged by the policy and the historic environment of Nantwich would be improved with a corresponding increase in visitor numbers, and that rural facilities would be improved. Benefits accrue to population, with minor positive to cultural heritage and with adverse impacts of new development on air and material assets. It is assumed that the majority of development would take place on previously developed sites, with minimal impact on biodiversity.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>The impacts of development are mitigated by other policies in the North West of England Plan on minimising the impact of development, particularly on carbon emissions, minimisation of car usage and</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of North West Regional Strategy

Alternative	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	
																												<p>the development of sustainable transport networks.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>Expansion of the university and development at Basford could lead to local landscape and soil effects.</p>
Revocation	0	0	0	0	+	+	0	?	?	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	?	?	0	-	-	0	+	+	0	0	0	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>Because the Cheshire East Core Strategy is yet to be adopted, local plans are not helpful in assessing the impact of revocation. The NPPF provides clear support for the types of development envisaged by MCR4. Paragraph 17 states that every effort should be made objectively to identify and then meet the housing, business and other development needs of an area.</p> <p>Paragraph 159 seeks to ensure that local planning authorities have a clear understanding of housing needs in their area by preparing Strategic Housing Market Assessments, working with neighbouring authorities where housing market areas cross administrative boundaries, and 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.</p> <p>Paragraph 31 states that Local authorities should work with neighbouring authorities and transport providers to develop strategies for the provision of viable infrastructure necessary to support sustainable development, including large scale facilities such as rail freight interchanges, roadside facilities for motorists or transport investment necessary to support strategies for the growth of ports, airports or other major generators of travel demand in their areas.</p> <p>Part 12 of the NPPF provides strong support for the preservation and enhancement of heritage assets. It is therefore assumed that where an assessment of needs, including a SHMA, supports the need for development (whether residential, commercial, or transport) in Crewe and other parts of Cheshire, this is likely to be reflected in local plans. However, it is likely that in the absence of the strategic direction provided by both the Regional Strategy and an up to date Core Strategy, that it will take some time for the NPPF to be fully understood and implemented, and ultimately reflected in the local plan. Revocation of MCR4 is therefore likely to result in a similar pattern of development to its retention, but with the impacts arising more slowly.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of North West Regional Strategy

Alternative	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	
																												<p>In 2011 £6million was awarded to upgrade Crewe Station as part of the Government's £100 million rail stations improvement fund. This is likely to promote sustainable modes of transport and may serve to support mitigation of climate change. However, it is not clear whether the amount of funding provided matches that anticipated by the RSS. Climate change score is therefore uncertain.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p> <p>The impacts of development are mitigated by policies in the NPPF on minimising the impact of development, particularly on carbon emissions, and the development of sustainable transport networks.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u></p> <p>The extent to which proposals for Crewe Station, the university and Basford match those anticipated by RSS.</p>

Policy MCR5 – Northern Part of the Manchester City Region

Alternative	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	
Retention	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>MCR5 seeks to set out high level strategy for economic growth and regeneration in the Northern Part of the Manchester City Region. It encourages appropriate sites to be brought forward for development – in employment development as set out in RDF1, through expanding the quality and choice of housing in line with the approach set out in Policy L4, and though improvements in infrastructure where necessary. MCR5 anticipates that the Housing Market Renewal Pathfinder in Oldham and Rochdale will provide an opportunity for economic and housing development in these areas, but this programme was cancelled in 2011.</p> <p>MCR5 also sets out a high level aim to support and diversify the rural economy and improve access to services in the rural areas of the city-region.</p> <p>An important aspect of the supporting text to the policy is considered to be the requirement that new housing is matched by economic development in order to avoid any dramatic rise in the need to travel to work.</p> <p>The RES supports Policy MCR5 through Actions which support economic development in areas suffering deprivation, including HMRs (Actions 52 and 53) development of Metrolink (Action 77) investing in quality business accommodation in HMRs (Action 83) and in reducing areas of housing market failure (Action 87).</p> <p>The main impacts arising from MCR5 result from new commercial and residential development. The, high quality, well designed development is likely to result in economic and health benefits to residents, and also to improve the townscape (landscape). Development, especially where it increases the population, is likely to have adverse impacts on water resources, air quality, carbon dioxide emissions and material assets.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>The impacts of development are mitigated by other policies in the North West of England Plan on minimising the impact of development, particularly on carbon emissions, minimisation of car usage and</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of North West Regional Strategy

Alternative	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	
																												<p>the development of sustainable transport networks.</p> <p>Assumptions Neutral for soil given the significant brownfield target.</p> <p>Uncertainty None identified.</p>
Revocation	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>As set out above for MCR4, paragraph 17 of the NPPF sets out a high level expectation that every effort should be made objectively to identify and then meet the housing, business and other development needs of an area. The detailed policies in the NPPF which support the assessment and meeting of economic and housing needs, together with the duty to co-operate and the co-operation of authorities through the Greater Manchester LEP mean that the development envisaged by MCR5 is likely to come forward. However, local authorities in the northern part of the City Region are in different stages of core strategy preparation, (with only two of the six with adopted strategies) and a clear picture of what plans will provide across the area has not yet emerged, particularly with the disestablishment of the Housing Market Pathfinder programme. In the absence of the strategic approach set out in MCR5 it may take longer for the development to come forward. The profile of impacts is therefore similar, but a longer timescale is reflected in the assessment.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>The impacts of development are mitigated by policies in the NPPF on minimising the impact of development, particularly on carbon emissions, and the development of sustainable transport networks.</p> <p>Assumptions None.</p> <p>Uncertainty None identified.</p>

