



# West of England Joint Spatial Plan

Addendum to the Consolidated  
Sustainability Appraisal Report



NOVEMBER 2018



[www.landuse.co.uk](http://www.landuse.co.uk)

# **West of England Joint Spatial Plan: Proposed Changes**

## **Addendum to the Consolidated Sustainability Appraisal Report**

Prepared by LUC  
November 2018

**Project Title:** Supplementary Sustainability Appraisal work for the West of England Joint Spatial Plan

**Client:** West of England Unitary Authorities

Version	Date	Version Details	Prepared by	Checked by	Approved by
1	09/11/2018	Addendum to the Consolidated Sustainability Appraisal Report	Kieran Moroney Taran Livingston	Taran Livingston	Taran Livingston



[www.landuse.co.uk](http://www.landuse.co.uk)

# West of England Joint Spatial Plan: Proposed Changes

## Addendum to the Consolidated Sustainability Appraisal Report

Prepared by LUC  
November 2018

Planning & EIA  
Design  
Landscape Planning  
Landscape Management  
Ecology  
GIS & Visualisation

LUC BRISTOL  
12<sup>th</sup> Floor Colston Tower  
Colston Street Bristol  
BS1 4XE  
T +44 (0)117 929 1997  
[bristol@landuse.co.uk](mailto:bristol@landuse.co.uk)

Offices also in:  
Edinburgh  
Glasgow  
Lancaster  
London  
Manchester



Land Use Consultants Ltd  
Registered in England  
Registered number: 2549296  
Registered Office:  
43 Chalton Street  
London NW1 1JD  
LUC uses 100% recycled paper

## Introduction

- 1.1 In April 2018 the West of England Unitary Authorities submitted the West of England Joint Spatial Plan (JSP) to the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government for examination. A Sustainability Appraisal (SA) and Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) has been undertaken alongside the preparation of the JSP. A Consolidated SA Report (November 2018) relating to the Submitted JSP is being consulted upon during the Examination of the West of England Joint Spatial Plan, from 12th November 2018 to 7th January 2019.
- 1.2 A number of other technical documents have been published for consultation during this same period, including updated evidence relating to viability, affordable housing and transport. As a result of the updated evidence documents, the Unitary Authorities have also published for consultation a Schedule of Proposed Changes to the JSP. The Schedule of Proposed Changes has been agreed through the delegated arrangements established by Bristol City Council, Bath and North East Somerset Council, South Gloucestershire Council and North Somerset Council. These are not formal changes to the JSP but have been put forward for the Inspectors' consideration as part of the JSP examination process. These changes may or may not result in formal modifications to the JSP in due course.
- 1.3 The Schedule of Proposed Changes focuses on the Strategic Development Location (SDL) Policies (7.1-7.12) and includes changes that provide extra clarity within the SDL policies, as well as some suggested amendments to the transport mitigation schemes referred to in Policy 6, the Key Diagram and the SDL policies (7.1-7.12) in the JSP. This SA Addendum has been prepared to consider the potential sustainability effects of the Proposed Changes.

## Appraisal of the Proposed Changes

- 1.4 The policies set out in the Submitted JSP have been appraised against the SA Framework which is presented in Table 2.2 of the Consolidated SA Report. The SA Framework includes a set of sustainability objectives that cover all of the required environmental topics listed in the SEA Regulations<sup>1</sup>. The findings of the SA of the Submitted JSP policies are presented in Chapter 5 of the Consolidated SA Report. The likely significant positive and negative effects of the policies and the overall cumulative effect of the JSP as a whole are described.
- 1.5 **Table 1** below reproduces the Schedule of Proposed Changes and the Unitary Authorities' reasons for proposing each change, with a final column added to record the implications of each Proposed Change for the SA conclusions reported in the Consolidated SA Report. The SA implications have been considered based on whether each Proposed Change would result in a change in the likely significant and cumulative effects described in the Consolidated SA Report.
- 1.6 As shown in **Table 1**, the Proposed Changes would not result in any significant changes to the SA effects previously identified for the Submitted JSP (in the November 2018 Consolidated SA Report). Only one minor change is expected to arise from the Proposed Changes, in relation to the Coalpit Heath SDL (Policy 7.10). This is due to the clarification of the policy requirement in bullet point 5, which seeks to mitigate potential effects on the surrounding landscape. The appraisal of Policy 7.10 (Charfield) in the Consolidated SA Report in relation to SA objective 4c: landscape (minor negative effect) is reflective of intricacies of the Frome Valley character area and the identified medium to high landscape sensitivity of the area. The proposed change would not have an effect on the existing situation at the site, however, it does seek to strengthen the mitigation requirement by 'enhancing the existing topography' therefore, the minor negative effect identified would be changed to minor negative uncertain.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004, Statutory Instrument 2004 No. 1633.

## Conclusions

- 1.7 The Proposed Changes would result in a small number of changes to the sustainable transport and wider transport schemes provided as mitigation for the scale of development at the Strategic Development Locations in the JSP. The Proposed Changes include removal of the requirement for the Callington Road scheme at the Whitchurch SDL, removal of requirement for new M25 junctions at the Churchill and Nailsea SDLs, and new requirements for provision of strategic cycle routes on the A432 and A38, and a Coalpit Heath/ Westerleigh bypass. While individually, these amended transport schemes might have effects SA objectives 1b: **air quality** and 5a: **sustainable transport** in particular, and potentially some of the other environmental objectives such as 4b: **biodiversity** and 4c: **landscape**, 4d: **re-use of previously developed land** and 4e: **loss of productive land**; due to the large number of transport mitigation schemes already contained in the JSP, the likely significant effects identified for Policy 6 (Strategic Infrastructure Requirements) and the relevant SDL policies, as well as the overall cumulative effects of the JSP would not change.

