

Strategic Environmental Assessment of the Revocation of the South East Regional Strategy

Environmental Report



AMEC Environment & Infrastructure UK Limited

October 2012

This Environmental Report is a consultation document on the likely significant environmental effects of revocation of the South East Plan and the Regional Economic Strategy (which together form the Regional Strategy in force for the South East).

Responses on any aspect of the report are invited by Thursday 6 December 2012.

This report succeeds the previous Environmental Report for the revocation of the South East Regional Strategy which was consulted on between October 2011 and January 2012. It is a stand alone document the intention of which is to provide the reader with an up-to-date comprehensive assessment of the environmental effects of the revocation of the South East Plan and the Regional Economic Strategy without the need to refer back to the previous environmental report. Any reader who has also read the previous Environmental Report should note that, insofar as there is any difference between the two documents, this Environmental Report is to be preferred.

A summary of responses to this consultation will be published on the DCLG website in due course. Unless you specifically state that your response, or any part of it, is confidential, we shall assume that you have no objection to it being made available to the public and identified on the DCLG website. Confidential responses will be included in any numerical summary or analysis of responses.

Responses and comments about this consultation may be sent by email to:

SEAConsultation@communities.gsi.gov.uk or by post to:

Environmental Assessment Team

Department of Communities and Local Government

Zone 1/J6, Eland House, Bressenden Place

London, SW1E 5DU

Tel: 0303 444 1654

Non Technical Summary

This **Non-Technical Summary** presents the findings of the **Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) of the plan to revoke the South East Regional Strategy** contained in the accompanying Environmental Report. The assessment, Environmental Report and NTS have been completed by AMEC E&I UK Ltd on behalf of DCLG. The following sections:

- explain what the plan is and its implications for the South East region by revoking the South East Regional Strategy;
- provide a summary of the environment within the region;
- outline the likely significant environmental effects of the plan, along with the reasonable alternatives;
- propose mitigating measures for likely significant environmental effects identified;
- propose monitoring measures; and
- provide an indication of the next steps.

The plan to revoke Regional Strategies

The Government announced in the Coalition Agreement its intention to “*rapidly abolish regional spatial strategies and return decision-making powers on housing and planning to local councils*”. The objective was to make Local Plans, and where desired neighbourhood plans, the basis for local planning decisions.

The Localism Act 2011 repealed Part 5 of the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009, thereby removing the legal framework for the review of regional strategies or the adoption of new or revised regional strategies, and gave the Secretary of State powers to revoke in full or in part the existing strategies by order.

The Government’s proposal is to replace the eight regional strategies outside London with a more localist planning system, together with incentives such as the New Homes Bonus, to encourage local authorities and communities to increase their aspirations for housing and economic growth.

The South East Regional Strategy

The South East Regional Strategy combines the contents of the **South East Regional Spatial Strategy** and the **South East Regional Economic Strategy**.

The **South East Regional Spatial Strategy** (published as the South East Plan in 2009) was introduced under the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and, in accordance with Government policy at the time, provides a broad development strategy for the region for 15 to 20 years. In particular, it has sought to achieve more sustainable development, protect the environment and combat climate change and to put in place a development strategy with the potential to support continued sustainable growth up to 2026. It includes policies to address housing, environmental protection and management, transport and other infrastructure, economic development, minerals, energy and waste, as well as sub-regional policies.

The key ambition of the South East Plan is to allow the region to accommodate higher levels of growth in sustainable ways by coordination of policy in nine sub-regions, and focussing development on a network of regional hubs, which would include development in five strategic development areas, and mixed use development in urban areas. It requires local planning authorities to provide at least 654,000 net additional dwellings over the period 2006 to 2026¹.

Figure NTS 1 The South East area covered by the South East Plan



¹ 8,440 additional dwellings allocated to Guildford were struck out following a successful High Court challenge; however, the total number of net additional dwellings in the South East Plan remained unchanged.

The Plan contains:

- a ‘core’ Spatial Strategy with generic policies that provide a framework for sustainable development in the region, and that complement national planning policy statements;
- policies on economic development, housing, built environment and town centres, tourism, transport, environmental aspects, social and community infrastructure, waste and minerals; and
- more location-specific policies for ten identified sub-regions and for the area outside these sub-regions.

In total there are 24 policy areas (13 regional policy topics and 11 more location-specific policy areas) and 179 individual policies. Further details of the individual policies are set out in **Appendix A**.

The **South East Regional Economic Strategy** (RES) was produced in compliance with the Section 7 of the Regional Development Act 1998. It provides a vision for the South East economy to 2016 that the South East will be a world class region achieving sustainable prosperity. It sets three headline and interlinked objectives for the strategy (with targets): achieving **Global Competitiveness; Smart Growth** and spreading the benefits of competitiveness; and **Sustainable Prosperity**, ensuring that competitiveness is consistent with the principles of sustainable development. The RES also sets eight transformational actions intended to have particular impact across the breadth of the strategy which cover:

- 100% broadband coverage;
- Science and Innovation Campuses;
- Skills Escalator;
- Regional Infrastructure Fund;
- Raising Economic Activity Rates;
- Global Leadership in Environmental Technologies;
- Education-led Regeneration; and
- Making the most of 2012.

The RES was developed with regional partners and was subject to a formal consultation and SEA process.

There is a strong and complementary relationship between the South East Plan and the South East RES:

- they share an understanding of the spatial economic differences within the region, particularly around the need to enhance the global competitiveness of 'high tech' industries while addressing underperformance in areas of social and economic deprivation.
- the South East Plan includes policies to support 'Smart Growth' and 'Global Competitiveness' which are core objectives of the RES.
- there are shared objectives in the two strategies covering housing, infrastructure and regeneration;
- both the Regional Economic Strategy and South East Plan have been prepared in accordance with the region's sustainable development priorities, and the underlying principles in the Regional Economic Strategy are consistent with the Regional Sustainability Framework² (RSF).

The relationship between the RES and the South East Plan is set out in more detail in **Appendix H**.

Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) of the plan to revoke the South East Regional Strategy

SEA became a statutory requirement following the adoption of European Union Directive 2001/42/EC on the assessment of the effects of certain plans and programmes on the environment. The objective of SEA, as defined in Directive 2001/42/EC is: *'To provide for a high level of protection of the environment and to contribute to the integration of environmental considerations into the preparation and adoption of plans and programmes with a view to contributing to sustainable development'*.

As part of its stated commitment to protecting the environment, the Government decided to carry out an assessment of the likely significant environmental effects of the revocation of the 8 regional strategies, on a voluntary basis. A 12 week consultation on the Environmental Reports of these assessments commenced on 20 October 2011 and ended on 20 January 2012. There were 103 responses to the consultation process.

² The RSF set out the overall sustainable development objectives which all regional strategies and initiatives have sought to deliver. It underpinned the assessment framework used in the Sustainability Appraisal of the South East Plan. It was produced jointly by the Regional Assembly, Government Office for the South East, SEEDA, the Environment Agency and National Health Service in 2001 and revised following consultation in 2007.

Since the completion of the consultation, the Government has published the final version of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and a planning policy on Travellers sites, and has commenced provisions in the Localism Act and introduced a duty to co-operate in the Localism Act which contains strong measures for local co-operation.³ In addition, in a judgement⁴ by the Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU), the Court held that ‘...in as much as the repeal of a plan may modify the state of the environment as examined at the time of adoption, it must be taken into consideration with a view to subsequent effects that it might have on the environment’. The Government therefore decided to use the additional information gained through the public consultation process, as well as the developments in policy and recent CJEU case law, to update and build on the assessments which were described in the previous Environmental Reports. This assessment is the result in relation to the revocation of the South East Regional Strategy - it is a stand-alone document and there is no requirement to refer back to the previous report on the revocation of the South East Regional Strategy published on 20th October 2011.

The South East environment

To provide the context for the assessment, the SEA Directive requires that the relevant aspects of the current state of the environment and its evolution without the plan are considered, along with the environmental characteristics likely to be significantly affected. This information is presented in detail for each SEA topic considered in this assessment in **Appendix E**. Table NTS 1 provides a brief summary.

Table NTS 1 Summary of State of the Environment in the South East

SEA Topic	Summary of the Environment and Key Characteristics in the South East
Biodiversity and Nature Conservation (which includes flora and fauna, and the functioning of ecosystems)	<p>The South East hosts 58 Special Areas of Conservation, 21 Special Protection Areas and 16 Ramsar sites as listed in Appendix G. These sites are subject to the highest level of protection.</p> <p>Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs) cover around 134,000 hectares of the region (around 7%). SSSI condition has improved significantly over recent years. In July 2012, 97.5% of this area was in ‘favourable’ or ‘recovering’ condition. This compares with 78% in 2006.</p> <p>Biodiversity interest in the South East is centred on both inland and coastal regions with particularly significant areas of lowland heathland, chalk grassland, ancient woodland, vegetated shingle and sheltered estuaries.</p>
Population (including socio-economic effects and accessibility)	<p>In 2010, over 8.5 million people were living in the South East region, which represents 16% of the English total. The most densely populated areas are Slough, Oxford, Reading, the South Hampshire coast, Sussex coast and Medway.</p> <p>Between 2004 and 2010 the population of the South East grew by 5%.</p> <p>In 2010 new housing completions in the region accounted for 21% of the total for England. As the economy entered recession in 2008, the number of net additions in the region fell by 22% over a two year period to a total of 23,500 in 2009/10. Housing in the</p>

³ S110 of the Localism Act 2011 Duty to co-operate in relation to planning for sustainable development

⁴ The judgment in Case C-567/10 *Inter-Environnement Bruxelles ASBL v Région de Bruxelles-Capitale*

SEA Topic	Summary of the Environment and Key Characteristics in the South East
	<p>South East is among the least affordable with the highest prices of any English region (after London).</p> <p>Economically, the South East is the most successful region in the country after London. It had the second highest Gross Value Added (GVA) per head of any region in 2010. Unemployment at 6.4% (February – April 2012) is lower than the national average (8.2%) but significantly higher than 2005 when unemployment was 3.8%.</p>
Human Health	<p>At 79.9 years, male life expectancy at birth in the region is a year longer than the England average. Female life expectancy at birth is 83.6 years which is also higher than the nationwide average. The death rate in the region was 8.8 per 1,000 population in 2009, the second lowest of all the regions after London.</p> <p>In 2010 the South East had the third lowest number of crimes recorded per 100,000 population of any region in England and the rate of crime committed against households (40 per 1,000 residents) was close to the national average (45 per 1,000 residents). The South East, together with the East of England, contains the largest proportion of least deprived areas of any region, although there still remain pockets of severe deprivation.</p>
Soil and Geology (including land use, important geological sites, and the contamination of soils)	<p>Sixty percent of the total land area in the region is categorised as farmland. In terms of Agricultural Land Classification (ALC), excluding London, approximately 80% is classified as Grade 3 land, 10% is Grade 1 or 2, and the remaining 10% is Grade 4 or 5.</p> <p>In 2007 there was a total of 4,580 ha of previously developed land (PDL) considered to be suitable for housing out of a total of 8,990 ha PDL. In 2008, 78% of new dwellings were constructed on PDL.</p>
Water Quality and Resources (including as inland surface freshwater and groundwater resources, and inland surface freshwater, groundwater, estuarine, coastal and marine water quality)	<p>The quality of the water environment has improved over the past decade due to improvements in sewage discharge, and the decline in heavy industry. Under the Water Framework Directive, 21% of the surface water bodies are classified as 'good ecological status' and 63% are moderate. Bathing water quality has also improved; all the beaches meet the 'mandatory standard', and 77% exceed the higher 'guideline' standard for bathing water.</p> <p>There is considerable pressure on water resources in the region related to development needs. Seventy five percent of the drinking water in the South East is derived from underground aquifers. The per capita consumption of water in 2008/9 was 156 litres/day. While there has been some decline in consumption (10% between 2002/3 and 2008/9) further reduction is needed to ensure that the needs of new development can be met.</p> <p>As described below under Climate Change, the region is particularly vulnerable to flooding.</p>
Air Quality	<p>Within the South East, 44 local authorities have declared one or more Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs), with 5 being designated in 2009 due to an increase in Nitrogen Dioxide (South Oxfordshire, Swale, West Berkshire, Windsor and Maidenhead and Reading).</p> <p>Overall air quality in the South East has improved over the past decade following a decline in heavy industry within the region. The main risk to air quality is traffic congestion.</p>
Climate Change (including greenhouse gas emissions, predicted effects of climate change and the ability to adapt)	<p>In 2009, the South East's net emissions of CO₂ (by end user) were estimated to be 58.1 million tonnes, giving an estimate of 6.9 tonnes of CO₂ per capita, the highest for all the English regions after London. There has been a notable decline since 2005 when the per capita emission was 8.2 tonnes.</p> <p>In 2009, renewable energy sources provided 6.7% of the electricity generated in the UK, an increase of 1.2% over 2008. Excluding bio-mass used for co-firing, the South East</p>