Policy MCR6 – Strategic Framework for Warrington

Alternative	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	
Retention	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>MCR6 aims to support sustainable economic growth in Warrington and its role as a source of employment for an area including Warrington, Knowsley, Halton, St Helens and Wigan, focussing development on sites which are accessible by public transport, walking and cycling and accord with other Regional Strategy policies. MCR6 focuses particularly on brownfield sites to ensure no further significant expansion onto open land. MCR6 also supports the regeneration and restructuring of the older urban areas, supports Warrington's role as a regional transport gateway/interchange, and aims to support and diversify the rural economy and improve access to services in the rural areas. The policy is supported by the RES vision for the sub-region which is to deliver growth opportunities in certain centres including Warrington. Actions include managing demand on the Chester/Warrington motorway network, exploiting the science base (Daresbury) and improving environmental quality.</p> <p>The main impacts of MCR6 arise from the redevelopment of brownfield sites for commercial development, and also from the redevelopment of older urban areas. Impacts of a lesser nature may arise from the support for Warrington's role as a regional transport gateway/interchange and rural development. Economic development will lead to effects upon air and climate and material assets in particular although these are less likely to be significant given the emphasis upon the re-use of land and accessibility by sustainable modes of transport.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>The impacts of development are mitigated by policies in the other policies in the North West of England Plan on minimising the impact of development, particularly on carbon emissions, minimisation of car usage and the development of sustainable transport networks.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>None identified.</p>
Revocation	0	0	0	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>In the absence of a Core Strategy for Warrington the impacts of revocation are based on the effect of</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of North West Regional Strategy

Alternative	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	
																												<p>Government policy. As set out above, the NPPF states that every effort should be made objectively to identify and then meet the housing, business and other development needs of an area, and also contains strong policies supporting economic and housing growth and regeneration. The implementation of these policies, especially in the context of the Cheshire and Warrington LEP Business Plan 2012, makes it unlikely that development coming forward in Warrington will be significantly different from that envisaged by MCR6. The profile of impacts is therefore similar. In the absence of the strategic direction provided by the Regional Strategy new development may take longer to be delivered, but given the very high level nature of the policy, it is not considered that any delay will be significant. Because most of the development is likely to be on previously developed land, any impact on biodiversity is expected to be minimal (particularly as NPPF paragraph 17 seeks to protect brownfield land of high environmental value). NPPF emphasis on sustainable transport (section 4) ensures that the minor negative effects of economic development upon issues such as air and climate do not become significant.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p> <p>The impacts of development are mitigated by policies in the NPPF on minimising the impact of development, particularly on carbon emissions, and the development of sustainable transport networks.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u></p> <p>None identified.</p>

Policy LCR1 – Liverpool City Region Priorities

Alternative	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	
Retention	0	+	+	+	+	+	0	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>LCR1 sets out high level policy seeking a significant improvement in the sub-region's economic performance by encouraging investment and sustainable development in the Regional Centre, surrounding inner areas, and other towns and other areas in accordance with RDF1, DP1-9, W2 and W3. Proposals and schemes should be directed primarily towards locations where they can contribute to the priorities set out.</p> <p>Housing delivery in the inner areas should be sufficient to meet the objectives of the Housing Market Renewal Initiative, and to support economic growth and regeneration. Improvements in public transport are envisaged to improve accessibility, and transport links between disadvantaged areas and key employment, education and healthcare locations should be improved. In the outer part in the Liverpool City Region economic development should be promoted to address worklessness, urban renaissance and social inclusion. Sustainable growth, local regeneration initiatives and development opportunities should be promoted in West Cheshire/North East Wales sub-region and in Vale Royal.</p> <p>Investment is envisaged in the City Region's transport systems, including Liverpool John Lennon Airport and the Merseyside Ports, in line with policies RT5 and RT6 (which are assessed separately), as is the development of Liverpool as a national and regional public transport gateway and interchange to the Region. The accessibility of the Regional Centre should be improved, particularly by public transport walking and cycling.</p> <p>Environmental improvements should be made where they can facilitate the sustainable development of the Regional Centre and Inner Areas, including the remediation of contaminated land and provision of high quality green infrastructure as part of comprehensive regeneration schemes. Existing environmental assets should be protected, in particular sites of international importance for nature conservation such as the Mersey Estuary recognition of which provides a positive score for biodiversity, as opposed to the neutral scored obtained by similar MCR policies.</p> <p>The policy is supported by the RES Vision and Actions. The Vision states that Manchester and Liverpool are vibrant European cities and, with Preston, are key drivers of city regional growth. Actions</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of North West Regional Strategy

Alternative	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	
																											<p>include building on the strengths of cities as drivers of regional growth (Action 54), improving the product associated with key tourism assets (Action 101) encouraging employment in deprived areas (Action 52) providing intensive support for areas with low employment rates (Actions 43, 44), improving road access to Liverpool City Centre (Action 63) and ensuring that new housing supports regeneration (Action 83).</p> <p>The impacts of policy LCR1 arise mainly from the provision of sites for employment development and significant number of new homes in inner areas, together with environment improvements and transport upgrades to facilitate these. In the longer term the economic benefits of additional housing provision is likely to become significant.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p> <p>The impacts of development are mitigated by policies in the other policies in the North West of England Plan on minimising the impact of development, particularly on carbon emissions, minimisation of car usage and the development of sustainable transport networks.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u></p> <p>None identified.</p>	

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of North West Regional Strategy