## Next Steps

- 1.8 The Consolidated SA Report is being consulted upon from 12th November to 7th January 2019, during the Examination of the West of England Joint Spatial Plan, in addition to a number of technical documents and the Schedule of Proposed Changes. Comments received during the consultation will be reviewed and passed to the Inspectors examining the JSP.
- 1.9 Should any formal modifications to the JSP be proposed during the Examination hearings, there will be a further round of consultation on the Proposed Modifications, and this will be accompanied by an updated SA Report (or Addendum, depending on the scale and nature of the modifications proposed).
- 1.10 If the JSP is found to be 'sound', it can be formally adopted by Unitary Authorities. Once the JSP has been adopted, a SA Adoption Statement will be published to report the full plan-making and SA process and the framework for monitoring future effects.

LUC  
November 2018

**Table 1: Assessment of West of England Joint Spatial Plan Schedule of Proposed Changes (November 2018) in relation to the SA conclusions reported previously in the Consolidated SA Report (November 2018)**

Ref no.	Reason For Change	Proposed Change	Implications for SA findings reported previously
<p>PC01</p> <p>Reasoned Justification to Policy 7 (page 32)</p>	<p>This change is proposed in response to the Inspectors' request in their correspondence ref ED02 dated 28 June 2018:</p> <p><i>"We note the Councils' response to our question about the plan's approach to the Green Belt and emphasise that at this stage in the Examination we have not reached any view on the principle of removing land from the Green Belt. However, should deletion of Green Belt land be justified, in order to provide effective guidance for Local Plan preparation and Examination we consider that it is likely to be necessary for the Joint Spatial Plan to be more explicit about the factors which the Local Plans would need to and would not need to consider in respect of deleting land from the Green Belt and exceptional circumstances. In order to assist consideration of Green Belt issues through the Examination, we therefore request that draft wording for inclusion in the plan is prepared which makes explicit the Councils' intentions in this respect."</i></p>	<p><b>Explanation of change</b></p> <p>The Reasoned Justification to JSP Policy 2, paras 11 to 13, explain that the WoE UAs have demonstrated that there are exceptional circumstances to alter the Green Belt to allow for the delivery of the five SDLs of <b>Coalpit Heath, North Keynsham, Yate, Bath Road and Whitchurch</b> and that the allocation of these sites, including the formal alteration the detailed Green Belt boundary, should take place via the preparation of LPs.</p> <p>Furthermore, <u>Topic Paper 2</u> (doc ref SD 7A) paras 3.9 to 3.11 explain how the UAs came to the decision that there are exceptional circumstances to alter the Green Belt in the JSP and paras 4.11 to 4.12 explains why there are exceptional circumstances to release these 5 locations from the GB.</p> <p>Local Plans must be consistent with the JSP, once adopted under [Reg 8(5) of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012] and so will not need to re-establish the principle of altering the Green Belt at these locations. Nor will they have the remit to review this principle established in the JSP.</p> <p>It is therefore now proposed to add new paras 68 to 69 to the Reasoned Justification for Policy 7 to more clearly explain the role of Local Plans in relation to Policy 7.</p> <p><b>Paragraph 68:</b></p> <p><b>"The five SDLs of Coalpit Heath, North Keynsham, Yate, Bath Road and Whitchurch are</b></p>	<p><b>No change to SA findings</b> – The change is proposed for clarity relating to the justification of deletion of land from the Green Belt. The change is proposed to be made to the Reasoned Justification for the Policy 7 and does not change the policy wording for the policy.</p> <p>The Green Belt is a planning designation and is not a sustainability consideration in its own right. However, the SA considered the effect of developing each SDL in terms of a number of SA objectives which are indirectly related to the Green Belt designation, in particular its role in safeguarding countryside from encroachment and assisting in urban regeneration/recycling of previously developed land (i.e. SA objectives 4c: landscapes and 4d: previously developed land). However, the scoring for these objectives will not be influenced by the change to the Reasoned Justification text.</p>

Ref no.	Reason For Change	Proposed Change	Implications for SA findings reported previously
		<p><b>in locations currently within the Green Belt as defined in adopted Local Plans. The WoE UAs have demonstrated that there are exceptional circumstances to alter the Green Belt in these five locations in order to provide the most appropriate spatial strategy.”</b></p> <p><b>Paragraph 69:</b></p> <p><b>“As the JSP is a strategic plan, it does not make detailed site allocations and identifies only broad locations. Therefore it will be the role of the Local Plans to formally allocate the SDLs and in doing so, define the appropriate site boundaries and also define the new Green Belt boundary around these SDLs. It will not be within the remit of Local Plans to review the in principle decision or to restate the exceptional circumstances to remove these locations from the Green Belt. Once the Local Plans are adopted, the Green Belt will be formally altered and the necessary land removed from the Green Belt. In defining new Green Belt Boundaries, the Local Plans will follow the guidance in para 139 of the NPPF 2018”</b></p>	
<p>PC02 Para 66 (page 31)</p>	<p>This change is proposed in response to the Inspectors’ request in their correspondence ref ED03 dates 1 August 2018:</p> <p><i>“Strategic Development Locations -</i></p> <p><i>We note the Councils’ wish to retain, as formal development plan policy, the specific criteria and requirements listed for each of the Strategic Development Locations (SDLs). We, of course,</i></p>	<p>Proposed amendment to paragraph 66:</p> <p><b>“Policies 7.1 – 7.12 set the strategic framework to facilitate delivery of the SDLs by establishing the set-out the bespoke strategic principles and requirements for each location prior to which will form the starting point for their more detailed assessment through the local plans. These are derived from the evidence prepared as part of the plan making process and summarised in the supporting documents, particularly the Strategic Development Location templates. The requirements identified in the Joint Spatial Plan policies are not exhaustive and will evolve</b></p>	<p><b>No change to SA findings</b> – This proposed change provides clarity in relation to the Reasoned Justification text for Policy 7 and does not affect the wording of Policy 7 itself.</p>