SEA Topic	Summary of the Environment and Key Characteristics in the South East
	<p>has the largest capacity to generate from biomass (20% of UK total).</p> <p>The South East is particularly vulnerable to climate change and sea level rise. Over 403,000 properties (domestic and commercial) are at risk from flooding, either from river or sea.</p>
Waste Management and Minerals	<p>The South East sends more waste to landfill than any other region (11.6 million tonnes in 2008) comprising waste derived from the region and from other regions, particularly London.</p> <p>The South East has a variety of mineral assets including primary aggregates, secondary aggregates and recycled materials, and imports. Marine dredged aggregate is a significant source of imported material providing 40% of the primary aggregate supply for the region. Other regionally or nationally significant minerals worked in the South East are clay, chalk, silica sand and gypsum.</p>
Cultural Heritage (including architectural and archaeological heritage)	<p>The region is home to 75,013 listed buildings (20% of the England total) of which 1,730 are listed Grade I and 3,858 listed Grade II* buildings. In 2007, 3.1% of Grade I and II* buildings were deemed at risk. Regionally important historic environments relate to the region's historic cities (Canterbury, Chichester, Oxford, Rochester, Southampton and Winchester); its maritime heritage; historic countryside; archaeological and defence heritage; market towns and villages and stately homes.</p> <p>The South East is extensively wooded and contains 40% of the total ancient woodland in England, an important cultural asset.</p>
Landscape and Townscape	<p>More than 36% of the South East region is protected by national designations. The New Forest National Park and the South Downs National Park together cover approximately 10% of the region. There are eleven Areas of Outstanding Beauty (AONB), more than any other region in England. A significant part of the region comprises the London and Oxford Green Belts which, although not designated for landscape, play a part in defining the broader landscape character of the area. Particular threats to the landscape character of the region are development and agricultural change.</p>

A more detailed description of issues and existing environmental problems that relate to sites designated under the Habitats Directive 92/43/EEC and the Birds Directive 79/409/EC is set out in **Appendix G**.

The evolution of the environmental baseline is likely to include the following changes:

- an increase in pressures on biodiversity from the levels of housing and employment growth;
- a growth in the population by 16% between 2010 and 2030;
- a growth in number of households to 4.1 million by 2033;
- an increased water resource demand of up to 440 Ml/d by 2035;
- hotter and drier summers and warmer and wetter winters (based on predictions for the effects of climate changes in the 2080's for the region);
- a rise in sea level from climate change leading to coastal change and habitat loss.

Appendix E contains more detailed information on the evolution of the baseline.

The relationship of the plan to revoke the South East Regional Strategy with other policies, plans and programmes

Consistent with the SEA Directive requirements, this assessment has identified and reviewed other relevant policies, plans and programmes at an international (European), national, regional and local level. The review has identified how these other policies, plans and programmes could influence the plan to revoke the regional strategy. It also identifies how the plan to revoke could contribute to the achievement of any environmental or sustainability objectives set out in these other policies, plans and programmes. Of particular relevance is the National Planning Policy Framework, as well as the 3 saved structure plan policies, 68 Local Plans and 15 Plans that contain mineral and waste policies in the region. The relevant policies from the Local Plans and Mineral and Waste Plans are presented in **Appendix C**.

The relevant environmental protection objectives are reviewed and provided in **Appendix E**. Examples include:

- protection and enhancement of the levels and variety of biodiversity, including designated sites, priority species and habitats;
- protection and enhancement of soil quality and landscape character;
- protection and enhancement of water supplies and resources; and
- promotion of the efficient use of water.

The review also helped to inform the development of the baseline, aid the determination of the key issues and provide the policy context for the assessment.

Which environmental topics has the plan to revoke the South East Regional Strategy been assessed against?

The plan to revoke the regional strategy has been assessed against the 12 topic areas, identified below. These include all of the topics set out in the SEA Directive. The methodology used within the assessment is in **section 3** of the Environmental Report.

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. Biodiversity | 8. Air quality |
| 2. Fauna | 9. Climatic Factors including climate change and adaptation and flood risk |
| 3. Flora | 10. Material Assets including waste management and minerals |
| 4. Population including demographics, socio-economics | 11. Cultural Heritage including architectural and archaeological heritage |
| 5. Human health | 12. Landscape |
| 6. Soil including geology and land use | |
| 7. Water quality (including surface and ground water quality and availability) | |

The baseline data and information required under the SEA Directive for each of these topics is presented in **Appendix E** to the Environmental Report.

What reasonable alternatives were identified and assessed?

Consideration of the reasonable alternatives for a proposed policy or plan is a fundamental aspect of policy and planning development and a pre-requisite for the preferred direction to gain wider and long term support. In turn, recording the reasons for the selection of the preferred option can also aid subsequent review, particularly if the assumptions that underpin any alternatives change over time.

Article 5(1) of the SEA Directive requires the identification, description and evaluation of reasonable alternatives, taking into account the objectives and the geographical scope of the plan or programme. On this basis, the starting point for identifying alternatives to the revocation of the South East Regional Strategy has been the scope of the powers of the Secretary of State to revoke, partially revoke or fully revoke the Regional Strategies. Responses to the consultation suggested a number of other alternatives (see **Appendix F** and section 2.4 of the main report) including partial revocation.

Following the application of the reasonableness test in compliance with Article 5(1) of the SEA Directive, the following alternatives have been taken forward for assessment within the SEA:

- **Revocation** of the entire South East Regional Strategy.
- **Retention** of the South East Regional Strategy but not updating it in the future.
- **Partial revocation of the South East Regional Strategy either by**
 - Revoking all the quantified and spatially specific policies (for instance where a quantum of development, land for development or amounts of minerals to be extracted or waste disposal is allocated to a particular location in the region) and retaining for a transitional period the non spatial policies, ambitions and priorities; or

- Retaining for a transitional period all the spatially specific policies (for instance where a quantum of development, land for development or amounts of minerals to be extracted or waste disposal is allocated to a particular location in the region) and revoking the non spatial policies, ambitions and priorities; or
- Retaining for a transitional period policies, ambitions and/or priorities the revocation of which may lead to likely significant negative environmental effects.

Under either revocation or retention, local authorities will need to prepare and implement their Local Plans and other planning policy documents and to take planning decisions having due regard to the NPPF. The importance placed on the retained Regional Strategy and the NPPF may change over time, particularly when the Regional Strategy is not revised and so becomes out of date and less relevant to local community circumstances. Revocation of the Regional Strategy also has the potential to affect Local Plans and planning decisions more immediately as in some cases, removing the Regional Strategy will remove a regional policy that the local planning authority used to make local development decisions and local policy. The implications and effects on relevant Local Plan policies have therefore also been considered in the assessment.

What are the likely significant effects⁵ of the plan to revoke the South East Regional Strategy and the reasonable alternatives?

The assessment of the revocation of the South East Regional Strategy has shown that **there will be significant positive environmental effects**, although these will be largely similar to those if the Regional Strategy were retained.

The areas where revocation of the Regional Strategy would lead to **significant negative effects are in relation to water resources, material assets, climate change and air quality** arising from development associated with housing, employment provision and airport development. It should be noted that the same significant negative effects are recorded for retention of the Regional Strategy as it is assumed that over the long term, a significant scale of development will proceed under both alternatives. The region is one of the driest in the country and securing adequate water supply is already a challenge with resources declining. However the effects are likely to be minimised as far as possible through the water resource management planning required by water companies (notably Southern Water, South East Water and Thames Water in the south east), the Environment Agency's river basin management plans and the application of policies in the NPPF which are designed to secure efficient water usage.

⁵ This includes consideration of the effects in the short, medium and long term permanent and temporary and positive and negative effects. Secondary, cumulative and synergistic effects are also specifically considered in Table NTS3.

For the majority of individual policies, it is difficult to identify clear differences between the effects of retention and revocation. This reflects the broad strategic nature of the Regional Strategy policies and the degree to which responsibilities are already devolved to local authorities to reflect the principles in their Local Plans. It also reflects the fact that both NPPF and the South East Regional Strategy have sustainable development principles at their core.

Where it occurs, differences between retention and revocation are most clear in respect of housing and employment allocations. Whilst the benefits to communities of housing and employment opportunities and the impacts on biodiversity, air quality, soils, water resources and material assets will be similar, a locally-led approach could ensure that the adverse effects are more effectively mitigated. This could be through a more detailed understanding of local environmental capacity issues and possibly more diverse and locally-specific spatial distributions of development. In the case of revocation, it is AMEC's view that there is some uncertainty about whether the benefits will be realised in the short to medium term for those local authorities that need to establish Local Plan policies for housing and economic development that reflect the objectively assessed and up to date needs of their respective local communities. This issue may be relevant for up to 47 out of the 68 South East local planning authorities who adopted Local Plans before 2009 (the date of the adoption of the South East Plan). The application of the NPPFs presumption in favour of sustainable development and its policies to boost the supply of housing will help where Local Plans or policies are absent, silent or out of date.

Where a Regional Strategy policy provides a strategic direction whose requirements extend beyond the boundaries of a single authority, such as strategic employment sites, there may also be a difference in the short and medium term between retention and revocation. Retention of the policy and the resulting development is likely to have significantly positive effects on the community and negative effects on biodiversity, air, water and material assets, in part because of the clarity and certainty provided by the retained policy. As in the previous example, the effects of revocation will be more uncertain until authorities define, agree and implement the duty to co-operate and then reflect this in their adopted plans. In the interim where Local Plans or policies are absent, silent or out of date, the application of the NPPFs presumption in favour of sustainable development is likely to lead to an increase in the number of approvals of development which is sustainable which will help counter the effects of this uncertainty.

Many of the benefits of retention relate to spatial planning issues that cross local authority boundaries (e.g. green infrastructure) and require direction and co-operation from a number of stakeholders including local authorities to be realised. Therefore, in the case of revocation, it is AMEC's view that there may be more uncertainty about benefits coming forward in the short to medium term where local authorities need to establish arrangements under the "duty to co-operate" to deliver such strategic policies and then reflect them in their adopted Local Plans. So whilst **the duty to co-operate could well address a wide range of strategic issues**, such as the delivery of green infrastructure, it is AMEC's opinion that **there is uncertainty as to how this might work, particularly in the short to medium term, both by topic and geographically**. There are examples in the South East, such as the Thames

Basin Heaths Partnership, where this has already worked successfully. If however, wider arrangements are ineffectual or lack support, for some issues, such as renewable energy, biodiversity enhancement or landscape conservation, their potential will not be realised.

It should be noted that the effects of the recent Government housing and planning package changes⁶ have not been considered in detail in this assessment as policy detail is still being developed; however, it may prove that the increased emphasis on growth and development given by these proposals addresses some of the effects in the short and medium term arising from the uncertainties in those 47 authorities without Local Plans in conformity with the Regional Strategy.

The following table presents a summary of the environmental effects of revocation, retention and partial revocation of each of the 14 policy areas contained in the South East Plan (please note that for this summary all the sub-regional policies have been grouped together). It includes consideration of the short, medium and long term permanent and temporary, positive and negative effects. These cover a broad range of policy issues and encompass those contained in the Regional Economic Strategy.

Table NTS 2 Summary of the Effects of Revocation, Retention and Partial Revocation by Topic

South East Plan Policy Area	Revocation	Retention	Partial Revocation		
			Quantified and spatially-specific policies	Non quantitative and non-spatially specific policies	Policies with significant negative effects
Spatial Strategy (Policies SP1 – SP5)	There are no areas where revocation of those policies which make up the Core Spatial Strategy would have any significant negative effects.	There would be a similar range of effects to revocation.	No significant effects identified.	No significant effects identified.	No significant effects identified.
Cross Cutting (Policies CC1 – CC9)	There are no areas where revocation of Cross Cutting policies would have any negative effects. There may be a delay in realising the benefits in the short and medium term due to the time required to put in place up to date Local Plans and to implement the duty to co-operate.	There would be similar range of effects to revocation. Effects in the short and medium term may be more pronounced as there would be no delay in implementation.	No significant effects identified.	No significant effects identified.	No significant effects identified.
Sustainable	The revocation of these	There would be a	There would be a	There would be a	No significant

⁶ <http://www.communities.gov.uk/news/housing/2211918>

South East Plan Policy Area	Revocation	Retention	Partial Revocation		
			Quantified and spatially-specific policies	Non quantitative and non-spatially specific policies	Policies with significant negative effects
Economic Development (Policies RE1 – RE6)	<p>policies is unlikely to affect local authorities planning for growth and in providing for these needs, there are expected to be significant benefits to the population in the long term. Adverse effects (for example on future water resources and material assets where effects would be significant) would be similar to those of retention.</p> <p>Mitigation of the effects on water resources would be through a combination of water resource management planning (Southern Water), the Environment Agency's river basin management plans and the measures set out in the NPPF.</p>	similar range of effects to revocation. Effects in the short and medium term would be more pronounced as there would be no delay in implementation.	similar range of effects to revocation.	similar range of effects to revocation although it might result in some confusion with the intent of the NPPF and how the retained policies are to be applied.	effects identified.
Housing (Policies H1 – H6)	<p>The revocation of these policies is unlikely to affect local authorities' provision and planning for housing. The NPPF requires all authorities to objectively assess their own housing markets and make provision accordingly. The negative effects on the region's water resources and material assets, noted above, have been identified as being significant. The effects could be lessened or delayed in the short to medium term due to some authorities needing to update and revise their Local Plans</p>	There would be similar range of effects to revocation. Effects in the short and medium term would be more pronounced as there would be no delay in implementation.	There would be a similar range of effects to revocation.	There would be a similar range of effects to revocation although it might result in some confusion with the intent of the NPPF and how the retained policies are to be applied.	No significant effects identified.
Transport (Policies T1 – T14)	The revocation of these policies is unlikely to affect local authorities' transport infrastructure provision and planning. Significant positive effects for population and health, air and climatic	Similar effects to revocation.	No significant effects identified.	There would be a similar range of effects to revocation although it might result in some confusion with	No significant effects identified.