Alternative	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	
Revocation	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	+	+	<p><u>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</u></p> <p>Paragraph 17 of the NPPF sets out a high level expectation that that every effort should be made objectively to identify and then meet the housing, business and other development needs of an area. The detailed policies in the NPPF which support the assessment and meeting of economic and housing needs, together with the duty to co-operate mean that the development envisaged by LCR1 is likely to come forward. In the absence of the strategic approach set out in LCR1 it may take longer for the development to come forward, particularly as none of the Merseyside authorities have adopted Core Strategies in place. The profile of impacts is therefore similar, but a longer timescale is reflected in the assessment.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p> <p>The impacts of development are mitigated by policies in the NPPF on minimising the impact of development, particularly on carbon emissions, and the development of sustainable transport networks.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>That authorities continue to target housing growth in areas in need of economic development and regeneration, and which are unlikely to result in significant additional land take.</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u></p> <p>None identified.</p>

Policy LCR2 – The Regional Centre and Inner Areas of Liverpool City Region

Alternative	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	
Retention	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>Policy LCR2 seeks to promote the role of Liverpool as the primary economic driver for the wider Liverpool City Region.</p> <p>Appropriate commercial, retail, leisure, cultural and tourism development should take place within the Regional Centre developing its role as the primary retail centre and main employment location. The knowledge economy should be expanded in the Regional Centre particularly by maximising the research and development roles of the Universities and delivering knowledge nuclei sites and the expansion of professional services.</p> <p>The RES supports the Policy through a number of actions including those listed under LCR1 above. These include support for tourism (Action 101) and supporting knowledge transfer between business and higher education institutions such as the Liverpool Universities, (Action 13).</p> <p>Outside areas of housing market renewal, residential development in the Regional Centre should form part of mixed use employment schemes that comprise a good range of housing sizes, types tenures and affordability, and contribute to the vitality and viability of the Regional Centre. There is a particular focus on residential development in the Inner Areas adjacent to the Regional Centre to secure a significant increase in population and to support regeneration, including maintaining and enhancing the roles of Birkenhead and Bootle to provide community facilities, services and employment. The New Heartlands Housing Market Renewal Pathfinder was expected to revitalise and regenerate Liverpool, Sefton, and Wirral.</p> <p>LCR2 also supports the development of the Mersey Ports and the maritime economy, investment in the Mersey Waterfront Regional Park, employment within the inner areas in accordance with W2 and W3 and LCR1.</p> <p>The development envisaged by LCR2 is likely to have significant social and economic benefits in the longer term, whilst the regeneration of inner areas plus the provision of new, high quality commercial development should bring improvements to the urban landscape. The adverse impacts of development</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of North West Regional Strategy

Alternative	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	
																												<p>are to air quality owing to a likely increase in traffic, carbon emissions resulting from significant development, and an increase in the use of water and material assets.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p> <p>The impacts of development are mitigated by other policies in the North West of England Plan which seek to minimise the impact of development, particularly on carbon emissions, minimisation of car usage and the development of sustainable transport networks.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>None.</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u></p> <p>None identified.</p>
Revocation	0	0	0	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	+	+	<p><u>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</u></p> <p>Liverpool City, and Wirral (policy reference is made to Birkenhead), do not yet have a core strategy in place. As for other sub-regional policies in the same position, the policy vacuum left by LCR2 is filled by policy set out in the NPPF. As set out above in the case of other policies, the NPPF sets out a high level expectation that that every effort should be made objectively to identify and then meet the housing, business and other development needs of an area. The detailed policies in the NPPF which support the assessment and meeting of economic and housing needs, together with the duty to co-operate mean that the development envisaged by LCR2 is likely to come forward. It may take longer for development plans to adjust to NPPF policy, and in the absence of the strategic approach set out in LCR2, it may take longer for development to come forward. The profile of impacts is therefore similar, but a longer timescale is reflected in the assessment.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p> <p>The impacts of development are mitigated by policies in the NPPF on minimising the impact of development, particularly on carbon emissions, and the development of sustainable transport networks.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>That authorities continue to target housing growth in areas in need of economic development and regeneration, and which are unlikely to result in significant additional land take.</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u></p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of North West Regional Strategy

Alternative	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				
																									None identified.			

Policy LCR3 – Outer part of the Liverpool City Region**Policy LCR4 – The remaining rural parts of Liverpool City Region**

Alternative	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	
Retention	?	?	?	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	?	?	?	?	?	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>Policy LCR3 supports economic development in town/cities as set out in RDF1 and at other locations which accord with policies DP1-9, W2, W3 and LCR1. Support is given to significant intervention in areas where housing market restructuring is required in line with the approach set out in Policies L3 and L4. LCR3 also seeks to maintain and enhance the roles of the regional towns, key service centres and local centres in accordance with Policy RDF2, and the identification, definition and maintenance of the role of suburban centres.</p> <p>LCR4 states that plans and strategies should support and diversify the rural economy and improve access to services in the rural areas focusing development in locations which accord with RDF2, and ensure the provision of housing to address barriers to affordability and to meet identified local needs.</p> <p>The RES supports both economic development in rural areas, and targeted economic investment to support worklessness both by improving access between areas of need and opportunity and through improved skills provision.</p> <p>LCR3 and LCR4 are general, strategic policies, which, depending on how they are implemented by the relevant local planning authorities, are capable of generating impacts ranging from very little to very significant. The specific impacts will depend on the outcome of assessments of local need undertaken by local authorities, however, the policy intention, which is to support the economic development of the areas in question is assumed to be significant. The impacts of these policies are therefore determined to be unclear across a range of receptors (biodiversity, soil, water, cultural heritage and landscape). Those receptors likely to be affected are population, air, climatic factors and material assets. Population is considered to have a positive outcome due to the policy encouragement for economic development. Medium to long term minor negative effects upon air, climatic factors and material assets are assumed to arise owing to a likely increase in traffic and carbon emissions resulting from significant development.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of North West Regional Strategy