Ref no.	Reason For Change	Proposed Change	Implications for SA findings reported previously
	<p><i>commit to adopting a proportionate approach to our examination of the soundness of these criteria/requirements, having regard to national policy/guidance, the evidence submitted by the Councils and the representations of other Examination participants. However, in the light of your most recent letter we are now somewhat confused as to the Councils' position and intentions concerning the paragraph 66 "starting point" and "will evolve" wording in relation to these criteria/requirements. We do not seek an immediate answer to this, but request that the Councils consider the point and make clear their intentions in this respect at the time of the publication of the additional evidence base work."</i></p>	<p><b>be supplemented by additional policy guidance</b> as detailed assessment and master planning takes place at these locations."</p>	
<p>PC03 Policy 7.1 North Keynsham, bullet 4 (page 33)</p>	<p><i>To improve clarity.</i></p>	<p><del>A</del><b>New primary school provision on site (to be determined through the Local Plan) and financial contribution to the expansion of existing primary and secondary schools provision of a secondary education provision off-site.</b></p>	<p><b>No change to SA findings</b> – The SA matrix for Policy 7.1 has already identified a significant positive effect in relation to SA objective 2d: educational facilities. This takes into consideration the requirement for new development to contribute to educational facilities in the "mitigation or enhancement" column. The proposed change would not result in a change to the score recorded given that accessibility to existing nearby educational facilities would not change and the policy would still require improvements to educational facilities to support development.</p>

Ref no.	Reason For Change	Proposed Change	Implications for SA findings reported previously
PC04 Whitchurch, bullet 1 Policy 7.2 (page 34)	<i>Updated evidence (Whitchurch Strategic Planning Framework 2018).</i>	<i>Around <del>2,500</del> <b>2,000</b> new homes, optimising densities with 1,600 homes built in the plan period, including affordable housing.</i>	<p><b>No change to SA findings</b> – The proposed change in the number of new homes to be accommodated at the SDL from 2,500 to 2,000 would not result in a change to the significant positive effect already identified for SA objectives 2a: quantum of high quality housing and 2b: suitable mix of high quality housing for Policy 7.2. This is reflective of the high level of housing which would still be delivered at the Whitchurch SDL.</p> <p>The proposed change has also been considered in terms of the potential for a change in expected effects relating to the accessibility of services and facilities and the number of journeys which are required to be undertaken regularly in the plan area and which are of particular relevance to the appraisal of Policy 2 (The Spatial Strategy). However, the relatively small change in the number of homes to be provided (500) compared to the overall level of housing supported by the JSP (at least 105,500) means that no change for any of the SA objectives is expected.</p>
PC05 Whitchurch, bullet 7 (page 34)	<i>Updated evidence (WED 008: Transport Emerging Findings Report Nov 2018).</i>	Provision of key transport infrastructure including; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i multi-modal link connecting A4, A37 and the south Bristol link road;</li> <li>ii Park &amp; Ride provision;</li> <li>iii Metrobus (high quality public transport) route from Bristol on the A4 – A37 link;</li> <li>iv pedestrian and cycle connections in all directions which link the site with key services and facilities. These include extending and improving walking and cycling routes to Bristol, Keynsham and to the countryside to the south; and</li> <li>v off-site junction improvements including at Hicks Gate. No dwellings will be completed at the Whitchurch SDL ahead of:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i Park &amp; Ride, and</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><b>No change to SA findings</b> – The proposed change would remove the requirement for the delivery of the Callington Road scheme as part of the multi-modal A4-A37 south Bristol link. While this change might have some effect in terms of promoting modal shift and subsequently air quality in the area there is still a requirement to deliver the south Bristol multi-modal link to support growth at the Whitchurch SDL (Policy 7.2).</p> <p>The existing appraisal of Policy 7.2 in relation to SA objective 1b: air quality (uncertain effect) is reflective of the close proximity of the Bristol AQMA and the current implementation of a short term monitoring scheme to clarify the levels of NO<sub>2</sub> at this location as well as the requirement for a Transport Impact Assessment and adequate preventative and mitigation measures to</p>

Ref no.	Reason For Change	Proposed Change	Implications for SA findings reported previously
		<p>ii the multi-modal link A4-A37-south Bristol link <del>including as a pre-requisite, the Callington Road scheme being completed.</del></p> <p>The strategic infrastructure listed above should not prejudice a full Transportation Assessment which will be required for each location.</p>	<p>support development. The proposed change would not affect the appraisal in relation to these issues. Policy 7.2 has been appraised as having a significant positive effect in terms of SA objective 5a: sustainable transport considering its good connections to Bristol and potential links to Keynsham. This effect is also reflective of the policy requirement for a park and ride and the multi-modal link A4-A37-south Bristol link which will still be required by the policy.</p> <p>Furthermore, the appraisal of Policy 6 has already taken into consideration numerous other strategic infrastructure requirements which would help to promote modal shift in the plan area and thereby be of benefit to local air quality. The Consolidated SA Report has already identified an overall mixed effect (significant positive/minor negative) in relation to SA objectives 1b: air quality and 5a: sustainable transport for Policy 6. It is expected that the removal of the requirement for the Callington Road scheme through the proposed changes would not result in a change to the positive or negative effect previously identified as part of that overall mixed effect for each SA objective. This is the same for the cumulative mixed minor positive/minor negative effect for SA objective 1b: air quality and a cumulative significant positive effect for SA objective 5a: sustainable transport as a result of all the JSP policies combined. The scores reflect the cumulative effect of all infrastructure requirements to support the development set out in the JSP and the proposed change would not result in a change to sustainable transport improvements of a scale to result in amendment to the mixed effect previously identified.</p>
PCO6 Policy 7.3	To correct as support will be required for both primary and secondary school places.	Financial contributions to the provision of <del>primary</del> school places off site;	<b>No change to SA findings</b> – The SA matrix in the Consolidated SA Report for Policy 7.3 has identified a significant positive effect in relation to SA objective 2d:

Ref no.	Reason For Change	Proposed Change	Implications for SA findings reported previously
Bath Road, Brislington, bullet 7  (page 35)			educational facilities. This takes into consideration the requirement for new development to make off-site contribution to the provision of school places in the “mitigation or enhancement” column. The proposed change would still require financial contributions to educational facilities, and therefore no change is expected as a result of this Proposed Change.
PC07 Policy 7.4 Backwell, bullet 10  (page 36)	<i>Updated evidence (WED 008: Emerging Findings Transport Report, Nov 2018).</i>	<p>Development to be mitigated with the delivery of:</p> <p>i) new multi-modal link from A370 Long Ashton Bypass to station interchange (including rail crossing), <b>new development area</b> and <del>Nailsea SDL and Nailsea town centre</del>, with connection to A370 <del>west to the east</del> of Backwell (including rail crossing) and a new or improved connection to M5;</p> <p>ii) new MetroBus route linking Bristol to Nailsea from Long Ashton Bypass to the station interchange (including rail crossing), Nailsea SDL and Nailsea town centre, and potential onward link to Clevedon;</p> <p>iii) opportunities to phase delivery of the highway improvements in step with parts of the development may be explored.</p>	<p><b>No change to SA findings</b> – The proposed change would require the A370 to link to the new development area to the east of Backwell and not the west. Given that a link road is still to be provided to support the development of the SDL, local connectivity and the potential to encourage modal shift and improving air quality would be unlikely to be affected. The effects identified in relation to SA objectives 1b: air quality and 5a: sustainable transport are therefore likely to remain unchanged for Policies 7.4 (Backwell) and 6 (Strategic Infrastructure Requirements).</p> <p>The re-routing of the link to the A370 is however less likely to adversely affect the Tickenham, Nailsea and Kenn Moors SSSI, given that the road would cross less of the designated site. This potential effect was identified in relation to the cumulative effect of the strategic transport infrastructure supported through Policy 6. While the adverse effect expected in relation to this one specific biodiversity designation may be reduced as a result of the proposed change, the overall effect of requiring the provision of all the strategic transport infrastructure across the plan area to support development set out in the JSP is still expected to have a significant negative effect (combined with a minor positive effect) in relation to SA objective 4b: biodiversity. The effect is expected to remain the same given the high level of transport infrastructure provision which would be supported, and its potential to negatively impact surrounding biodiversity</p>

Ref no.	Reason For Change	Proposed Change	Implications for SA findings reported previously
			features.
PC08 Policy 7.5 Banwell, bullet 6 (page 37)	To improve clarity.	<i>Development <b>requires</b> will not commence until the construction of the Banwell Bypass is delivered in <b>conjunction with residential development</b> as part of the M5 to A38 highway improvements with <b>a future connection to a new M5 Junction 21a at a location to be confirmed, and onward connection to the Sandford/Churchill Bypass. Opportunities to phase delivery of the highway improvements in step with parts of the development may be explored particularly where delivery of infrastructure is directly within the land controlled by the developer. Development must not prejudice the delivery of future improvements to M5, including the construction of the new M5 junction.</b></i>	<b>No change to SA findings</b> – The proposed change removes the requirement to provide the Banwell Bypass ahead of development at the Banwell SDL. Given that this provision is still supported by the policy however, no changes are likely to the sustainability effects identified in the Consolidated SA Report.
PC09 Banwell, bullet 7 (page 37)	To improve clarity.	<i>Local network and junction improvements including <b>widening of any necessary works to Wolverhill Road as a key feature associated with the proposed garden village.</b></i>	<b>No change to SA findings</b> – As above, the sustainability effects identified in relation to Policy 6 and Policy 7.5 are not expected to change given that improvements to Wolverhill Road are still to be required to support development at this location. Furthermore (and in relation to the appraisal of Policy 6 in particular) the improvement of Wolverhill Road is just one part of a suite of transport improvements which are required to support the development set out in the JSP, therefore the sustainability effects identified for Policy 6 relate to the full suite of transport improvements.
PC10 Banwell, bullet 10 (page 37)	To improve clarity.	<i>Development should avoid the flood plain and demonstrate reduced run-off rates including through the use of attenuation ponds and other features as appropriate. Additional land may be required off-site to facilitate long term water storage as part of a sustainable drainage strategy. <b>Measures to ensure that water quality and levels on the nearby Puxton Moor SSSI are not adversely impacted</b></i>	<b>No change to SA findings</b> – The proposed change would require that water quality and levels on the nearby Puxton Moor SSSI are not adversely impacted. The Consolidated SA Report identified an uncertain minor negative effect in relation to SA objective 4b: biodiversity considering the site's importance for bat flight corridors and as a part of an area which is a Natural England Priority Habitat area. It is also reflective of policy