South East Plan Policy Area	Revocation	Retention	Partial Revocation		
			Quantified and spatially-specific policies	Non quantitative and non-spatially specific policies	Policies with significant negative effects
	factors have been identified due to improved air quality and reduced potential for greenhouse gas emissions due to the emphasis on sustainable transport modes. Policy T9 relates to airports. Revocation will not impact on regional/national aviation policy. Significant adverse effects on air quality and climate would be similar to those of retention.			the intent of the NPPF and how the retained policies are to be applied.	
Natural Resource Management (Policies NRM1 – NRM 16)	The revocation of these policies is unlikely to affect local authorities' provision and planning for the environment. There will be benefits across virtually all of the SEA topic areas with many of the effects being significant due to a combination of existing statutory environmental protection and the application of the NPPF policies. Provision of improved infrastructure for water resource management is a necessity in order to accommodate economic growth in the region.	Similar effects to revocation.	No significant effects identified.	No significant effects identified.	No significant effects identified.
Waste (Policies W1 – W17)	The revocation of the policy is unlikely to affect local authorities planning policy for waste management. Significant positive effects on material assets will arise due to the continued presence of national policy approaches in the PPS10 which seek to reduce the amount of waste being produced. A significant positive impact on human health has been identified due to improved air quality	Similar effects to revocation.	No significant effects identified.	There would be a similar range of effects to revocation although it might result in some confusion with the intent of the NPPF and how the retained policies are to be applied.	No significant effects identified.

South East Plan Policy Area	Revocation	Retention	Partial Revocation		
			Quantified and spatially-specific policies	Non quantitative and non-spatially specific policies	Policies with significant negative effects
	associated with reduced transport of waste.				
Minerals (Policies M1 – M5)	The assessment has identified significant positive benefits for population and material assets – these reflect the sustainable approach to mineral extraction and supply which is presented in the NPPF.	Similar effects to revocation.	No significant effects identified.	There would be a similar range of effects to revocation although it might result in some confusion with the intent of the NPPF and how the retained policies are to be applied.	No significant effects identified.
Countryside and Landscape Management (Policies C1 – C7)	The revocation of these policies is unlikely to affect local authorities' planning policy for countryside and landscape management. Areas of national significance receive statutory protection and the NPPF maintains the policy base for this legislation. Significant positive benefits are assessed for biodiversity, population and human health, cultural heritage and landscape.	Similar effects to revocation.	No significant effects identified.	No significant effects identified.	No significant effects identified.
Managing the Built Environment (Policies BE1 – BE6)	The revocation of these policies is unlikely to affect aspirations to ensure urban renaissance including renewal of suburban areas, and management of villages and the historic environment. Ensuring quality of the built environment and good design are core planning objectives of the NPPF. Significant positive impacts are identified for population and cultural heritage. These effects could be lessened or delayed in due to some authorities needing to update and revise	Similar effects to revocation. Effects in the short and medium term would be more pronounced as there would be no delay in implementation	No significant effects identified.	No significant effects identified.	No significant effects identified.

South East Plan Policy Area	Revocation	Retention	Partial Revocation		
			Quantified and spatially-specific policies	Non quantitative and non-spatially specific policies	Policies with significant negative effects
	their Local Plans.				
Town Centres (Policies TC1 – TC3)	Significant positive impacts are assessed for population resulting from increased economic development in town centres. The NPPF promotes the concept of competitive town centres and the prioritisation of areas for economic regeneration. These effects could be lessened or delayed due to some authorities needing to update and revise their Local Plans.	Similar effects to revocation. Effects in the short and medium term would be more pronounced as there would be no delay in implementation.	No significant effects identified.	Similar effects to revocation.	No significant effects identified.
Tourism and related Sports and Recreation (Policies TSR1 – TSR7)	Revocation of the policy is unlikely to affect the aspirations of local authorities to enhance opportunities for economic development associated with managed development of tourism, in line with Government policy. The NPPF supports the rural economy and Local Enterprise Partnerships, together with Local Tourism Bodies will take forward the development of tourism. A significant positive impact on population is assessed. These effects could be lessened or delayed due to some authorities needing to update and revise their Local Plans.	Similar effects to revocation. Effects in the short and medium term would be more pronounced as there would be no delay in implementation.	No significant effects identified.	Similar effects to revocation.	No significant effects identified.
Social and Community Infrastructure (Policies S1 – S6)	Revocation of these policies will not affect the requirement of local authorities to plan for health, education and community facilities in accordance with the NPPF framework. Significant positive impacts on population and human health are assessed. These effects	Similar effects to revocation. Effects in the short and medium term would be more pronounced as there would be no delay in implementation.	No significant effects identified.	Similar effects to revocation.	No significant effects identified.

South East Plan Policy Area	Revocation	Retention	Partial Revocation		
			Quantified and spatially-specific policies	Non quantitative and non-spatially specific policies	Policies with significant negative effects
	could be lessened or delayed due to some authorities needing to update and revise their Local Plans.				
Sub Regions	Revocation of these policies will leave decisions to local authorities collaborating under the duty to co-operate to bring forward the necessary development across the sub-region in line with the policies in the NPPF. Specific effects and uncertainties have been identified where there is a difference between local authority and Regional Strategy policy in some sub-regions e.g. Sussex Coast, East Kent and Ashford and Kent Thames Gateway.	There would be similar range of effects to revocation. Effects in the short and medium term would be more pronounced as there would be no delay in implementation.	No significant effects identified	There would be a similar range of effects as revocation although it might result in some confusion with the intent of the NPPF and how the retained policies are to be applied.	No significant effects identified.

What are the secondary, cumulative and synergistic effects of the plan to revoke the South East Regional Strategy?

In determining the significance of effects of a plan or programme, the SEA Directive requires that consideration is given to the secondary, cumulative, synergistic effects on the environment. The following table summarises these effects by assessment topic.

The plan to revoke the Regional Strategies is national in scope as well as applying to the eight regions. In consequence the national implications and effects of the plan have also been considered in the cumulative assessment. In respect of setting local housing targets, over the medium and longer term, the wider effects could yield increasing differences between regions with growth concentrated in those areas of greatest demand with consequential effects for infrastructure and environmental assets.

Table NTS 3 Summary of Secondary, Cumulative and Synergistic Effects

Assessment Topic	Summary Cumulative Effects
Biodiversity and Nature Conservation (which includes flora and fauna, and the functioning of ecosystems)	<p>The existing good or favourable condition of priority wildlife habitats in the South East should not be affected by any proposals for revocation of the Regional Strategy. Specific policies introduced under the South East Plan to avoid effects on identified European designated conservation sites, such as Thames Basin Heaths, will be continued. In the case of the Thames Basin Heaths, this will be through the mitigation strategy contained in Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area Delivery Framework and implemented by the Thames Basin Heaths Partnership.</p> <p>Achievement of legally binding targets for water discharges and air quality (under the Environmental Permitting Regulations 2010) will also be significant contributory factors in improving the quality of areas important for wildlife, while enhanced provisions on aspects such as the delivery and protection of green infrastructure will play an important role in increasing the overall area with significant biodiversity value.</p> <p>The NPPF together with legislation and wider national policies on biodiversity provides a strong framework to maintain the current high level of protection for the existing biodiversity resource; however, there may be some uncertainties associated with the implementation of the duty to co-operate.</p> <p>There will, however, be some development anticipated on greenfield sites, and where this occurs, this will lead to some local loss of biodiversity (either directly through land take or indirectly through effects associated with disruption and disturbance of habitats adjacent to the developed sites, from construction, traffic and recreational activity). The local effects however, will depend on decisions taken by local authorities in consultation with their communities, and by businesses and other partners, on the future scale, nature and location of housing and other development in order to meet identified need.</p>
Population (including socio-economic effects and accessibility)	<p>There is a range of significant direct and secondary positive benefits anticipated to accrue to communities from the provision of employment and housing land, improvements in local facilities and enhancement from local environmental quality. Revocation is unlikely to affect this due to the application of the NPPF together with the Planning Policy on Traveller sites and a range of Local Economic Partnerships with clear commitments and visions to address issues in their respective areas.</p>
Human Health	<p>There is a range of direct and secondary benefits to human health of increasing the quality and quantity of new housing, addressing local deprivation and improving local environmental quality. Revocation of the South East Regional Strategy will not affect the realisation of these benefits.</p>
Soil and Geology (including land use, important geological sites, and the contamination of soils)	<p>The main adverse impacts on soil are as a result of development, and land cover under arable and horticulture has decreased by 9.1% between 1998 and 2007 across the UK. As a region, the South East has the largest area of previously developed land (PDL) suitable for housing and in 2008, 78% of new dwellings were constructed on previously developed land (PDL).</p> <p>Following revocation, given the scale of likely future development to meet population growth needs, it is likely that some greenfield land will be affected. The majority of land in the South East is Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) Grade 3, with pockets of 1 and 2. Policies in the NPPF seek to protect best and most versatile land (i.e. ALC Grades 1-3a).</p> <p>At this stage the cumulative effects remain uncertain although are likely to be negative. However, given the target in the Natural Environment White Paper (NEWP) that by 2030 all of England's soils will be managed sustainably and degradation threats tackled successfully along with further research, there remains the potential</p>

Assessment Topic	Summary Cumulative Effects
	for this to be addressed in the long term.
Water Quality and Resources (including as inland surface freshwater and groundwater resources, and inland surface freshwater, groundwater, estuarine, coastal and marine water quality)	Potentially significant negative effects have been identified against this topic (arising from the cumulative effects of future development and increased demand in an increasingly water scarce region). These issues are likely to be compounded by the effects of climate change. However, legislation and policy for water companies, the Environment Agency, developers and local authorities along with the NPPF policy will continue to ensure water resources are considered and sustainably managed.
Air Quality	<p>Whilst air quality in the South East is relatively good there is growing pressures on air quality in particular locations, most notably due to the increase in traffic movements and congestion across the region and the potential for growth in air traffic.</p> <p>Revocation of the South East Regional Strategy will not affect this trend.</p>
Climate Change (including greenhouse gas emissions, predicted effects of climate change and the ability to adapt)	<p>The South East could be substantially affected by the effects of climate change (including increased frequency and severity of flood and storm events). The Environment Agency forecast that sea levels could rise by 37 - 93 cm in some areas by 2080.</p> <p>Carbon emissions from new development and associated increases in traffic will contribute to the regions emissions; however, this has been on a declining trend (decreasing from 66.7million tonnes of carbon dioxide (by end user) to 58.1 million tonnes between 2005 and 2009. Given the range of statutory and policy commitments, along with the NPPF's policy for LPAs to support the move towards a low carbon economy (paragraph 94) and increase the supply of renewable energy (paragraphs 97-99), revocation should continue this overall trend.</p> <p>One policy in the South East Plan (T9) related to airport development and was assessed as having a significant effect on the climate change topic. Revocation of the South East Regional Strategy will not remove the demands for airport development, and the national policy will remain as set out in the 2003 Aviation White Paper until superseded. Similarly, revocation of the Regional Strategy will not affect the national policy ambition to move towards a low carbon economy and the national measures put in place to realise this ambition.</p>
Waste Management and Minerals	<p>If the current levels of waste going to landfill continue then the existing available capacity is estimated to be sufficient for a further 7 years. However, the South East does have over 2.8 million tonnes (per annum) of residual waste treatment capacity either 'operating' or 'under construction. In addition, planning consent has been granted to over 1.3 million tonnes of new incineration, gasification and Waste Incineration Directive compliant biomass capacity. Whilst these may help address infrastructure needs in the short and medium term, a growing population, a current higher than average proportion of waste requiring residual treatment and a reduction in the quantities of waste going to landfill will require the provision of further waste management infrastructure in the long term.</p> <p>Revocation of the South East Regional Strategy will not affect waste management in the region or the provision of future waste infrastructure to meet changing regional needs. The combination of European Directives (notably the Waste Framework Directive and Landfill Directive), Government policy (the 2007 Government Waste Management Strategy and the review of waste policy) and waste planning policy (PPS10) will ensure that waste management is undertaken in a manner consistent with the waste management hierarchy, increasing resource efficiency and reducing waste requiring disposal in landfill (consistent with the Landfill Directive target that local authorities reduce the amount of biodegradable municipal waste (BMW) that they send to landfill to 35% of the 1995 value by 2020.</p> <p>Ensuring the timely provision of appropriate waste management facilities will have</p>

Assessment Topic	Summary Cumulative Effects
	significant benefits on human health while reducing the amount of waste imported into the region should reduce traffic levels and have benefits for air quality. The reduction in the amount of waste disposed of to landfill will reduce the risk of water contamination and emission of green house gases (i.e. methane).
Cultural Heritage (including architectural and archaeological heritage)	The South East cultural heritage is unlikely to be significantly affected by revocation. Existing legislation protecting listed buildings, scheduled monuments, conservation areas and registered parks and gardens remains in place, strengthened by the commitments in the NPPF.
Landscape and Townscape	The South East landscapes are unlikely to be affected by revocation. Existing legislation and policy protection will remain although there may be gradual change over time (due to factors such as climate change, change in agricultural practices and economic conditions).