Alternative	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		
																												That the North West of England Plan is read as one document with policies that support environmental protection, waste and energy minimisation and management of travel demand are compatible. <u>Assumptions</u> None. <u>Uncertainty</u> These policies are set at a strategic level referring back to other policies within the RS which have been appraised separately. The level of effects resulting from these policies in isolation of others will depend on the outcome of assessments of local needs undertaken by local authorities.	
Revocation	?	?	?	0	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	<u>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</u> The effects of revocation are likely to be the same as for retention but with the potential for delay whilst the Councils refocus their priorities following the abolition of the Housing Market Renewal programme and the demise of the North West Development Agency. They will also need to prepare their evidence base prior to the preparation of their new local plans (formerly Core Strategies). None of the affected Council's have adopted Core Strategies in place. <u>Mitigation Measures</u> Regeneration should be undertaken in the context of NPPF policy guidance concerned with the protection of the environment, accessible locations and low carbon development. <u>Assumptions</u> Council's prepare evidence base to support the preparation of policy for economic growth. <u>Uncertainty</u> These policies are set at a strategic level that do not allow an assessment to be made of their site specific impacts, and therefore of the impacts of revocation.

Policy LCR5 - West Cheshire – North East Wales

Alternative	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	
Retention	0	0	0	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	+	+	0	0	0	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>LCR5 seeks to focus development in the town/cities as set out in RDF1 and at other locations which accord with other policies in the Strategy. It supports the potential of Chester for sustainable growth, and as a key sub-regional commercial centre, provided development is compatible with the conservation and enhancement of the historic City and its setting. There is also support for sustainable economic growth and regeneration of Ellesmere Port and Northwich.</p> <p>Improvement in the internal and external transport links, in particular with North East Wales are encouraged, including development in the role of Chester as a regional public transport gateway.</p> <p>In keeping with a key theme of the RS, LCR5 seeks to enhance links between areas of opportunity and areas of need, including the Wrexham - Bidston - Liverpool rail corridor, Wrexham – Chester, the Route leading to the Flintshire Coastal Corridor, and other corridors radiating out from Chester, in particular links to Ellesmere Port and Broughton. The enhancement of road links in particular does not necessarily imply the provision of additional capacity but on balance it is considered the effects upon air quality are likely to occur.</p> <p>The RES also identifies linkages between Chester and North Wales as appropriate for improvement encouraging greater public transport use between areas of need and economic opportunity (Chester) as Action 77.</p> <p>Joint working between Authorities and Agencies across the sub-region is encouraged to ensure the strategic planning and management of the sub-region's economy, housing market, transport network and environmental and cultural assets. LCR5 also seeks to ensure the provision of housing to meet local needs and address barriers to affordability, further develop the skills base of the labour force and promote access to employment, and support and diversify the rural economy and improve access to services in the rural areas.</p> <p>LCR5 is likely to lead to a moderate level of residential and commercial development, with social and economic improvements, and this has the potential to lead to adverse effects upon climatic factors</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of North West Regional Strategy

Alternative	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	
																												<p>(carbon emissions), and material assets. Improvements to transport links between areas of need and areas of economic opportunity are likely to result in economic benefits in those areas. Some benefits are likely to arise from the conservation and enhancement of Chester. The increased role for Chester as a public transport gateway is likely to generate additional transport movements, with some additional carbon emissions as a result, but also social and economic benefits.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>The impacts of development are mitigated by policies in the other policies in the North West of England Plan on minimising the impact of development, particularly on carbon emissions, minimisation of car usage and the development of sustainable transport networks.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>None.</p>
Revocation	0	0	0	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	+	+	0	0	0	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>As for other sub-regional policies, the policy vacuum left by LCR2 is filled by policy set out in the NPPF. As set out above in the case of other policies, the NPPF sets out a high level expectation that every effort should be made objectively to identify and then meet the housing, business and other development needs of an area. The detailed policies in the NPPF which support the assessment and meeting of economic and housing needs and the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment, together with the duty to co-operate mean that the development envisaged by LCR5 is likely to come forward. Whilst the absence of the strategic approach set out in LCR5 may have some impact (particularly as Cheshire West and Chester does not have an adopted Core Strategy), the moderate scale of development envisaged suggests this is not likely to have a significant impact. The revocation of LCR5 is therefore unlikely to have a different impact from its retention.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>The impacts of development are mitigated by within the NPPF principally the encouragement for sustainable transport.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>That assessment of need undertaken by local authorities indicates the need for a broadly similar pattern</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of North West Regional Strategy

Alternative	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	
																												<p>of development as that envisaged by LCR5.</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u></p> <p>None identified.</p>