Ref no.	Reason For Change	Proposed Change	Implications for SA findings reported previously
		<b><i>must be in place.</i></b>	<p>requirements to safeguard and enhance bat habitats and potential requirements for a HRA to establish potential effects on the SAC to the south of Banwell.</p> <p>Considering that these effects will still be relevant and also that the policy previously had a requirement for reduced run-off rates to be demonstrated which would in itself help to protect water quality at the SSSI the proposed change is not expected to result in an amendment to score identified in the Consolidated SA Report.</p>
PC11 Policy 7.6 Churchill, introductory text (page 39)	<i>To improve clarity.</i>	<p><del>The area of search for development</del> <b>Land</b> to the north west of Churchill and Langford is shown indicatively on the Key Diagram as the broad location to accommodate a new Garden Village. The key strategic principles and infrastructure requirements are as follows:</p>	<p><b>No change to SA findings</b> – Proposed change provides clarity in relation to the introductory text for Policy 7.6 and does not affect the wording of Policy 7.6 itself..</p>
PC12 Churchill, bullet 8 (page 39)	<i>Updated evidence (WED 008: Emerging Findings Transport Report, Nov 2018).</i>	<p><del>Package of highway schemes including a new M5 junction,</del> <i>Banwell Bypass, Sandford/Churchill Bypass and capacity improvements to A38/A368 junction. Bus service improvements to Bristol and Weston-super-Mare, including the potential for Metrobus.</i></p>	<p><b>No change to SA findings</b> – The proposed change would no longer require that a new M5 junction would be directly supported as part of highway improvements associated with the Churchill SDL. Policy 7.5 (Banwell) still requires that development should not prejudice the construction of a future M5 junction. No specific effects were identified in relation to the potential for a new M5 junction through the SA of Policy 7.6. While there may be effects in relation to air quality and sustainable transport use the effects previously identified are not expected to change. The uncertain minor positive effect expected in relation to SA objective 1b: air quality is still likely given that the SDL is not in close proximity of an AQMA but there is potential for poor air quality along the M5. There is still policy requirement for a Transport Impact Assessment and adequate preventative and mitigation</p>

Ref no.	Reason For Change	Proposed Change	Implications for SA findings reported previously
			<p>measures which would help to address air quality issues associated with traffic in the area. The significant positive effect expected in relation to SA objective 5a: sustainable transport is still applicable given that the mitigation measures previously identified (including Metrobus Extension to Thornbury &amp; Buckover GV, A38(N) Park and Ride, M5 J14 improvements, Charfield Rail Station re-opening and local bus service improvements) are still required by the policy.</p> <p>The proposed change is not expected to have result in a change to the effects identified in relation to Policy 6 either. While the new M5 junction would no longer be required the development at the SDL is still expected to result in improvements to connectivity in the area which could help to alleviate congestion in the plan area but could also facilitate increased numbers of car journeys. As such the mixed effect (significant positive/minor negative) is still expected in relation to SA objectives 1b: air quality and 5a: sustainable transport. These improvements considered in combination with those other transport improvements required to support the development set out in the JSP (Policy 6) are still likely to help support inward economic investment in the sub-region and therefore the significant positive effect expected in relation to SA objective 3a: access to work opportunities is expected to remain unchanged.</p> <p>Similarly the potential effects of removing the requirement for the new M5 junction as part of the overall transport mitigations supported by Policy 6 in relation to SA objectives 4b: biodiversity (uncertain minor positive/significant negative), 4c: landscapes (uncertain minor positive/significant negative), 4d: re-use of previously developed land (minor negative) and 4e: loss of productive land (minor negative) are unlikely to result in a change of sustainability effects identified. In addition, the mitigation within Policy 6 to be provided by</p>

Ref no.	Reason For Change	Proposed Change	Implications for SA findings reported previously
			the West of England Green Infrastructure Plan is still required to be in place.
<p>PC13 Policy 7.7 Nailsea, bullet 5 (page 40)</p>	<p><i>Updated evidence (WED 008: Emerging Findings Transport Report, Nov 2018).</i></p>	<p>Development to be mitigated with the delivery of:</p> <p>i new multi-modal link from A370 Long Ashton Bypass to station interchange (including rail crossing), <b>Nailsea SDL</b> new development area and Nailsea town centre, with connection to A370 <del>west</del> <b>to the east</b> of Backwell (including rail crossing) and a new or improved connections to the M5;</p> <p>ii new MetroBus route linking Bristol to Nailsea from Long Ashton Bypass to the station interchange (including rail crossing), new development area and Nailsea town centre, and onward link to Clevedon <del>via M5 J20 link</del>; and</p> <p>iii opportunities to phase delivery of the highway improvements in step with parts of the development may be explored.</p>	<p><b>No change to SA findings</b> – The proposed change would require the A370 to link to the SDL at the east of Backwell and not the west. Given that a link road is still to be provided to support the development of the SDL, local connectivity, the potential to encourage modal shift and improving air quality would be unlikely to be affected. The effects identified in relation to SA objectives 1b: air quality and 5a: sustainable transport are therefore likely to remain unchanged for Policies 7.4 (Backwell) and 6 (Strategic Infrastructure Requirements).</p> <p>The re-routing of the link to the A370 is however less likely to adversely affect the Tickenham, Nailsea and Kenn Moors SSSI, given that the road would cross less of the designated site. This potential effect was identified in relation to the cumulative effect of the strategic transport infrastructure supported through Policy 6. While the adverse effect expected in relation to this one specific biodiversity designation may be reduced as a result of the proposed change, the overall effect of requiring the provision of all strategic transport infrastructure across the plan area to support development set out in the JSP is still expected to have a significant negative effect (combined with a minor positive effect) in relation to SA objective 4b: biodiversity. The effect is expected to remain the same given considering the high level of transport infrastructure provision which would be supported, and its potential to negatively impact surrounding biodiversity features.</p> <p>The proposed change relating to the removal of requirement for a link to Clevedon specifically by the M5 J20 link is also not expected to result in a change to the effects identified in relation to Policy 6 or Policy 7.4. The policy still requires the delivery of the MetroBus route</p>