Proposed Mitigation Measures

A number of mitigation measures have been identified in the detailed assessment in **Appendix D**.

Mitigation of the effects will be diverse and may need to be topic or sub-regionally specific. For example, in planning for water provision as part of new development, there may be greater reliance on Water Resource Management Plans, greater involvement of the Environment Agency and heightened co-operation between interested parties. Similarly, for issues such as biodiversity, continued co-operation and resources could be required to achieve similar commitments to that intended under the South East Plan.

Monitoring proposals

It is a requirement of the SEA Directive to establish how the significant effects of revoking the Regional Strategy will be monitored. As set out in ODPM Guidance⁷, *“it is not necessary to monitor everything or monitor an effect indefinitely. Instead, monitoring needs to be focused on significant sustainability effects.”*

CLG’s Business Plan⁸ under section 5 ‘Put Communities in charge of planning’ includes specific monitoring actions for the department regarding the Local Plan making progress by authorities and on compliance with the duty to co-operate. The results of this monitoring will provide clarity over the extent of any delay in adoption of revised Local Plans. When reviewing the environmental effects of the final decision on revocation, it is proposed that CLG will make periodic reference to the following metrics and

⁷ ODPM, September 2005: *Practical Guide to the Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive*

⁸ CLG May 2012, Business Plan 2012-2015

sources of information contained in Table NTS 4. Any resulting analysis of long term trends will be used to consider whether any further mitigation or intervention is needed for:

- The significant effects identified in the assessment that may give rise to irreversible damage where it is appropriate to implement relevant mitigating measures before such damage is caused; and
- Uncertain effects where monitoring would enable preventative or mitigating measures to be undertaken.

Taking this into account, of the 12 topics considered in this SEA, it is proposed that monitoring should focus on the following:

Table NTS 4 Proposed Monitoring Indicators and Sources of Information

SEA Topics	Proposed Monitoring Indicators	Source(s) of Information
Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna	Annual (where information allows) trends in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Condition of designated sites • Threatened habitats and species • Populations of countryside birds • Surface water biological indicators 	Joint Nature Conservancy Committee (JNCC) report under Article 17 of the Habitats Directive (completed every 6 years) on the conservation status of protected habitats JNCC http://www.jncc.gov.uk/page-4241 http://jncc.defra.gov.uk/page-4239 http://jncc.defra.gov.uk/page-4238 http://jncc.defra.gov.uk/page-4235 http://www.sssi.naturalengland.org.uk/Special/sssi/report.cfm?category=R,RF Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra) http://www.defra.gov.uk/statistics/environment/inland-water/ The Environment Agency (EA) are responsible for monitoring water quality under the Water Framework Directive
Population	Annual (where information allows) trends in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employment Information • Population • Housing and additional net dwellings 	Office of National Statistics (ONS) reports, specifically Regional Trends and Regional Gross Value Added Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) statistics: Annual net additional dwellings, Housebuilding: permanent dwellings completed by tenure and region
Human Health	Annual (where information allows) trends in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Statistics – Long term illness, etc. 	ONS on health

SEA Topics	Proposed Monitoring Indicators	Source(s) of Information
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Crime • Deprivation • Access to and quality of the local environment 	Home Office, Crime Survey for England and Wales DCLG: Indices of Deprivation ONS (proposed measures of wellbeing)
Soil and Geology	Annual (where information allows) trends in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land use 	DCLG statistics
Water	Annual (where information allows) trends in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • % of catchments with good ecological status • Water resource availability • Per capita water consumption 	EA and Defra http://www.defra.gov.uk/statistics/environment/inland-water/ Southern Water, Thames Water, South East Water, Portsmouth Water, Veolia Water South East, Sutton and East Surrey Water
Air	Annual (where information allows) trends in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of AQMAs • Number of AQMAs where exceedances occurred. 	Defra Defra
Climatic factors	Annual (where information allows) trends in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emission of greenhouse gases • Number of properties at risk of flooding 	Department for Energy and Climate Change (DECC) Statistical Release: Local and regional CO2 emissions EA
Material Assets	Annual (where information allows) trends in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Volume of construction waste and proportions recycled • Volume of hazardous waste • Volume of controlled wastes and proportions recycled • Volume of minerals extracted 	EA EA EA South East Mineral Planning Authorities'
Cultural heritage, including architectural and archaeological heritage	Annual (where information allows) trends in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • % of heritage assets of different types that are at risk 	English Heritage 'Heritage at risk report'
Landscape and Townscape	Annual (where information allows) trends in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change in AONBs (area, threats and 	National Association of AONBs

SEA Topics	Proposed Monitoring Indicators	Source(s) of Information
	quality) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes in Conservation Areas • Percentage who are very or fairly satisfied with local area • Trend in number of vacant dwellings 	English Heritage (if 2003 survey repeated) ONS (proposed measures of wellbeing) DCLG http://www.communities.gov.uk/documents/housing/xls/1815794.xls

What were the challenges faced in completing this report?

A number of technical difficulties were incurred in carrying out the assessment. These reflect a number of factors, principally that undertaking an assessment of the effects of revocation is new and has not been undertaken before and that there are some uncertainties over future effects. The environmental effects of revoking the Regional Strategy will clearly be dependent on future decisions by local authorities, individually and collectively. The uncertainty arising from local decisions has been reflected as appropriate in the assessment of the individual policies in **Appendix D** and in the consideration in the topic chapters contained in **Appendix E**.

The next steps

This Environmental Report will be presented for consultation until 6 December 2012. Feedback received from consultees in relation to the SEA will be documented and considered in reviewing the proposals to revoke the regional strategies. A Post Adoption Statement will summarise how the SEA and the consultation responses have been taken into account and how environmental considerations have been integrated into the final decisions regarding the proposals to revoke the regional strategies.

Contents

1.	Introduction	1
1.1	The Plan to Revoke Regional Strategies	1
1.2	Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)	1
1.2.1	Applying SEA to the Revocation of the Regional Strategies	1
1.3	Purpose of this Report	3
1.4	Habitats Directive Assessment	4
1.5	Consultation and Stakeholder Engagement	4
1.5.1	Overview	4
1.5.2	Scoping Consultation	4
1.5.3	Public Consultation on the previous Environmental Reports	5
1.6	Structure of this Report	7
2.	The Plan to Revoke the Regional Strategies	11
2.1	Overview	11
2.2	Key Aspects of the Plan to Revoke the Regional Strategies	11
2.2.1	Partnership Working on Strategic Planning Issues	12
2.2.2	Duty to Co-operate	12
2.2.3	Local Development Orders (LDOs)	13
2.2.4	Local Enterprise Partnerships	13
2.2.5	Examples of Cross-Authority Working in the South East Region	14
2.3	Background and Description of the South East Regional Strategy to be Revoked	19
2.3.1	Legislative Background to Regional Strategies	19
2.3.2	The Development of the South East Plan (Regional Spatial Strategy)	20
2.3.3	The Content of the South East Plan	22
2.3.4	The Content of the South East Regional Economic Strategy	25
2.3.5	The Relationship Between the South East Plan and the Regional Economic Strategy	26
2.3.6	Structure Plans	26
2.3.7	Local Plans	27
2.4	Reasonable Alternatives to the Plan to Revoke the Regional Strategies	28
2.4.1	Retention	29
2.4.2	Partial Revocation of the South East Regional Strategy	31
2.5	Summary	33

3.	SEA Methodology	35
3.1	Overview	35
3.2	Scope of the Assessment	37
3.2.1	Environmental Categories Included in the Scope of the Assessment	37
3.2.2	Geographic Scope of the Assessment	38
3.2.3	Short, Medium and Long-Term Timescales	39
3.3	Context and Baseline	40
3.3.1	Review of Plans and Programmes	40
3.3.2	Collecting Baseline Evidence	40
3.3.3	Presenting the Context and Baseline Information	40
3.4	Approach to Assessing the Effects	41
3.4.1	Prediction and Evaluation of Effects	41
3.4.2	Determining Significance	43
3.4.3	Specific Issues Considered When Assessing the Effects of the Plan to Revoke the Regional Strategies	44
3.4.4	Secondary, Cumulative and Synergistic Effects Assessment	46
3.4.5	Assumptions used in the Assessment	46
3.5	Technical Difficulties	48
3.5.1	Assessing the Effects of Revocation is a New Requirement	48
3.5.2	Ensuring Consistency	48
3.5.3	Uncertainty and Future Effects	49
4.	Assessment of Effects of Revoking the South East Regional Strategy and the Reasonable Alternatives	51
4.1	Overview	51
4.2	Effects of Revoking the South East Regional Strategy	51
4.2.1	Likely Significant Effects	85
4.2.2	Other Effects	108
4.2.3	Proposed Mitigation Measures	108
4.3	Effects of Retention of the South East Regional Strategy	109
4.3.1	Likely Significant Effects	143
4.3.2	Revoking all the Quantified and Spatially Specific Policies	156
4.3.3	Retaining all the Quantified and Spatially Specific Policies	161
4.3.4	Retention of Policies, the Revocation of which may lead to likely Significant Negative Environmental Effects	168
4.4	Secondary, Cumulative and Synergistic Effects	169
4.5	In summary	175

5.	Conclusions and Key Findings	177
5.1	What are the Environmental Effects of Revocation of the South East Regional Strategy?	177
5.2	Proposals for Monitoring	179
5.3	Quality Assurance	183
5.4	Next Steps	186

Table 1.1	Summary of consultation responses	6
Table 1.2	SEA Directive Requirements and where they are covered in the Environmental Report	8
Table 2.1	South East Plan preparation	21
Table 3.1	The SEA process and key steps undertaken during the environmental assessment of the proposed revocation of the regional strategies	35
Table 3.2	Categories of Effects Considered by the SEA of the plan to revoke the regional strategies	38
Table 3.3	High Level Assessment Matrix	42
Table 3.4	Illustrative Guidance for the Assessment of Significance for Biodiversity and Nature Conservation	43
Table 3.5	Definitions of Secondary, Cumulative and Synergistic Effects	46
Table 4.1	Summary of the Effects of Revoking the South East Regional Strategy (with reference to the South East Plan policies)	52
Table 4.2	Summary of the Effects of Retention of the South East Regional Strategy (with reference to the South East Plan policies)	110
Table 4.3	Summary of the Effects of Revoking all the Quantified and Spatially Specific Policies	156
Table 4.4	Summary of the Effects of Retaining all the Quantified and Spatially Specific Policies	162
Table 4.5	Cumulative Effects of the Plan to Revoke the South East Regional Strategy	169
Table 5.1	Potential Environmental Monitoring Indicators	181
Table 5.2	Quality Assurance	183
Appendix A	Regional Strategy Policies	
Appendix B	Saved Structure Plan Policies	
Appendix C	Review of Relevant Local Plans and Policies	
Appendix D	Assessment of Revocation and Retention of Individual Regional Strategy Policies	
Appendix E	SEA Topic Information and Detailed Assessment of Significance	
Appendix F	Consultation Responses	
Appendix G	Pressures on European Designated Sites	
Appendix H	Mapping of Regional Economic Strategy and Regional Spatial Strategy	

1. Introduction

1.1 The Plan to Revoke Regional Strategies

The Government announced in the Coalition Agreement its intention to “*rapidly abolish regional spatial strategies and return decision-making powers on housing and planning to local councils*”. The objective was to make Local Plans, and where desired neighbourhood plans, the basis for local planning decisions.

The Localism Act 2011 repealed Part 5 of the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009, thereby removing the legal framework for the review of Regional Strategies or the adoption of new or revised Regional Strategies. It gave the Secretary of State powers to revoke in full or in part the existing strategies by order.