Policy CLCR1 – Central Lancashire City Region Priorities

Alternative	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	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	
Retention	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	?	?	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	+	+	+	0	?	?	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>CLCR 1 seeks to focus investment and sustainable development in Preston, Blackburn, Burnley and Blackpool and directs proposals and schemes where they can contribute to this priority. The policy encourages tourism and housing regeneration in Blackpool and knowledge based development in Preston and Blackpool. It seeks to provide enhanced educational opportunities and new employment opportunities as well as improving transport links. The role of Blackpool Airport will be developed as well as promoting Preston as a regional transport gateway. The rural economy will also be supported and diversified.</p> <p>The policy recognises that there are localised problems of worklessness in the sub-region and Policy CLCR 5 seeks to improve the skill-base of the resident population and develop new employment opportunities to remedy this. This, alongside additional investment in Preston, Blackburn, Burnley and Blackpool and restructuring the East Lancashire will be beneficial to population and human health.</p> <p>The RES is supportive of economic regeneration in central Lancashire. It recognises that Preston is one of the three regional centres that drive economic growth in the region. It support employment opportunities in areas such as east Lancashire (Action 52) and provides a range of action to promote economic growth linked to HMRs (such as Elevate). Blackpool's tourist revival is supported by RES Action 101 as it is classified as one of the region's 'Attack Brands'.</p> <p>Three of the twelve planning authorities have core strategies adopted post RS (Preston, South Ribble and Chorley are preparing a joint Core Strategy), therefore the positive benefits arising from this policy are likely to be delivered now, increasing to significant in the medium and long term as the remaining core strategies come forward. Focussing sustainable development within the sub-region's major settlements should encourage greater use of historic buildings in the City of Preston and the towns of Blackburn, Burnley and Blackpool, and as such was assessed as minor positive within the SA of the RS.</p> <p>Air quality may be compromised by diversifying the rural economy and improving access to services in the rural area. Improvements to the City Region's internal and external transport links and the</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of North West Regional Strategy

Alternative	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	
																												<p>development of the role of Blackpool Airport may also be detrimental to air quality.</p> <p>A focus on supporting and diversifying the rural economy could have detrimental impacts upon the landscape and soil however the impact is uncertain as the nature of diversification is unknown.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p> <p>None proposed</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Success will depend on full implementation of the strategy.</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u></p> <p>A focus on supporting and diversifying the rural economy could have detrimental impacts upon the landscape however the impact is uncertain as the nature of diversification is unknown.</p>
Revocation	0	0	0	0	+	+	0	?	?	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	+	+	0	?	?	<p><u>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</u></p> <p>Revocation will not change the immediate policy stance of the three local planning authorities which have adopted core strategies in the short and medium term. A Core Strategy is nearing adoption having completed examination. It is therefore assumed that revocation is unlikely to change the policy stance of this Core Strategy either. Any significant differentiation in environmental performance between the two alternatives is therefore only likely to manifest itself in the long term. The NPPF aims to build a strong and competitive economy and policy is supportive of the promotion of clusters of knowledge driven development. The NPPF also supports a strong rural economy, supporting the diversification of rural business, seeks to deliver a wide choice of high quality homes and also promotes sustainable transport.</p> <p>Without an NPPF policy direction for sustainable development to take place in major settlements (Preston, Blackburn, Burnley and Blackpool), there is a prospect that opportunities may come forward elsewhere. The Core Strategy for Blackburn locates the larger proportion of growth to the urban areas Blackburn however Core Strategies for Blackpool and Burnley are not close to adoption and, whilst it is likely that development would be promoted within urban areas of the authorities, it is uncertain whether it would be primarily directed to the towns of Blackpool and Burnley. The adopted Core Strategy for Central Lancashire (Preston, South Ribble and Chorley) directs growth to the urban areas of Preston and South Ribble.</p> <p>Blackpool is already undergoing significant regeneration with a new seafront and other major</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of North West Regional Strategy

Alternative	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				
																										<p>regeneration projects including the new Tower Festival Headland and St John's underway. Whilst Blackpool's Core Strategy is not yet adopted it is assumed that this regeneration has already gained enough momentum to continue.</p> <p>The presence of British Aerospace as a significant employer in Preston means that knowledge based development may continue to develop in the region but may not be solely confined to Preston and Blackburn. The Central Lancashire Core Strategy submission draft designates Cuerden in South Ribble as a strategic site for knowledge-based development.</p> <p>Blackpool International Airport has produced a masterplan for the airport for 2007-2030 to allow proposals to be incorporated into emerging planning documents. The masterplan is intended to be reviewed each year. This is likely to result in development of the airport's role.</p> <p>Overall it is concluded that there are likely to be few effects arising through revocation over those identified for the retention alternative. Changes in effect are likely to be timescale only resulting from the opportunities that Councils will have to increase provision for development to meet identified local needs.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p> <p>None proposed.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>That those local planning authorities with adopted core strategies continue to implement them (including housing targets) over the lifetime of those documents.</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u></p> <p>There is uncertainty as to the location of future development. It is likely to be primarily located within urban areas however it is not certain whether it will be located within Preston, Blackburn, Burnley and Blackpool as dictated by policy CLCR1.</p>		

Policy CLCR2 – Focus for Development and Investment in Central Lancashire City Region

Alternative	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	
Retention	0	0	0	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	+	+	0	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>CLCR 2 seeks to focus development in the Central Lancashire City Region primarily in the City of Preston and in Blackburn, Blackpool and Burnley. Such development should enhance urban quality and contribute to the enhancement of the natural setting of the city and towns and also address worklessness.</p> <p>The policy recognises that there are localised problems of worklessness in the sub-region and seeks to address this issue which will be beneficial to population and human health. The RES complements this strategy by seeking to target areas of economic opportunity to areas of economic need referencing improved transport links between East Lancs and Preston (Action 78). It also sets out to deliver innovative solutions to link people with jobs (Action 79). Support for the Blackpool Masterplan (Action 48) is also provided.</p> <p>Development should be pursued in a manner which enhanced urban quality which is likely to have a positive impact upon cultural heritage, improving the setting of cultural heritage in the City and three towns.</p> <p>Similarly the requirement of the development to contribute to the enhancement of the natural setting of the city and towns is considered to be positive in landscape terms over the medium and long term as development takes place.</p> <p>By locating development primarily in the city and three specified towns, particularly in giving priority to sites in and around their centres is considered likely to result in the re-use of brownfield sites, given the pressures for urban land. There will be a neutral effects for soil, and also to biodiversity, flora, fauna as development is concentrated in existing urban locations.</p> <p>The impact upon air quality is uncertain. Focussing additional development in already urban locations may worsen air quality in those locations through increased vehicle movements and through construction activities; however these locations have better access to services and sustainable transport modes which may reduce the need to travel.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of North West Regional Strategy