Ref no.	Reason For Change	Proposed Change	Implications for SA findings reported previously
			linking Bristol to Nailsea with links to Long Ashton Bypass, the station interchange, Nailsea town centre, and Clevedon. As such the overall effect of the policy requirement is still expected to have a similar effect in relation to the potential connectivity, promotion for modal shift and subsequently air quality in the plan area. As such similar effects are likely most notably in relation to SA objectives 1b: air quality (Policy 6: significant positive/minor negative and Policy 7.7: minor positive) and 5a: sustainable transport (Policy 6: significant positive/minor negative and Policy 7.7: significant positive in the long term).
PC 14 Nailsea, bullet 13 (page 41)	<i>To improve clarity.</i>	Consideration of relocation/undergrounding of <del>existing overhead powerlines pylons.</del> <b>overhead powerlines</b>	<b>No change to SA findings</b> – Proposed change is to be included for clarity.
PC 15 Policy 7.8 Buckover, introductory text (page 42)	To be consistent with other policy 7's and improve clarity.	A Garden Village will be developed on land either side of the A38 at Buckover (east of Thornbury) <del>as shown indicatively on the key diagram.</del>  Proposed change to improve clear English:  An appropriate delivery body, <del>including the land value capture, ownership and management of assets, long-term stewardship and governance arrangements (for the benefit of the community), land uses, master planning and detailed design principles will</del> <b>(that</b> accord with Garden community principles), <del>and</del> shall be agreed with the Council following consultation with the local community, Parish and Town Councils and other relevant stakeholders.	<b>No change to SA findings</b> – Proposed change is to be included for clarity.
PC16 Buckover,	Updated evidence ( <i>WED 008: Emerging Findings Transport</i> )	<i>Provision of a strategic transport package including as appropriate delivery of or contributions towards:</i>	<b>No change to SA findings</b> – The proposed change would require a new A38 strategic cycle route to be

Ref no.	Reason For Change	Proposed Change	Implications for SA findings reported previously
bullet 8 (page 42)	<i>Report, Nov 2018).</i>	<i>Metrobus Extension to Thornbury and Buckover GV, A38(N) Park &amp; Ride, <b>A38 strategic cycle route</b>, M5 J14 improvements, Charfield rail station re-opening, local bus service improvements (including new local shuttlebus to Thornbury), strategic and local cycle and pedestrian connections to Thornbury and other local highway network improvements as necessary.</i>	<p>delivered or to be contributed towards to support development at the Buckover SDL. This is expected to be to the benefit of encouraging modal shift at the SDL. However, an uncertain minor positive effect has already been identified in relation to SA objective 1b: air quality for Policy 7.8 which is reflective of the areas of poor air quality along the A38 and near to M5 and the requirement for adequate preventative and mitigation measures. A significant positive effect has already been recorded in relation to SA objective 5a: sustainable transport for this policy. This is reflective of the requirement of the policy for provision of a strategic transport package. The proposed change would strengthen but not change this effect if taken forward.</p> <p>Furthermore, the appraisal of Policy 6 has already taken into consideration numerous other strategic infrastructure requirements which would help to promote modal shift in the plan area and thereby be to benefit of local air quality. The Consolidated SA Report has already identified a mixed effect (significant positive/minor negative) in relation to SA objectives 1b: air quality and 5a: sustainable transport for Policy 6. It is expected that the requirement for a new strategic cycle route as set out through the proposed change would strengthen the positive effect previously identified as part of that overall effect for each SA objective. As the minor negative effect has been identified is reflective of transport improvements which might support the proliferation of the number of car journeys in the plan area no change is expected to this part of the score.</p>
PC17 Policy 7.9 Charfield, bullet 2	Factual update following appeal decision Appeal Ref: APP/P0119/W/17/3179643 Land north of Wotton Road, Charfield, Gloucestershire.	<i>The future role and function of existing retail and community assets <del>and remaining greenfield land parcels within the centre of the village adjoining the Wotton Road</del> will firstly be reviewed in consultation with the local community to ensure future needs are</i>	<b>No change to SA findings</b> – The proposed change is a factual update.

Ref no.	Reason For Change	Proposed Change	Implications for SA findings reported previously
(page 43)		<i>assessed, new and existing facilities make the most efficient use of land and they assist to maximise the sustainability of the expanded village.</i>	
PC18 Charfield, bullet 4 (page 43)	To clarify the Public Open Space needs.	<i>New and/or improved retail and community facilities, <b><u>including outdoor sport pitches.</u></b></i>	<b>No change to SA findings</b> – The proposed change would require new development to contribute to the provision of new and/or improved retail community facilities which is now to include outdoor sport pitches. This requirement would help to improve access to public open spaces at the SDL. However, a significant positive effect has already been identified in relation to SA objective 1a: access to public open space for Policy 7.9. As such the proposed change would only strengthen the significant positive effect already identified and no change in the score presented would result.
PC19 Policy 7.10 Coalpit Heath, bullet 1 (page 44)	To align with Charfield SDL policy.	<i>Provide around 1800 dwellings, including affordable housing, to be developed within the plan period. <b><u>New housing should expand the range of types and tenures available in the settlement.</u></b></i>	<b>Change to SA findings:</b> The proposed change set out the additional key strategic principle which should guide development at the SDL which is that new housing should contribute to the range of dwelling types and tenures. A significant positive effect has already been identified for Policy 7.10 in relation to SA objectives 2a: quantum of high quality and 2b: suitable mix of high quality housing types in the Consolidated SA Report. The proposed change would strengthen this effect expected, however the recorded effect will remain the same.
PC20 Coalpit Heath, bullet 4 (page 44)	Updated evidence ( <i>WED 008: Emerging Findings Transport Report, Nov 2018</i> ).	The new development areas will provide or contribute to a strategic transport package including: MetroBus extension to Yate and Chipping Sodbury, A432 Park & Ride, <b>A432 strategic cycle route</b> , Yate Rail Station enhancement, the Winterbourne and Frampton Cotterell Bypass, <b>and the Coalpit Heath/ Westerleigh bypass</b> . Vehicular access will be off Badminton Road/ Frog Lane, Roundways and Woodside	<b>No change to SA findings</b> – The proposed change would require a new A38 strategic cycle route and the Coalpit Heath/Westerleigh bypass to be delivered or to be contributed towards to support development at the Coalpit Heath SDL. The appraisal of Policy 7.10 (Coalpit Heath) is already reflective of the requirement to deliver or contribute towards numerous sustainable transport improvements as well as the Winterbourne and Frampton