The Government’s proposal is to replace the eight regional strategies (comprising the relevant regional spatial and regional economic strategies) outside London with a more localist planning system. Together with incentives such as the New Homes Bonus it aims to encourage local authorities and communities to realise their aspirations for housing and economic growth.

1.2 Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)

SEA became a statutory requirement following the adoption of European Union Directive 2001/42/EC on the assessment of the effects of certain plans and programmes on the environment. This was transposed into UK legislation on the 20 July 2004 as Statutory Instrument No.1633 - The Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 (SI2004/1633). The objective of SEA, as defined in Directive 2001/42/EC is:

‘To provide for a high level of protection of the environment and to contribute to the integration of environmental considerations into the preparation and adoption of plans and programmes with a view to contributing to sustainable development’.

Throughout the course of the development of a plan or programme, the SEA should seek to identify, describe and evaluate the likely significant effects on the environment of implementing the plan or programme and to propose measures to avoid, manage or mitigate any significant adverse effects and to enhance any beneficial effects.

1.2.1 Applying SEA to the Revocation of the Regional Strategies

Regional strategies are plans for the purpose of the European Directive 2001/42/EC because they are land use plans, are required by legislative, regulatory or administrative provisions and set the framework for future development consent of projects listed in Annexes I and II of the European Directive on environmental impact assessment. They are also subject to an appraisal of sustainability under the

Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. Both requirements were met in a single process called sustainability appraisal, as set out in guidance issued by the then Office of the Deputy Prime Minister in 2005.

As part of its stated commitment to protecting the environment, the Government decided to carry out an environmental assessment of the revocation of the existing Regional Strategies, on a voluntary basis. These assessments were prepared to be compliant with the procedure set out in the Strategic Environmental Directive. A 12 week consultation on the Environmental Reports of these assessments commenced on 20 October 2011 and ended on 20 January 2012.

Since the start of the consultation on the assessments there have been a number of developments that are relevant to assessing the likely significant environmental effects of the proposal to revoke the regional strategies. These are:

- the **National Planning Policy Framework** was published in March 2012. This sets out the government's planning policies for England and provides a framework within which local communities can produce their own distinctive local and neighbourhood plans reflective of the needs and priorities of their communities. It includes Government's expectations for planning strategically across local boundaries and within that the role of the planning system in protecting the environment;
- the **planning policy for Traveller sites** was published in March 2012 (to be read in conjunction with the NPPF);
- the provisions which create a **new duty to co-operate** were commenced when the Localism Act received Royal Assent on the 15th November 2011. They require local planning authorities to work collaboratively to ensure that strategic priorities across local boundaries are properly co-ordinated and clearly reflected in Local Plans.

Additionally, the Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU) gave judgment in March on the applicability of the SEA Directive to a procedure for the total or partial revocation of a land use plan.⁹ It held that such a procedure in principle falls within the scope of the Directive and is subject to the rules relating to the assessment of effects on the environment as laid down by the Directive.

The public consultation on the Environmental Reports generated many helpful and informative responses. Some of these provided additional information and suggested other analysis to help improve the assessments. The Government has therefore decided to use the additional information gained through the public consultation process, as well as the developments in policy and CJEU jurisprudence, to update and build on the earlier assessments. Details of this additional analysis are given in **Section 3.1**. This Environmental Report reflects this decision and, in line with the requirements of the SEA Directive, is subject to consultation. As this is further to the consultation in 2011 on the environmental assessments, the Government considers it reasonable for the consultation period for this subsequent consultation to run for eight weeks.

⁹ The judgment in Case C-567/10 *Inter-Environnement Bruxelles ASBL v Région de Bruxelles-Capitale*

The assessment in this Environmental Report can be considered as stand-alone and has been intentionally written to provide sufficient information for consultees to consider whether the likely significant environmental effects have been identified of the plan to revoke the Regional Strategy (and reasonable alternatives) without recourse to the previous Environmental Report. Any reader who has also read the previous Environmental Report should note that, insofar as there is any difference between the two documents, this Environmental Report is to be preferred.

All responses to this consultation will be given careful consideration alongside those received in response to the earlier consultation. The Government would particularly welcome responses on:

- whether there is any additional information that should be contained with the baseline or review of plans and programmes;
- whether the likely significant effects on the environment from revoking the Regional Strategy for the South East¹⁰ have been identified, described and assessed;
- whether the likely significant effects on the environment from considering the reasonable alternatives to revoking the Regional Strategy for the South East have been identified, described and assessed; and,
- the arrangements for monitoring.

1.3 Purpose of this Report

The purpose of this Environmental Report is to:

- present relevant environmental baseline information, including a review of plans and programmes;
- identify, describe and assess the likely significant environmental effects associated with the plan to revoke the regional strategies and reasonable alternatives;
- propose measures to avoid, reduce and/or offset any potentially significant adverse effects and, where appropriate, to enhance any potential positive effects from the plan;
- outline and describe the measures envisaged for monitoring any significant effects identified by the Environmental Report; and
- demonstrate that the plan to revoke the regional strategies has been developed in a manner consistent with the requirements of the SEA Regulations.

¹⁰ For the purposes of this Environmental Report the Regional Strategy means the Regional Spatial Strategy for the South East of England, and the Regional Economic Strategy for the South East

1.4 Habitats Directive Assessment

The Habitats Directive prohibits the adoption of plans or projects which have an adverse effect on the integrity of European sites unless there are no alternative solutions and the plan or project must be adopted for imperative reasons of overriding public interest.

The revocation of Regional Strategies does not affect the legal requirement set out in the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 that a competent authority, such as a local planning authority, in exercising any of their functions must have regard to the requirements of the Habitats Directive (Regulation 9). Part 6 of the Regulations also contains provisions which require the assessment of implications for European sites of any plan or project, which is likely to have a significant effect on it, before it proceeds in accordance with the Habitats Directive.

Where a competent authority other than the Secretary of State proposes to agree to a plan or project despite a negative assessment of the implications for a European site, they must notify the Secretary of State and they must not approve the plan or project. The Secretary of State may give directions to the competent authority in any such case prohibiting them from agreeing to the plan or project, either indefinitely or for a specified period (Regulation 62).

Given these safeguards, the Government's view is that the revocation of the regional strategies will therefore have no effects requiring assessment under the Habitats Directive.

1.5 Consultation and Stakeholder Engagement

1.5.1 Overview

As part of the environmental assessment of the revocation of the Regional Strategies, there has been consultation with the statutory consultation bodies on the scope and level of detail of the environmental reports, followed by a public consultation on the environmental reports on the effects of revoking each of the eight regional strategies.

Detailed responses to the environmental reports published in October 2011 were provided by consultees, and in the intervening period several key pieces of planning policy and legislation have been put in place. The Government has therefore decided to further consult on the environmental reports to allow the developments in policy and legislation, as well as the comments from respondents to be taken into account in the assessment of the likely significant environmental impacts of revocation of the Regional Strategies.

1.5.2 Scoping Consultation

The designated consultation bodies for strategic environmental assessment in England (the Environment Agency, English Heritage and Natural England) were consulted on the scope and level of detail to be included in the environmental reports in May 2011 for five weeks. The corresponding bodies for Scotland

and Wales were also consulted on the reports for regions on their boundaries. Their comments on individual regions have been taken into account in the environmental reports.

They were consulted on the method proposed to assess the likely significant environmental effects of revoking the Regional Strategies which was to take as a starting point the environmental assessment components of the sustainability appraisals carried out when the regional strategies were being prepared. For those regions which had not completed an up-to-date regional spatial strategy, use was also made of the more recent appraisals of the emerging strategy. The assessments followed the format set out in Annex I of the Directive, assessing impacts taking into account that Local Plans would set the framework for decisions on planning applications following the proposed revocation of the regional strategies and saved structure plan policies.

The approaches taken in the appraisals during preparation of the strategies differed to some extent between regions, and the assessments inevitably reflect this. However, as far as possible, a broad assessment was made of the component policies in the Regional Strategy, identifying their objectives and any particular issues from the sustainability appraisals, so as to identify the key environmental issues arising in assessing the likely effects of revocation. The assessment focused on those aspects of the plan which might be expected to lead to significant environmental effects.

The Environment Agency agreed that the scope and level of detail proposed for the analysis of environmental effects of revocation of the regional strategies was appropriate. Natural England recognised that the SEA was unusual in that it applied to the revocation, rather than the creation of a plan, and that therefore many of the usual aspects of SEA did not apply. English Heritage focussed their comments on the implications for heritage on the proposed revocation. Scottish Natural Heritage considered that the implications for strategic planning for green infrastructure and the interface with the marine environment should be considered.

In addition, since this is the first time an environmental assessment had been undertaken for the revocation (rather than the creation) of a plan, a draft of the previous Environmental Report was also sent to the statutory consultation bodies for their comments. Their comments on the previous draft reports are presented in summary in **Appendix F**, together with a response.

1.5.3 Public Consultation on the previous Environmental Reports

As part of the assessment of the revocation of the Regional Strategies a public consultation on the environmental reports on the effects of revoking each of the eight regional strategies was undertaken. Consultation on the environmental reports was announced in both Houses of Parliament through a Written Ministerial Statement and copies were sent by email to the statutory consultation bodies, the equivalent organisations in the devolved administrations, all local planning authorities and organisations thought to have an interest in the process. Copies of the reports were also published on the DCLG website. The consultation ran from 20 October 2011 to 20 January 2012.

A total of 103 responses were received, of which 24 contained comments that were common to all the reports. The remaining responses made specific comments on the environmental reports for particular regions. The Woodland Trust provided individual responses for each of the eight regions as did the

Scottish Government SEA Gateway (enclosing responses from Scottish Heritage, the Scottish Environmental Protection Agency and Scottish Natural Heritage). 15 responses dealt specifically with the environmental report for the South East - 6 responses were received from local planning authorities within the South East. A further 64 dealt solely with environmental reports for regions other than the South East. A summary of the consultation responses relevant to the South East environmental report is set out at **Appendix F**.

The main issues raised by respondents on the previous environmental reports, which were relevant to the South East, are grouped into 6 broad themes as follows:

- The Overall Approach to SEA;
- Assessment;
- Reliance on the NPPF;
- Policy Change;
- Reliance on the Duty to Co-operate;
- Individual Topics (covering data availability, Green Belt, the provision of gypsies and traveller pitches, housing allocations, heritage, minerals and waste management, biodiversity, renewable energy, transport, water, brownfield land, flooding, national parks and AONBs).

A high level summary of the issues raised and the response to those is set out below. A more detailed summary of the responses is presented in **Appendix F**.

Table 1.1 Summary of consultation responses

Issue	Summary of consultation responses to the previous Environmental Report	Response
The overall approach taken to SEA	The Environment Agency supported the broad approach to the analysis presented in the October 2011 environmental reports. Natural England recognised that the SEA was unusual in that it applied to the revocation, rather than the creation of a plan, and that therefore many of the usual aspects of SEA did not apply. English Heritage did not comment on the overall approach taken to the assessment, but had concerns about the potential impacts of the revocation of the South East Plan on heritage assets. Other respondents thought the analysis was undertaken too late in the plan making process and was not consistent with the requirements of the Directive	Section 1 of the Environmental Report sets out how the report meets the requirements of the SEA Directive. The impacts of revoking, retaining or partially revoking the South East Plan have been assessed in detail in the short, medium and long term against the 12 SEA topics. This includes Cultural Heritage – including architectural and archaeological heritage.
Assessment	The Statutory Consultees drew attention to more up to date data that could be included in the environmental report, for instance in River Basin Management Plans. Other respondents asked for a revised non-technical summary, for baseline data to be updated, for a more extensive analysis of the potential effects taking into account the content of Local Plans, the reconsideration of the likelihood of effects and, where significant effects were identified, to set out mitigation measures and give more	The Environmental Report updates the baseline evidence and provides a detailed analysis of the retention, partial revocation and revocation of the South East Plan in the short, medium and long term against all 12 SEA topics, taking into account the content of Local Plans. Mitigation measures are proposed where significant impacts are predicted. Arrangements for monitoring possible effects are set out and a non-

Issue	Summary of consultation responses to the previous Environmental Report	Response
	consideration to monitoring the impacts.	technical summary is provided.
Reliance on the NPPF	A number of respondents thought that it was difficult to assess the impact of revocation of the regional strategies before the National Planning Policy Framework was finalised.	The Government published the National Planning Policy Framework in March 2012. The analysis presented in the environmental report takes account of the policies set out in the Framework.
Policy Change	Several respondents thought that the revocation of the South East Plan would weaken certain policies, particularly the delivery of strategic policies.	The National Planning Policy Framework states that local planning authorities should set out the strategic priorities for the area in the Local Plan. This should include strategic policies to deliver homes and jobs and other development needed in the area, the provision of infrastructure, minerals and energy as well as the provision of health, security, community and cultural infrastructure and other local facilities; and climate change mitigation and adaptation, conservation and enhancement of the natural and historic environment, including landscape.
Reliance on the Duty to Co-operate	Some respondents thought that it was unlikely that the duty to co-operate would be able to provide a framework robust enough to enable strategic planning across local government boundaries at a sufficiently large scale.	The Government has introduced a new Duty to Co-operate and supporting regulations are now in place. Councils who cannot demonstrate that they have complied with the duty may fail the Local Plan independent examination. In addition the NPPF sets out the strategic priorities on which the Government expects joint working to be undertaken by authorities. The NPPF also sets out the requirements for sound Local Plans, including that plans are deliverable and based on effective joint working on cross boundary strategic priorities.
Individual Topics	Respondents raised a number of questions about individual topics. In particular, respondents thought that the impact of the revocation of the South East could impact on Green Belt, the provision of gypsy and traveller pitches, housing allocations, heritage, waste management, biodiversity, renewable energy, transport, water, brown field land, coast, flooding and managed woodland.	Individual policies for the planning of individual topics are described in the Environmental Report, drawing on the policies set out in the NPPF.