Alternative	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	
																												<p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p> <p>None proposed.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>That those local planning authorities with adopted core strategies continue to implement them (including housing targets) over the lifetime of those documents.</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u></p> <p>The impact upon air quality is uncertain. Focussing additional development in already urban locations may worsen air quality in those locations through increased vehicle movements and through construction activities; however these locations have better access to services and sustainable transport modes which may reduce the need to travel.</p>
Revocation	0	0	0	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	+	+	0	?	?	<p><u>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</u></p> <p>Revocation will not change the immediate policy stance of the six local planning authorities which have adopted core strategies in the short and medium term (the Central Lancashire Core Strategy covers the authorities of Preston, Chorley and South Ribble). It is therefore assumed that revocation is unlikely to change the policy stance of this Core Strategy either. Any significant differentiation in environmental performance between the two alternatives is therefore only likely to manifest itself in the long term. The NPPF requires good design that contributes positively to making places better for people and also seeks to conserve and enhance the natural environment.</p> <p>Without an NPPF policy direction for development to take place in major settlements (Preston, Blackburn, Burnley and Blackpool), there is a prospect that opportunities may come forward elsewhere. The Core Strategy for Blackburn locates the larger proportion of growth to the urban areas Blackburn however Core Strategies for Blackpool and Burnley are not close to adoption and, whilst it is likely that development would be promoted within urban areas of the authorities, it is uncertain whether it would be primarily directed to the towns of Blackpool and Burnley. The Core Strategy for Central Lancashire directs growth to the urban areas of Preston and South Ribble.</p> <p>Overall it is concluded that there are likely to be few effects arising through revocation over those identified for the retention alternative. Changes in effect are likely to be timescale only resulting from the opportunities that Councils will have to increase provision for development to meet identified local needs.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of North West Regional Strategy

Alternative	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	
																												<p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p> <p>None proposed.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>That those local planning authorities with adopted core strategies continue to implement them (including housing targets) over the lifetime of those documents.</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u></p> <p>There is uncertainty as to the location of future development. It is likely to primarily located within urban areas however it is not certain whether it will be located within Preston, Blackburn, Burnley and Blackpool as dictated by CLCR1.</p>

Policy CLCR3 – Green Cities

Alternative	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	
Retention	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>CLCR 3 protects the unique 'green' character of the Central Lancashire City Region. It protects the general extent of the green belt and the Forest of Bowland AONB whilst also encourages the further development of the City Region's three regional parks. The policy also encourages the greening or urban area through measures including the revocation of existing parks, the reclamation of derelict land for 'soft' end uses and the utilisation of open space.</p> <p>The RES complements this policy through its support for regional parks (Action 116), and through investment in public realm, greenspaces and environmental quality (Action 119).</p> <p>Maintaining the extent of the greenbelt and protecting the Forest of Bowland AONB has a positive impact for landscape and also for biodiversity, flora and fauna. Maintaining the green belt is also beneficial for soil.</p> <p>The further development of the City Region's regional parks and the greening of urban areas is also beneficial for the above but also for air quality in the region and for climatic factors given the beneficial impact of trees and flora on greenhouse gas emissions.</p> <p>The policy also has a beneficial impact on population and human health particularly in greening urban areas which contributes to quality of life and encourages physical activity and recreation.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>That those local planning authorities with adopted core strategies continue to implement them (including housing targets) over the lifetime of those documents.</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>None.</p>
Revocation	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>Revocation will not change the immediate policy stance of the six out of 13 local planning authorities which have adopted core strategies in the short and medium term. Furthermore all authorities which</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of North West Regional Strategy

Alternative	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	
																												<p>include green belt land have policy protection in place albeit sometimes, older local plans. The NPPF attaches great importance to green belts and states that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances (paragraphs 70 and 83). Valued landscapes such as AONBs should also be protected and enhanced under provisions in the NPPF (paragraph 115) and the creation, management and enhancement of green infrastructure is also required. Therefore two of the three aspects supported by the Policy, green belts and AONB are maintained. NPPF support for the latter is particularly important given that the Wyre Borough Core Strategy is not yet adopted and therefore there is no specific up to date policy support for the Forest of Bowland AONB</p> <p>The Core Strategies of authorities whose boundaries include all or parts of the three regional parks of East Lancashire, Ribble Estuary and Morecambe Bay are not adopted; however policy support for high quality open spaces can be found within the NPPF (paragraph 73) and Lancashire County Council continues to promote the initiatives.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u> None proposed.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u> That those local planning authorities with adopted core strategies continue to implement them (including housing targets) over the lifetime of those documents.</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u> None.</p>