Ref no.	Reason For Change	Proposed Change	Implications for SA findings reported previously
		Road.	<p>Cotterell Bypass which is expected to have a net positive effect in terms of encouraging modal shift to the benefit of local air quality in the area.</p> <p>A minor positive effect has already been identified in relation to SA objective 1b: air quality for Policy 7.10 which is reflective of the varying air quality in close proximity to the SDL but also the lack of nearby major traffic routes. A significant positive effect has already been recorded in relation to SA objective 5a: sustainable transport for this policy considering the nearby existing sustainable transport links and the requirements of the policy for provision of a strategic transport package. The proposed change would strengthen this effect if taken forward.</p> <p>Furthermore, the appraisal of Policy 6 has already taken into consideration numerous other strategic infrastructure requirements which would help to promote modal shift in the plan area and thereby be to benefit of local air quality. The Consolidated SA Report has already identified a mixed effect (significant positive/minor negative) in relation to SA objectives 1b: air quality and 5a: sustainable transport for Policy 6. It is expected that the requirement for the new Coalpit Heath/ Westerleigh bypass and new strategic cycle route as set out through the proposed changes would strengthen the positive effect previously identified as part of that overall effect for each SA objective. Given that the minor negative effect is reflective of the cumulative effect of transport improvements which might support the proliferation of the number of car journeys in the plan area and only one additional improvement of this type would result it is likely that no change would result to this part of the score.</p> <p>Similarly the potential effects of requiring the delivery of or contributions towards the Coalpit Heath/ Westerleigh</p>

Ref no.	Reason For Change	Proposed Change	Implications for SA findings reported previously
			<p>bypass considered as part of the overall transport mitigations supported by Policy 6 in relation to SA objectives 4b: biodiversity (uncertain minor positive/significant negative), 4c: landscapes (uncertain minor positive/significant negative), 4d: re-use of previously developed land (minor negative) and 4e: loss of productive land (minor negative) are unlikely to result in a change of sustainability effects identified. In addition, the mitigation within Policy 6 to be provided by the West of England Green Infrastructure Plan is still required to be in place.</p>
<p>PC21 Coalpit Heath, bullet 5 (page 44)</p>	<p>To improve clarity.</p>	<p>Establish a Green Infrastructure network that will contribute to defining a new Green Belt boundary along the east and southern edges of the SDL, provide attractive routes through the site to the nearby countryside (including along the historic Dramway), <del>break-up development impact along the ridgeline</del> <b>enhance the existing topography of the site, particularly existing</b> ridgelines, and protect the setting of nearby Listed Buildings</p>	<p><b>No change to SA findings</b> – The clarification of the policy requirement seeks to mitigate potential effects on the surrounding landscape. The appraisal of Policy 7.10 (Charfield) in relation to SA objective 4c: landscape (minor negative effect) is reflective of intricacies of the Frome Valley character area and the identified medium to high landscape sensitivity of the area. The proposed change would not have an effect on the existing situation at the site, however, it does seek to strengthen the mitigation requirement by ‘enhancing the existing topography’ therefore, the minor negative effect identified could be changed to minor negative uncertain.</p>
<p>PC22 Policy 7.11 Thornbury, bullet 3 (page 45)</p>	<p>To reflect emerging concept planning proposals.</p>	<p><i>Around 5ha of additional employment land on land at Crossways east of Morton Way, sensitively designed to respect the rural nature of the locality, <b><u>including safeguarded foot/cycle and bus only route to provide for a possible connection to the proposed Buckover Garden Village.</u></b></i></p>	<p><b>No change to SA findings</b> – The proposed change would clarify the requirement of the policy. The policy previously made reference at bullet 6 to a requirement for all development to follow principles including the support for a Metrobus Extension to Thornbury (and Buckover Garden Village) as well as foot and cycle improvements. The proposed change would clarify that this requirement is also relevant to the 5ha of employment land on land at Crossways east of Morton. As such no change to the appraisal of Policy 7.11 (Thornbury SDL) or Policy 6 (Strategic Infrastructure Requirements) in the</p>

Ref no.	Reason For Change	Proposed Change	Implications for SA findings reported previously
PC24 Thornbury, bullet 6 (page 45)	Updated evidence ( <i>WED 008: Emerging Findings Transport Report, Nov 2018</i> ).	<i>Development will also make financial contributions towards local and strategic transportation schemes, including <del>potentially</del>: Metrobus Extension to Thornbury (and Buckover GV), A38(N) Park &amp; Ride, <b>A38 strategic cycle route</b>, M5 J14 improvements, Charfield rail station re-opening, local bus service improvements local highway, foot and cycle improvements.</i>	<p>Consolidated SA Report is expected.</p> <p><b>No change to SA findings</b> – The proposed change would require a new A38 strategic cycle route to be contributed towards to support development at the Thornbury SDL. The appraisal of Policy 7.11 (Thornbury) is already reflective of the requirement to contribute towards numerous sustainable transport improvements including the Metrobus Extension, Charfield railway station re-opening, local bus service improvements and foot/cycle improvements which is expected to have a positive effect in terms of encouraging modal shift to the benefit of local air quality.</p> <p>A minor positive effect has been identified in relation to SA objective 1b: air quality for Policy 7.11 which is reflective of the lack of air quality issues in the area. Furthermore, a significant positive effect has already been recorded in relation to SA objective 5a: sustainable transport for this policy considering the nearby existing sustainable transport links and the requirements of the policy for contributions towards local and strategic transportation schemes. The proposed change would strengthen this effect if taken forward.</p> <p>Furthermore, the appraisal of Policy 6 has already taken into consideration numerous other strategic infrastructure requirements which would help to promote modal shift in the plan area and thereby be of benefit to local air quality. The Consolidated SA Report has already identified a mixed effect (significant positive/minor negative) in relation to SA objectives 1b: air quality and 5a: sustainable transport for Policy 6. It is expected that the requirement for the new strategic cycle route as set out through the proposed changes would strengthen the positive effect previously identified as part of that overall effect for each SA objective. Given that the minor negative effect is reflective of the cumulative effect of</p>