1.6 Structure of this Report

The assessment in this Environmental Report builds on the earlier assessment that was published for consultation in October 2011 and in particular includes further work in response to consultees' comments. This includes additional work to revise and update the baseline and contextual information used in the assessment, a necessary strengthening of the evidence base used as well as providing greater detail in the assessment itself. The approach that has been undertaken is set out in **Section 3** with the resulting information presented in **Appendices C, D, E, G and H**.

Table 1.2 sets out how the information requirements of Annex I of the SEA Directive are met in this Environmental Report. Reasonable alternatives are considered in Section 2 and the approach taken to the assessment is explained in Section 3. Section 4 summarises the likely significant effects of revoking the Regional Strategy along with reasonable alternatives, where identified, including any secondary,

cumulative or synergistic effects in the short, medium and long term. Section 5 provides a summary of the key findings along with proposed monitoring measures.

Table 1.2 SEA Directive Requirements and where they are covered in the Environmental Report

SEA Directive Requirements	Where covered in the Environmental Report?
Preparation of an environmental report in which the likely significant effects on the environment of implementing the plan or programme, and reasonable alternatives taking into account the objectives and geographical scope of the plan or programme, are identified, described and evaluated. The information to be given is (Art. 5 and Annex I):	
a) An outline of the contents, main objectives of the plan or programme, and relationship with other relevant plans and programmes	<p>Section 2 outlines the contents and main objectives of the plan.</p> <p>Section 3 presents a summary of the relationship with other relevant plans and programmes.</p> <p>Appendix E (the SEA topic information chapters) presents greater details the other plans and programmes that are relevant to the plan.</p>
b) The relevant aspects of the current state of the environment and the likely evolution thereof without implementation of the plan or programme	Appendix E (the SEA topic information chapters) outlines the relevant aspects of the current state of the environment and the likely evolution thereof without implementation of the plan or programme.
c) The environmental characteristics of areas likely to be significantly affected	Appendix E (the SEA topic information chapters) outlines the environmental characteristics of areas likely to be significantly affected.
d) Any existing environmental problems which are relevant to the plan or programme including, in particular, those relating to any areas of a particular environmental importance, such as areas designated pursuant to Directives 79/409/EEC and 92/43/EEC.	<p>Appendix E (the SEA topic information chapters) outlines any existing environmental problems.</p> <p>Appendix G outlines pressures on the existing European designatedconservation sites.</p>
e) The environmental protection, objectives, established at international, Community or national level, which are relevant to the plan or programme and the way those objectives and any environmental, considerations have been taken into account during its preparation	Appendix E (the SEA topic information chapters) outlines the relevant environmental protection objectives.
f) The likely significant effects on the environment, including on issues such as biodiversity, population, human health, fauna, flora, soil, water, air, climatic factors, material assets, cultural heritage including architectural and archaeological heritage, landscape and the interrelationship between the above factors. (Footnote: These effects should include secondary, cumulative, synergistic, short, medium and long-term permanent and temporary, positive and negative effects)	Appendix D, Appendix E and Section 4 outline the likely significant effects of the plan on the SEA issues.

SEA Directive Requirements	Where covered in the Environmental Report?
g) The measures envisaged to prevent, reduce and as fully as possible offset any significant adverse effects on the environment of implementing the plan or programme;	Appendix D, E and Section 4 outline the mitigation measures to prevent, reduce and as fully as possible offset any significant adverse effects of the plan.
h) An outline of the reasons for selecting the alternatives dealt with, and a description of how the assessment was undertaken including any difficulties (such as technical deficiencies or lack of know-how) encountered in compiling the required information;	Section 2 outlines the reasons for selecting the alternatives. Section 3 contains and a description of how the assessment was undertaken including any difficulties encountered.
i) A description of measures envisaged concerning monitoring in accordance with Art. 10;	Section 5 presents proposals for monitoring.
j) A non-technical summary of the information provided under the above headings	A non-technical summary is provided.

2. The Plan to Revoke the Regional Strategies

2.1 Overview

The Government announced in the Coalition Agreement its intention to “*rapidly abolish regional spatial strategies and return decision-making powers on housing and planning to local councils*”.¹¹ The objective was to make Local Plans, and where desired neighbourhood plans, the basis for local planning decisions. The Government’s proposal is to replace the eight regional strategies outside London with a more localist planning system, together with incentives such as the New Homes Bonus, to encourage local authorities and communities to realise their aspirations for housing and economic growth.

The Localism Act 2011 repealed Part 5 of the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009, thereby removing the legal framework for the review of regional strategies or the adoption of new or revised Regional Strategies, and gave the Secretary of State powers to revoke in full or in part the existing strategies by order.

The Regional Strategy under consideration for revocation comprises the South East Plan published by the then Secretary of State in 2009 and the Regional Economic Strategy published by the South East Development Agency finalised in 2006.

The individual policies from the South East Plan are presented in **Appendix A**. The whole Plan can be viewed at:

<http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20100528142817/http://www.gos.gov.uk/gose/>

The vision, ambitions, priorities and implementation priorities from the South East Regional Economic Strategy are presented in **Appendix H** and can be viewed at:

http://www.seeda.co.uk/publications/RES_2006_2016.pdf

This section sets out the key aspects of the plan to revoke the Regional Strategies, the implications for the South East region and the alternatives considered.

2.2 Key Aspects of the Plan to Revoke the Regional Strategies

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published on 27th March 2012. This followed extensive consultation during 2011 and replaces government planning policy and mineral policy guidance for England. It provides ‘*a framework within which local people and their accountable councils can produce their own distinctive local and neighbourhood plans, which reflect the needs and priorities of their communities.*’ Accordingly, local planning authorities and communities will continue to determine

¹¹ HM Government (2010), The Coalition: our programme for government

the quantum and location of development, albeit without the additional tier of regional direction. It does not contain waste planning policy, nationally significant infrastructure and Traveller policy, all of which are in separate policy documents but to be read in conjunction with the NPPF.

In the absence of the South East Regional Strategy, strategic and cross authority working will be delivered in the South East region through a variety of legislative and non-legislative means. This includes: the preparation of joint plans under the powers set out in the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (PCPA) 2004; through the new duty to co-operate under the powers set out in section 33A of the PCPA 2004 (as inserted by section 110 of the Localism Act); and through the establishment of non-legislative Local Enterprise Partnerships. This combination of measures aims to ensure that strategic planning operates effectively in the absence of the Regional Strategies. The sections below describe some of the partnership working that is already taking place across the South East region.

2.2.1 Partnership Working on Strategic Planning Issues

The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 provides for two or more councils to prepare joint Local Plans either through joint working under section 28¹² or through the establishment of a joint committee under section 29.

The NPPF sets out the Government's policy on strategic planning priorities, including the priorities on which authorities should work jointly. It makes clear that local planning authorities should work collaboratively to ensure that strategic priorities across local boundaries are properly coordinated and clearly reflected in Local Plans, resulting in a final position where plans are in place to provide the infrastructure necessary to support current and projected future levels of development.

2.2.2 Duty to Co-operate

Section 110 of the Localism Act 2011 inserts new section 33A into the PCPA 2004: the duty to co-operate. The duty is a new requirement¹³ on local authorities and other public bodies to work together constructively, actively and on an ongoing basis in relation to planning for strategic, cross-boundary matters in local and marine plans. Local Plans should include strategic policies on certain issues in line with the paragraph 156; however, the list in paragraph 156 is not exhaustive and it is for authorities to

¹² Where authorities work together under section 28 they have the option of establishing a joint committee under section 101 of the Local Government Act 1972. The authorities who are party to the joint committee must also comply with the requirements of the Local Authorities (Functions and Responsibilities) (England) Regulations 2000 (SI2000 No. 853) as amended by the Local Authorities (Functions and Responsibilities) (Amendment) (No.2) Regulations 2005 (SI2000 No. 714). This means that the joint committee cannot make decisions which are the responsibility of the Authority and not its executive, these must be taken by each constituent authority individually (they include decisions about the submission, adoption and withdrawal of local plans).

¹³ Through Regulations made under Section 33A of the PCPA 2004, which came into force on 6th April 2012, the duty to co-operate is extended to bodies such as the Environment Agency and Natural England.

determine whether there are additional strategic priorities in their areas and what strategic policies should cover.

The Localism Act requires authorities to demonstrate to an independent inspector how they have met the duty when their plans are submitted for examination in public. There is no prescribed way to meet the duty to co-operate, but compliance could for example be demonstrated by plans or policies prepared as part of a joint committee, informal strategies such as joint infrastructure and investment plans, or a memorandum of understanding which is presented as evidence of an agreed position. Failure to demonstrate compliance may mean that authorities may not pass the examination process.

Over time, it is expected that the duty to co-operate will become an integral part of the preparation of sound Local Plans that are effective and deliverable in relation to strategic cross boundary matters. Ongoing engagement and joint working, for example in the form of strategic infrastructure assessments done in consultation with others, memorandums of understanding and statements of common ground should become much more common place in the evidence base demonstrating how co-operation is securing delivery of objectively assessed plan needs.

2.2.3 Local Development Orders (LDOs)

The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 allows for the establishment of local development orders. These allow local authorities to extend permitted development rights for certain forms of development with regard to a relevant local development document. The establishment of an LDO potentially speeds up the planning process and provides greater certainty to developers. LDOs are being used extensively across enterprise zones as the main means by which to simplify the planning process. There are currently 23 LDOs in place across all enterprise zones and it is anticipated that there will be a further 19 LDOs in place this year. Where enterprise zones straddle more than one local authority area, local planning authorities have been working in partnership to create a planning framework for the zone and to simplify planning.

2.2.4 Local Enterprise Partnerships

The Government has facilitated the establishment of Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs). These are business led locally-owned partnerships between local authorities and businesses providing strategic leadership in driving private sector growth and job creation in their area. There are 39 LEPs now in place covering the whole of the country. These are based around a locally determined economic geography which makes sense to the local business community. All are playing a central role in determining local economic priorities and undertaking activities to drive economic growth and the creation of local jobs. Local Enterprise Partnerships are non-statutory and hold no statutory powers, but they are able to draw upon the powers held by their constituent public bodies.

LEPs and local planning authorities are able to work together to ensure economic activity and infrastructure delivery is co-ordinated across local authority boundaries. The duty to co-operate also requires local authorities and other public bodies to have regard to the activities of LEPs when they are

preparing strategic policies in their local and marine plans and undertaking related activities. This is intended to strengthen strategic planning on economic activity and infrastructure delivery.

The Government has allocated £730m of Growing Places Fund to all 39 LEPs. The Growing Places Fund will enable targeted investment in pieces of infrastructure which unlock viable schemes that are not able to proceed because capital constraints have reduced the flow of investment in the physical infrastructure which enables development (e.g. transport, utilities and flood defence). The fund should also be used to establish revolving funds.

Beyond these broad parameters LEPs are free to decide for themselves how their allocation is best invested and where.

2.2.5 Examples of Cross-Authority Working in the South East Region

Local Enterprise Partnerships in the South East

There are seven Local Enterprise Partnerships in the South East England region, covering Kent, East Sussex, West Sussex, Hampshire, Isle of Wight, Surrey, Oxfordshire, Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Bedfordshire. These are described in more detail below.

South East Local Enterprise Partnership (includes Ashford, Basildon, Braintree, Brentwood, Canterbury, Castle Point, Chelmsford, Colchester, Dartford, Dover, Eastbourne, Epping Forest, Gravesham, Harlow, Hastings, Lewes, Maidstone, Maldon, Medway, Rochford, Rother, Sevenoaks, Shepway, Southend on Sea, Swale, Tendring, Thanet, Thurrock, Tonbridge and Malling, Tunbridge Wells, Uttlesford, Wealden)

The South East Local Enterprise Partnership has four core objectives. These are to:

- secure the growth of the Thames Gateway;
- promote investment in its coastal communities ensuring that they are able to take advantage of future opportunities in tourism, low carbon technologies (including offshore wind, solar power and other renewable energy sources), creative and cultural industries, manufacturing, engineering and business services;
- strengthen its rural economy to ensure growth in tourism and high value added services as super fast broadband is rolled out across the LEP area; and
- strengthen the competitive advantage of strategic growth locations.