Policy CLN 1 – Overall Spatial Policy For Cumbria

Alternative	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	
Retention	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>The policy seeks to focus major development within the settlements of Carlisle, Barrow Workington and Whitehaven with appropriate support for lower order development within other key settlements. The policy also seeks to improve transport links within the sub-region and promotes improved accessibility by public transport to employment, education opportunities. Network management of the highway network is also promoted as a means of improving connectivity and road safety. Sustainable tourism and higher value knowledge based and specialist industry based employment is promoted. The policy refers back to other RSS policies such as RT1, RT10 and DP1-9.</p> <p>The RES provides complementary support for the policy by supporting the development of the University of Cumbria (Action 38), encouraging employment (Action 52), the Lake District Economic Futures Policy Statement, and delivering plans that promote sustainable growth within and outside the LDNP (Action 89) enhancing road access to Barrow and the Furness peninsular (Action 68), and completing the West Coast Mainline upgrade in Cumbria (Action 70).</p> <p>Recognition of the particular issues and opportunities facing Cumbria, including the differences inherent in this sub-region in comparison to other parts of the north-west is noted. Policy encouragement to develop recognised economic strengths in the region with new economic development focussed upon major and key settlements should lead to positive population and health benefits. The SA Report of the RSS identified that the implementation of this policy (in conjunction with those other RS policies which it cross references) would positively support urban and rural renaissance. A focus upon development on brownfield sites brings environmental benefits and in time addresses economic and social conditions. Four of the seven Cumbria planning authorities have core strategies adopted post RS, therefore the positive benefits arising from this policy are likely to be delivered now (as opposed to in other sub-regions, where core strategy coverage is proportionately lower) increasing to significant in the medium and long term as the remaining core strategies come forward. A focus upon major settlements should encourage greater use of historic buildings in towns, and as such was assessed as minor positive within the SA of the RS. Policy guidance to direct development in settlements and to support sustainable</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of North West Regional Strategy

Alternative	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	
																												<p>tourism is likely to restrict development within the countryside therefore protecting the landscape.</p> <p>Air quality may be improved sub-regional wide by concentrating development in major centres accessible by sustainable modes of transport, as opposed to a dispersed approach. However, local air quality conditions, in settlements experiencing major development could worsen as a result of increased activity. Air, along with climate and water (demand) therefore scores minor negative.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p> <p>None proposed.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u></p> <p>Success will depend on full implementation of the regional strategy.</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u></p> <p>Air quality, the local negative impacts resulting from major development versus the positive benefits resulting from the concentration of development in larger settlements which have the best accessibility by sustainable modes of transport.</p>
Revocation	0	0	0	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	+	+	0	+	+	<p><u>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</u></p> <p>Revocation will not change the immediate policy stance of the four local planning authorities which have adopted core strategies in the short and medium term. Therefore any significant differentiation in environmental performance between the two alternatives is only likely to manifest itself in the long term. The NPPF aims to build a strong and competitive economy and policy is supportive of economic strengths which is assumed to include the Cumbrian nuclear industry. NPS EN 6 also identifies Sellafield as a potentially suitable site for new nuclear development.</p> <p>NPPF also supports a strong rural economy and it also encourages the use of brownfield land (providing it does not have high environmental value). Without an NPPF policy direction for major development to take place in major settlements (the four RS settlements) other than retail, there is a prospect that opportunities make come forward elsewhere, however due to the dispersed nature of development within the county, and low density of population this is assumed to be unlikely. Furthermore authorities such as Barrow have already in place DPDs for port redevelopment for example.</p> <p>Overall it is concluded that there are likely to be few effects arising through revocation over those identified for the retention alternative. Changes in effect are likely to be timescale only resulting from</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of North West Regional Strategy

Alternative	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	
																												the opportunities that Councils will have to increase provision for development to meet identified local needs. <u>Mitigation Measures</u> None proposed. <u>Assumptions</u> That those local planning authorities with adopted core strategies continue to implement them (including housing targets) over the lifetime of those documents. <u>Uncertainty</u> None identified.

Policy CLN 2 – Sub-area Development Priorities For Cumbria

Alternative	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	
Retention	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>The policy maintains a requirement for consistency with Policy CLN1 but provides further direction at the sub-regional level with regard to the specific focus for development within the different geographical areas of the sub-region. This includes sustainable growth in Cumbria, regeneration in West Cumbria and Barrow, focussing upon existing skills in nuclear and ship building and meeting the needs of local people in south and east Cumbria. The policy builds upon work and projects previously commissioned by the different councils therefore reflecting local needs and aspirations. The focus of the policy is economic led- with the exception of south and east Cumbria, therefore there are significant positive benefits associated with population and health. Delivered in conjunction with CLN1 (which is a policy requirement), together with the other RS policies referenced by CLN1, overall performance is considered to mirror that recorded for CLN2.</p> <p>RES provides a level of support listed under CLN1 but in addition promote the establishment of the National Nuclear Skills Academy (Action 27) and the development of a skilled workforce in rural areas to support diversification (Action 30).</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Development should take place within the wider spatial context provided by the North West of England Plan with regard to development in sustainable and accessible locations.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>Success will depend on full implementation of the strategy.</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>None identified.</p>
Revocation	0	0	0	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	+	+	0	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>CLN2 was the product of inputs made by the Cumbria council's during the RS process. It therefore reflected local needs and priorities at that time. Initiatives which are mentioned within the policy include the University of Cumbria, which has been established and the regeneration priority areas for west</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of North West Regional Strategy

Alternative	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	
																												<p>Cumbria and Barrow, which have been curtailed (there is now the Cumbria LEP). The National Nuclear Skills Academy has been established in Cockermouth.</p> <p>It is anticipated that local evidence and policy will continue to support similar initiatives and it should be recognised that the RS policy did not allocate funding, or formally allocate the regeneration areas so revocation in itself will not be significant. Taking into account the abolition of the Regional Development Agency it is concluded that in the short to medium term at least economic benefits arising from the regeneration activities of this policy will be reduced whilst other sources of funding are identified and delivered. This could be described as a cumulative impact and is less likely to be considered a direct result of RS revocation.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u> Establishment of the LEP should provide a new framework for regeneration.</p> <p><u>Assumptions</u> That those local planning authorities with adopted core strategies continue to implement them with continued focus upon areas requiring regeneration.</p> <p><u>Uncertainty</u> None identified.</p>