Ref no.	Reason For Change	Proposed Change	Implications for SA findings reported previously
			transport improvements which might support the proliferation of the number of car journeys in the plan area and no additional improvements of this type would result it is likely that no change would result to this part of the score.
Policy 7.12 Yate, bullet 5 (page 46)	Updated evidence ( <i>WED 008: Emerging Findings Transport Report, Nov 2018</i> ).	The new development areas will provide or contribute to a strategic transport package including: MetroBus extension to Yate and Chipping Sodbury, A432 Park & Ride, <b>and strategic cycle route</b> , Yate Rail Station enhancement, the Winterbourne and Frampton Cotterell bypass, <b>and the Coalpit Heath/Westerleigh bypass</b> . An on-site rail crossing and a new bridge may also to be required across Nibley Lane.	<p><b>No change to SA findings</b> – The proposed changes relate to the requirement for new development to deliver or contribute towards strategic transport improvements including a strategic cycle route and the Coalpit Heath/Westerleigh bypass. The requirement relating to the strategic cycle route was already set out in Policy 7.12.</p> <p>The proposed change relating to the requirement for support of the Coalpit Heath/Westerleigh bypass is likely to have the most notable effect in relation to promoting modal shift and subsequently air quality. The policy has already been recorded as having an uncertain minor positive effect in relation to SA objective 1b: air quality. This reflects some identified localised air quality issues and also considers the absence of an AQMA in the surrounding area. The effect is also considerate of the fact that future development may affect air quality but that Transport Impact Assessment and adequate preventative and mitigation measures are required. Given that these uncertainties and mitigation measures will still remain relevant the likely sustainability effect is expected to stay the same. The SDL has been recorded as having a significant positive effect in relation to SA objective 5a: sustainable transport considering the current and future potential links to the area. This effect is also considerate of the requirement for contribution towards a strategic transport package which would include Metrobus extension to Yate and Chipping Sodbury, strategic cycle route, A432 Park and Ride, Yate Rail Station enhancement, Winterbourne and Frampton</p>

Ref no.	Reason For Change	Proposed Change	Implications for SA findings reported previously
			<p>Cotterell Bypass and local bus services. It is not considered that the requirement for support for the Coalpit Heath/Westerleigh bypass which would be over and above the requirements already contained within the policy would result in a change to the expected sustainability effect.</p> <p>Furthermore, the appraisal of Policy 6 has already taken into consideration numerous other strategic infrastructure requirements which would help to promote modal shift in the plan area and thereby be of benefit to local air quality. The Consolidated SA Report has already identified a mixed effect (significant positive/minor negative) in relation to SA objectives 1b: air quality and 5a: sustainable transport for Policy 6. It is expected that the requirement for contribution towards the Coalpit Heath/Westerleigh bypass as set out through the proposed changes would not have an effect which is beyond that already identified for these SA objectives. Given that the minor negative effect is reflective of the cumulative effect of transport improvements which might support the proliferation of the number of car journeys in the plan area and that only one additional scheme would be supported through the proposed change it is likely that no change would result to this part of the score.</p> <p>Similarly, the potential effects of requiring the delivery of or contributions towards the Coalpit Heath/ Westerleigh bypass considered as part of the overall transport mitigations supported by Policy 6 in relation to SA objectives 4b: biodiversity (uncertain minor positive/significant negative), 4c: landscapes (uncertain minor positive/significant negative), 4d: re-use of previously developed land (minor negative) and 4e: loss of productive land (minor negative) is unlikely to result in a change of sustainability effects identified. In addition, the mitigation within Policy 6 provided by the West of England Green Infrastructure Plan is still required to be in</p>

Ref no.	Reason For Change	Proposed Change	Implications for SA findings reported previously
PC25 Yate, bullet 6 (page 45)	To improve clarity.	<p><b>Establish a</b> A Green Infrastructure network <b>that</b> will reinforce a new Green Belt boundary <b>along the western edges of the SDL</b>, protect the river valley <b>and the setting of nearby Listed Buildings</b>, <b>enhance the</b> linear settlement of Engine Common and Nibley Village, provide an attractive segregated route along the Frome Valley Walkway, and enhance North Road and the Frome river corridor through the Beeches Estate.</p>	<p>place.</p> <p><b>No change to SA score</b> – The proposed change would clarify the requirement of the policy. The Consolidated SA Report has identified an uncertain minor negative effect in relation to SA objective 4a: historic environment. This is reflective of Listed Buildings and potential for archaeology within the SDL area. The proposed change would now require the establishment of a Green Infrastructure network to be delivered to help protect the setting of the nearby Listed Buildings, although the successful implementation of this would still be uncertain. In addition, no policy requirement has been included in relation to investigation of archaeological potential in the area meaning the uncertain minor negative effect previously identified is still relevant.</p>