The South East LEP area is home to two Enterprise Zones at Discovery Park in Sandwich, Kent, and Enterprise West Essex in Harlow. Discovery Park, on the former Pfizer site, is aimed at attracting innovative businesses specialising in pharmaceuticals, cleantech, and research and development.

Coast to Capital (Adur, Arun, Brighton & Hove, Chichester, Crawley, Croydon, Horsham, Mid Sussex, Mole Valley, Reigate and Banstead, Tandridge, Worthing)

The Local Enterprise Partnership vision is to place international growth and entrepreneurship at its very heart. Partnership aims to transform business and economic performance so that its area can compete in any international marketplace. By 2035, the LEP aims to have developed an economy that is trade-led with a business community that is outward looking, investment-led and driven by the need to be innovative. It will have a skilled workforce delivering high value added and knowledge-driven products and services. Key objectives are to:

- increase the proportion of businesses which are internationalised from the level of 12% regular exporters by 1% per annum over the next 5 years;
- increase the level of entrepreneurship and business start-up rate to above the regional and England average;
- stimulate business growth, innovation, productivity and employment across a range of key sectors, bringing GVA and employment growth overall up to at least the regional average;
- generate the required investment to bring about major catalytic investments in key business locations;
- create a planning environment which supports business development and growth; and
- press for investment in transport infrastructure, business premises and other infrastructure.

Solent (East Hampshire, Eastleigh, Fareham, Gosport, Havant, Isle of Wight, New Forest, Portsmouth, Southampton, Test Valley, Winchester)

The Local Enterprise Partnership vision is to create an environment that will better facilitate economic growth and private sector investment in the Solent area. This will allow existing businesses to grow and become more profitable, greener and enable new businesses to form and prosper. Key objectives include:

- Develop a growth hub and strategic based clusters which can deliver export-led growth in high value employment. Capitalising on the sectoral strengths of the area as a leading location and growth hub for advanced manufacturing, engineering and transport and logistics.
- Strengthen the visitor economy reflecting the increasing importance of the sector to the Solent economy, capitalising on its reputation as an international gateway for business visitors and tourists as well as natural assets, accommodation, heritage and retail experience.
- Invest in skills to enable higher levels of employment and deliver a more balanced and sustainable pattern of growth to ensure that local residents are equipped to take up the jobs that are created.
- Realise the potential of its cities and supporting areas that are economically vulnerable in order to substantially reduce the high levels of welfare dependency and secure an additional 10,000 job opportunities for those not in work.

- Focus on infrastructure priorities including key land assets, transport and housing, flood risk mitigation and reliable high speed broadband.
- Establish a single inward investment and place marketing function building on the streamlining of services that has already taken place.
- Implement innovation in delivery and funding in order to secure a financially sustainable future and commit to a continued programme of public sector rationalisation and co-location of services across local authorities and with key partners such as Job Centre plus and the Environment Agency.

The HMS Daedalus site at Gosport has been designated as an Enterprise Zone with a focus on marine aviation and aerospace.

Enterprise M3 (Hampshire and Surrey encompassing: the districts of Basingstoke and Deane; East Hampshire; Elmbridge; Guildford; Hart; New Forest; Runnymede; Rushmoor; Spelthorne; Surrey Heath; Test Valley; Waverley; Winchester and Woking).

The Enterprise M3 Local Enterprise Partnership has the vision of being ‘One of the premier locations in the country for enterprise and economic growth, with an excellent environment and quality of life’. Key objectives include:

- grow the economy in an environmentally sustainable way, working to meet the needs of businesses from large multi-national companies to sole traders to new start ups;
- focus on creating jobs, improving infrastructure, increasing the skills of local people, attracting inward investment and tourism to the area;
- develop strong local supply chains and international exporting from local companies;
- develop a business plan that has financial support from all sectors by 2013. Using a diverse funding model including public, private and European funding, building on existing expertise in securing funding; and
- ensure that the area is a good place to live, with a strong and safe community. Where business can work with the healthcare providers, education institutions, the police and local authorities to develop the area as one cohesive organisation understanding the needs of everyone from the residents, the businesses and those people who are employed locally.

Thames Valley Berkshire (Districts of Newbury, Reading, Wokingham, Bracknell, Maidenhead and Slough)

The Local Enterprise Partnership involves representation from education, employment, SMEs, corporate enterprises, local authorities and the community sector. It aims to enable increased economic prosperity for the area by retaining existing businesses and attracting others. To achieve this it intends to ensure:

- a 'work-ready' skilled labour force;
- world-class support initiatives for local businesses including: innovation business services: business start-up mentoring and high growth business support;
- maximisation of the partnership between business and local authorities including help to deliver the infrastructure (business, transport, housing, digital and social) needed to support the economy and standard of living;
- a generously spirited community sector to look after its own and support those in need.

Oxford City Region (Cherwell, Oxford, South Oxfordshire, Vale of White Horse, West Oxfordshire)

The Local Enterprise Partnership supports key programmes in the following areas intended to help and further realise the economic dynamism of Oxfordshire:

- getting the county connected to fast broadband access and improvement to the mobile phone coverage;
- improving the skills of Oxfordshire's workforce and those people about to enter the workforce;
- increasing inward investment in Oxfordshire;
- developing the business support services for Oxfordshire's businesses;
- enabling improved access to finance; and
- improving infrastructure for growth and jobs.

The Oxfordshire Science Vale Enterprise Zone, based at Harwell, comprises two for the UK's leading science and innovation hubs: Harwell, Oxford, and Milton Park.

Buckinghamshire Thames Valley (Aylesbury Vale, Chiltern, South Buckinghamshire, Wycombe)

The Local Enterprise Partnership vision is to ensure Buckinghamshire plays its full part in realising the Government's Plan for Growth, through growing existing strengths in the sectors identified as the future drivers of prosperity; by delivering exceptional learning and skills outcomes; and by continuing to celebrate and embrace the area's position as the entrepreneurial heart of Britain. Key objectives are to:

- Provide business support through provision of a signposting service to Business Link and commissioning tailored private sector support identified by business need.
- Support 'Access to Finance' - lending to business unable to access finance through banks using the Buckinghamshire Investor Group (BIG).
- Support infrastructure programmes that stimulate growth including East West Rail, broadband, commercial and industrial development projects and transport projects.

- Lead on inward investment - working with UKTI, upgrading commercial properties and developing an intelligence bank for the county.
- Champion and support skills and employment through increasing apprenticeships and internships and undertaking workplace skills study.
- Encourage business engagement in housing and planning.

Other Partnership Working

In Sussex and Surrey, **the Gatwick Diamond** has been established as a 'business led' partnership, originally intended to support economic growth in the areas covered by Crawley, Mid Sussex, Horsham in West Sussex, and Reigate & Banstead, Mole Valley and Tandridge in Surrey.

The Gatwick Diamond has helped authorities to manage cross-boundary planning priorities, which are being taken forward through a Local Strategic Statement and using tools like a Memorandum of Understanding. It is also part of the wider Coast to Capital LEP and links are beginning to be made between the Gatwick Diamond partnership and the LEP.

The Partnership for Urban South Hampshire (PUSH) was originally established to support and promote economic-led growth in the South Hampshire area. It has in place a strong governance structure to manage a wide range of strategic planning and economic issues and has been responsible for a significant amount of joint evidence to support Local Plan-making. The spatial strategy is currently being updated to take account of a revised economic strategy and to manage a shortfall in housing provision.

Environmental Partnerships in the South East

Local Nature Partnerships (LNPs) are a key initiative in the Natural Environment Paper and their importance is identified in the National Planning Policy Framework. The ambition for LNPs is that they will help their local area to manage the natural environment as a system and to embed its value in local decisions for the benefit of nature, people and the economy. To do this effectively they will need to be self-sustaining strategic partnerships of a broad range of local organisations, businesses and people with the credibility to work with and influence other local strategic decision makers. Applications to become a Government-recognised LNP opened on 2 April 2012 and closed on 6 June 2012. Fifty applications were made, including several in the South East Region. The Government published a list of the first partnerships to gain LNP status in July 2012.

The Natural Environment White Paper committed Government to assist partnerships of local authorities, local communities and landowners, the private sector and conservation organisations to establish new **Nature Improvement Areas (NIAs)**, based on a local assessment of opportunities for restoring and connecting nature on a significant scale. The importance of NIAs is recognised in the National Planning Policy Framework and local authorities will be able to support them in their Local Plans. In February 2012 the Government announced 12 initial NIAs in England that will receive government funding. Two

are located in the South East -the South Downs which will be administered by the South Downs Way Ahead Partnership, and the Greater Thames Marshes (Kent)."

In conjunction with the Environment Agency, Crawley Borough Council, Mid Sussex District Council, Horsham District Council, and Reigate and Banstead Borough agreed to undertake a collaborative cross boundary Water Cycle Study (WCS). A WCS provides strategic evidence and recommendations on water and waste water infrastructure and environmental capacity to inform local planning policy.

2.3 **Background and Description of the South East Regional Strategy to be Revoked**

2.3.1 **Legislative Background to Regional Strategies**

The Town and Country Planning Act 1947 required local planning authorities to draft Local Plans setting out policies for the development and use of land. Prior to the Town and Country Planning Act 1968, which introduced county structure plans to co-ordinate and guide Local Plans, the focus of strategic planning was mainly at the regional level. A number of regional plans were prepared from the 1940s onwards and there were initiatives to link land use planning and regional economic development.

In 1988 regional planning guidance was introduced to provide a strategic framework for county structure plans. Regional planning guidance was not statutory and therefore structure plans and Local Plans were not required to be in conformity with it.

The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 introduced a two tier statutory spatial development plan system consisting of regional spatial strategies and local development frameworks. The counties retained statutory planning powers for minerals and waste plans, but county structure plans were abolished.

Initially, the regional spatial strategy (RSS) for each region consisted of existing regional planning guidance. These were then reviewed, leading in most cases to publication of updated strategies, though only parts of the West Midlands strategy were reviewed, and the review of the South West Plan was never completed. In revising their RSS, regional planning bodies were required to have regard to the regional economic strategy (RES) for the region.

Regional economic strategies (RES) were introduced by the Regional Development Agencies Act 1998. Until 1 April 2010, each regional development agency (RDA) was required to formulate and keep under review, a strategy in relation to its purposes, and have regard to the strategy in exercising its functions. The purpose of RDAs included furthering the economic development and the regeneration of its area, promoting business efficiency and investment and contributing to the achievement of sustainable development where it is relevant to its area to do so.

The Local Democracy Economic Development and Construction Act 2009 introduced regional strategies (RS). These came into existence on 1 April 2010 for the eight English regions outside London. The intent was that each RS would initially consist of the existing RSS and the RES for the region but for the

responsible authority in each region to bring forward a revised RS. However, no revised RS were adopted so each RS continues to consist of the existing RSS and the RES.

The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 was amended so that local development documents were required to be in general conformity with the RS and the RS became part of the statutory development plan for the purposes of determining planning applications. For the purposes of the development plan however, the RS for a region consists of only the existing RSS and not the RES. This was originally intended to be for an interim period prior to adoption of a revised RS.

The Localism Act 2011 made significant changes to the 2009 Act repealing the requirement for there to be a RS in each region outside London and confirming that the RS for the purposes of the development plan includes only the existing RSS.

2.3.2 The Development of the South East Plan (Regional Spatial Strategy)

The South East Plan superseded the former regional planning guidance for the South East (known as RPG9), together with its subsequently amended chapters comprising:

- Chapter 9: Regional Transport Strategy;
- Chapter 10 (part): Energy Efficiency;
- Chapter 10 (part): Waste;
- Chapter 11: Minerals;
- Chapter 12: Ashford Growth Area;
- Chapter 14: Tourism and Related Sport and Recreation;
- Milton Keynes & South Midlands Sub-Regional Growth Strategy.

Between 2003 and 2006, work was undertaken to develop a revised Regional Spatial Strategy by the South East regional assembly and a draft was submitted to the Secretary of State in March 2006 (the 'submission draft'). The submission draft was amended through the Secretary of State's 'proposed changes' in July 2008 which responded to the recommendations of the panel which conducted an examination in public of the submission draft of the strategy between November 2006 and March 2007, and as a consequence of considering the consultation responses to those proposed changes.

Preparation of the South East Plan was informed by sustainability appraisal at both the submission draft and proposed changes stages, incorporating strategic environmental assessment. The Secretary of State's proposed changes were also assessed against the requirements of the European Habitats Directive.