Policy CLN 3 – Spatial Policy for the Lake District

Alternative	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	
Retention	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	?	?	?	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>Policy requires that plans and strategies give priority to the protection of the landscape and cultural heritage of the Lake District whilst supporting the diversification of its economic base, supporting the provision of local needs housing, improving public transportation, managing traffic in tourism hotspots and promoting sustainable tourism and improvements to the public realm. The Lake District Core Strategy was adopted in 2010 and contains policies aimed at promoting sustainable tourism, protecting the landscape and historic environment and the provision of housing of a type and tenure that reflects local need.</p> <p>The RES provides support to the Lake District both directly, for example the Lake District Economic Futures Policy Statement, and delivering plans that promote sustainable growth within and outside the LDNP (Action 89) and through indirect Actions for example that which encourages the provision of affordable housing that is available for local people (Action 86).</p> <p>The SA of this policy identified significant positive benefits against objectives with a read across to population (rural renaissance, affordable housing) and with a core strategy in place since 2010 these significant effects are likely to be in the short, medium and long term. Minor positive benefits are also identified for cultural heritage, landscape and biodiversity with the policy requiring priority to protection set against development priorities.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>None proposed.</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>Success presumes continued implementation of the Core Strategy in line with RS policy.</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>Development, could lead to impacts upon the lakes with an uncertain effect upon water.</p>
Revocation	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	?	?	?	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>NPPF paragraph 115 requires that great weight should be given to conserving the landscape and</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of North West Regional Strategy

Alternative	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	
				+	+																						scenic beauty of national parks. Cultural heritage is also safeguarded via section 12 of the NPPF. Furthermore the NPPF allows local authorities to develop policy based upon robust local evidence which would allow the Lake District National Park to continue to support policies aimed at promoting local needs and affordable housing. Similarly the other priorities identified within the policy could still come forward within the new national policy framework on the basis that they respond to identified local needs/requirements. With an adopted Core Strategy in place the revocation of the Regional Strategy is unlikely to result in any significant change in the effects identified for the retention option. <u>Mitigation Measures</u> None proposed. <u>Assumptions</u> None. <u>Uncertainty</u> Development, could lead to impacts upon the lakes with an uncertain effect upon water.	

Policy CLN 4 – Spatial Policy for North Lancashire

Alternative	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	
Retention	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Retention</p> <p>The RSS policy requires that other plans and strategies secure the regeneration of Morecambe, through tourism and the restructuring of the housing market, support sustainable growth in Lancashire, whilst compatible with the conservation of the historic city, build on the strengths of Lancaster University, increase the supply of affordable housing, support the Port of Heysham and manage traffic in Lancaster and Morecambe.</p> <p>The RES sets out actions to improve the linkages between the Port of Heysham and the M6. It also recognises the importance of Lancaster University and seeks to develop plans to capitalise on ongoing private sector investment around Lancaster in addition to other towns in the region, (Action 55).</p> <p>The SA of the RSS concluded that there would be positive economic (population) benefits arising from this policy, through support for tourism, raising the image of the area and recognition of the issue of affordable housing particularly in the rural areas. Minor positives were also identified for soil, biodiversity based upon a spatial approach which sees to concentrate development within existing centres. Climate change, water and material assets are minor negative as a result of the level of development that may take place although in mitigation, the RSS policy explicitly requires that it is read in conjunction with other RSS policies such as DP1-9. A minor negative for urban areas in relation to air was recorded based upon new development taking place in towns and the city of Lancaster which may lead to localised effects. In all cases other than material assets, where minor negatives are recorded it should be noted that a concentrated approach to development is more sustainable than one that would permit a more dispersed pattern of growth.</p> <p>The Lancaster Core Strategy was adopted in July 2008 therefore the benefits accruing from this policy are likely to be applicable in the short, medium and long term.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>None proposed.</p> <p>Assumptions</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of North West Regional Strategy

Alternative	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	
																												<p>Success will depend on full implementation of the strategy.</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>Air quality, the local negative impacts resulting from major development versus the positive benefits resulting from the concentration of development in larger settlements which have the best accessibility by sustainable modes of transport.</p>
Revocation	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	<p>Likely Significant Effects of Revocation</p> <p>The revocation of the RS is unlikely to result in any significant change in the effects identified for the retention option. The NPPF paragraph 28 provides policy support for rural sustainable tourism, whilst town centres are identified as appropriate for larger tourism attractions. Cultural heritage is also safeguarded via NPPF policies 126 to 141. Education within the NPPF is related more towards delivering sustainable provision to support residential development but support for the economy (of which establishments such as Lancaster University form a key part) is provided. There is no explicit reference within the NPPF to traffic management. The Lancashire Local Transport Plan 3 2011-2021 recognises issues of congestion within Lancaster City and discusses opportunities to combat congestion through increased road space and park and ride. Whilst the second of these measures is broadly sustainable, increasing road space may lead to additional vehicle journeys into the centre as the capacity of the network is increased and such actions are unlikely to enhance the public realm which is a requirement of the RS policy in relation to traffic management. Increase in affordable housing and economic development supported by the strengths and opportunities offered by the universities could also lead to the same negative effects upon water, climate and material assets as identified for retention.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Identification of park and ride sites should focus on land which is of lower environmental quality. (The core strategy identifies a requirement for park and ride).</p> <p>Assumptions</p> <p>That Lancaster will continue to implement its Core Strategy in the short to medium term following revocation.</p> <p>Uncertainty</p> <p>None identified.</p>

Appendix D - SEA of Revocation of North West Regional Strategy

Score Key:	++ Significant Positive effect		+ Minor positive effect		0 No overall effect		- Minor negative effect		-- Significant negative effect	? Score uncertain
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 1 year), M – medium term (between 1 and 5 years) and L – long term (> 5 years)										