A summary of the South East Plan preparation process is provided in **Table 2.1** below.

Table 2.1 South East Plan preparation

Date	Plan Stage	Sustainability Appraisal	Habitats assessments
2003-2006	Draft Regional Spatial Strategy prepared by the South East England Regional Assembly	Sustainability Appraisal of Draft Regional Spatial Strategy	
March 2006	Publication of Draft Regional Spatial Strategy	Publication of Sustainability Appraisal of Draft Regional Spatial Strategy	
May-Oct 2006			Habitats Regulation Assessment/ Appropriate Assessment of Draft Regional Spatial Strategy
Nov 2006 – March 2007	Examination in Public		
August 2007	Publication of Panel Report		
Sept 2007 – July 2008	Proposed Changes prepared by the Government Office for the South East	Sustainability Appraisal and Habitats Regulation Assessment/ Appropriate Assessment of Proposed Changes	
July 2008	Publication of Proposed Changes	Publication of Sustainability Appraisal and Habitats Regulation Assessment/ Appropriate Assessment of Proposed Changes	
July – Oct 2008	Consultation on Proposed Changes and the Sustainability Appraisal and Habitats Regulation Assessment/ Appropriate Assessment report		
Nov 2008 – April 2009	Final Revisions and Final South East Plan prepared by Government Office for the South East	Sustainability Appraisal and Habitats Regulation Assessment/ Appropriate Assessment of Final Revisions and Final South East Plan	
May 2009	Publication of Final South East Plan	Publication of Sustainability Appraisal and Habitats Regulation Assessment/ Appropriate Assessment of Final Revisions and Final South East Plan	

The Plan was issued by the Secretary of State in May 2009. Six legal challenges to the South East Plan were received within the statutory six week period allowed for such challenges:

- one of the challenges related to Policy H2 bullet point (i) which refers to how Growth Points and eco-towns should be assessed in the South East Plan;
- one related to the policy for a selective review of the Green Belt to the north east of Guildford; and
- four related to the policy for a selective review of the Green Belt to the south of Oxford and the creation of a strategic development area (SDA) to accommodate an urban extension of 4,000 dwellings.

The challenge related to bullet point (i) of Policy H2 was conceded and bullet point (i) was deleted from the Plan.

In regard to the policy for a selective review of the Green Belt to the north east of Guildford, the case was settled by a Sealed Consent Order which directed that the following parts of the Plan were remitted to the Secretary of State to be treated as not having been approved or adopted:

- Policy SP5 in so far as it requires a selective reviews of the Green Belt boundaries of Guildford Borough;
- Policy H1b in so far as it specifies a particular housing requirement for Guildford Borough;
- Policy LF3 in so far as it specifies a particular housing requirement for Guildford Borough;
- Policy LF5 in so far as it identifies an urban extension to the north-east of Guildford.

In consequence of the above deletions, the regional and sub-regional housing totals in policy tables H1a, H1b and LF3 are no longer the sums of the district level figures listed.

In regard to the policy for a selective review of the Green Belt to the south of Oxford, the four challenges were conceded on the basis that the Sustainability Appraisal failed to take into account reasonable alternatives, but the precise form of relief, at that time, was not agreed. Two of the challenges were subsequently withdrawn. The terms of relief in respect of the remaining two challenges is yet to be agreed.

Following publication of the South East Plan in May 2009, reviews of two policies continued until May 2010, when work stopped. The first review concerned revision to Policy M3 which sets out the amount of primary aggregates (sand, gravel and crushed rock) that each minerals planning authority (the county or unitary council) should provide for the period 2001 to 2016. The review extended the period covered by M3 from 2010 to 2026. An independent Panel of planning inspectors tested the soundness of the draft RSS policy at an examination in public between 6 and 8 October 2009. The Panel's report to the Secretary of State was published for information on 27 November 2009. In March 2010, the Government published its Proposed Changes to the Policy M3. No further work took place and the original version of Policy M3 was not replaced.

The second review concerned the provision of new pitches that each local authority should provide for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople in the South East. A new draft policy (H7) was proposed that required local planning authorities to make provision in Local Development Documents to deliver 1,064 net additional permanent residential pitches for Gypsies and Travellers and 302 for Travelling Showpeople in the period 2006-2016. The draft policy was subject to consultation between June 2009 and September 2009 and an examination in public took place in February 2010. No further work occurred on the review of this policy after this date.

2.3.3 The Content of the South East Plan

The South East Plan sets a vision, objectives and core strategy for the period 2006 to 2026. In particular it seeks to achieve more sustainable development, protect the environment and combat climate change.

The overall Spatial Vision is described as follows:

A socially and economically strong, healthy and just South East that respects the limits of the global environment. Achieving this will require the active involvement of all individuals to deliver a society where everyone, including the most deprived, benefits from and contributes to a better quality of life. At the same time the impact of current high levels of resource use will be reduced and the quality of the environment will be maintained and enhanced.

A total of 16 core objectives support the vision. These are as follows:

- a sustainable balance between planning for economic, environmental and social benefits will be sought, to help improve quality of life for everyone in the South East;
- economic growth and competitiveness in the region will be sustained, with Gross Value Added (GVA) in the region increased by 3% per annum over the period 2006-2016;
- new initiatives to tackle skills deficits will be promoted a closer alignment between jobs and homes growth will be pursued;
- economic and social disparities within the region will be reduced;
- a sufficient level of housing development will be delivered;
- a substantial increase in the supply of affordable housing will be pursued, through a package of measures to deliver this goal;
- adequate infrastructure will be provided in a way that keeps pace with development;
- key transport links will be improved, providing access for all, especially disadvantaged groups;
- health provision and access will be improved;
- spatial planning in the region will take into account the needs of an ageing population and its implications;
- crime and the fear of crime will be reduced;
- better natural resource management and efficiency will be pursued, leading to reductions in the consumption of water and energy and the production of waste;
- new development will be delivered in a manner which mitigates the effects of, and adapts to, climate change;

- the best of the region's historic, built and natural environment will be protected and where possible enhanced, both for its own sake and to underpin the social and economic development of the region;
- new development will be of high quality sustainable design and construction, and be an asset to the region.

The South East Plan seeks to address the different characteristics and issues arising from the economic and physical diversity within the region. The intention is to achieve '*sharper focus*', supporting the economic competitiveness of the region, while spreading the benefits more evenly. The Plan identifies 22 regional hubs which will be a focus for investment in: infrastructure; economic activity and regeneration; new market and affordable housing and major retail and employment development. The Plan also identifies seven strategic development areas (SDAs) located around the centres of the 'knowledge economy in the Golden Arc' together with further development in the surrounding towns. The prime focus for development in the South East is to be in urban areas. It requires local planning authorities to provide 654,000¹⁴ net additional homes over the period 2006 to 2026 and an indicative target of 480,000 jobs in the period to 2026.

The South East Plan contains a total of 179 policies covering:

- a 'core' Spatial Strategy with generic policies that provide a framework for sustainable development in the region, and that complement national planning policy statements;
- policies on economic development, housing, built environment and town centres, tourism, transport, environmental aspects, social and community infrastructure, waste and minerals; and
- more location-specific policies for ten identified sub-regions and for the area outside these sub-regions.

Also included is a framework for implementing, monitoring and reviewing the South East Plan. Further details of the individual policies are set out in **Appendix A**.

The South East Plan reflects the national policies on development at the time of its publication. It incorporates the Regional Transport Strategy (RTS) and also takes account of, and builds on, the Regional Economic Strategy (RES -see below for more details) produced by the South East England Development Agency and the Regional Sustainable Development Framework, which provides a high level statement of the regional vision for achieving sustainable development.

¹⁴ 8,440 additional dwellings allocated to Guildford were struck out following a successful High Court challenge; however, the total number of net additional dwellings in the South East Plan remained unchanged

2.3.4 The Content of the South East Regional Economic Strategy

The Regional Economic Strategy (RES) covers the period 2006 to 2016 and seeks to achieve global competitiveness for the region through smart growth and sustainable prosperity. It acknowledges the challenge to provide the framework and partnerships to invest in success and lift underperformance in a sustainable way. The strategy as developed with regional partners and was subject to a formal consultation and appraisal process.

The RES vision for the region is that:

By 2016 the South East will be a world class region achieving sustainable prosperity.

Informing this **vision** are **three values** which run through the strategy:

- **Building on excellence** for global competitiveness;
- **Investing in potential** to lift underperformance;
- **Safeguarding quality of life** as a competitive advantage

It also sets the following three headline interlinked objectives for the strategy, together with headline targets for monitoring progress against the vision:

- achieving **Global Competitiveness**;
- **Smart Growth** and spreading the benefits of competitiveness; and
- **Sustainable Prosperity**, ensuring that competitiveness is consistent with the principles of sustainable development.

Eight **transformational actions** are defined which are intended to have particular impact across the breadth of the Strategy:

- **100% Next Generation Broadband Coverage**: to improve business efficiency and transform the way people work and learn;
- **Science and Innovation Campuses**: to establish new world class research facilities in the South East;
- **Skills Escalator**: to ensure that people at all skill levels are continually equipped to progress in the labour market;
- **Regional Infrastructure Fund**: to harness new sources of funding for infrastructure investment;
- **Raising Economic Activity Rates**: by addressing barriers to employment and increasing incentives to work;

- **Global Leadership in Environmental Technologies:** to exploit the business opportunities created by reducing carbon emissions and waste generation;
- **Education-Led Regeneration:** to harness the catalytic effect of new Further and Higher Education facilities on releasing untapped potential;
- **Making the Most of 2012:** to ensure that the 2012 Olympic Games and Paralympic Games leave a positive and lasting legacy for the South East.

2.3.5 The Relationship Between the South East Plan and the Regional Economic Strategy

There is a strong and complementary relationship between the South East Plan and the South East RES:

- they share an understanding of the spatial economic differences within the region, particularly around the need to enhance the global competitiveness of 'high tech' industries while addressing underperformance in areas of social and economic deprivation;
- the South East Plan includes policies to support 'Smart Growth' and 'Global Competitiveness' which are core objectives of the RES;
- there are shared objectives in the two strategies covering housing, infrastructure and regeneration;
- both the RES and South East Plan have been prepared in accordance with the region's sustainable development priorities, and the underlying principles in the regional economic strategy are consistent with the Regional Sustainable Development Framework (RSDF).

2.3.6 Structure Plans

In 2007 the Government wrote to local authorities under the transitional provisions of Schedule 8 to the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 to advise them which policies from their existing structure plans would be saved after 27 September 2007. Policies were saved in the expectation that they would be replaced promptly by policies in the relevant regional spatial strategy, or development plan documents for the relevant local authorities. Section 109(5) of the Localism Act provides for the revocation of saved structure plan policies.

The 3 saved policies in the Oxfordshire Structure Plan 2016 were extended by the Secretary of State in September 2008 after the publication of the Proposed Changes to the draft South East Plan.

The policies are listed in **Appendix B**. The Government is proposing to retain policy H2 (Upper Heyford) until a revised plan is adopted by Cherwell District Council.

2.3.7 Local Plans

In relation to plan-making, development plan documents prepared by local authorities are required to be in general conformity with the Regional Strategy.

Regional spatial strategies¹⁵ form part of the statutory development plan under the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (PCPA) 2004, until such time as the regional strategies are revoked.

Local Development Plan Documents developed in accordance with the PCPA 2004 include Core Strategies, Area Action Plans and Site Allocation Plans. Core Strategies set out the spatial planning vision, principles and key planning policies for an area. This portfolio of documents is known collectively as the Local Development Framework. Nearly a third of the 68 local planning authorities in the South East have adopted development plan documents under the PCPA 2004.

The remaining 47 local planning authorities in the South East, who were yet to adopt a development plan document under the PCPA 2004 have Local Plans and saved structure plan policies, developed under the earlier requirements of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

On revocation of the Regional Strategy (and any saved structure plan policies), the statutory development plan would comprise any saved Local Plan policies and adopted development plan documents. The statutory development plan may in future include any adopted neighbourhood plans that are prepared under the powers brought forward by the Localism Act. Revocation does not affect the statutory duty on local authorities to keep under review the matters which may be expected to affect the development of their area or the planning of its development.

A list of Local Plans in the South East region and their current composition is included at **Appendix C**. There are a total of:

- 47 Local Plans adopted by May 2009;
- 21 Core Strategies adopted after May 2009, when the South East Plan was adopted;¹⁶
- 15 minerals and waste plans, of which 2 were adopted after May 2009.

¹⁵ By virtue of section 82(2) of the Local Democracy, Economic Development Act 2009 as amended by the Localism Act references to Regional Strategy in relation to the component of the development plan are to the regional spatial strategy that subsisted for that region immediately before 1 April 2010.

¹⁶ Local Plans adopted from around this time onwards will have been drafted either in parallel with preparation of the Regional Strategy or after the Regional Strategy was published, and so will be in general conformity with the Regional Strategy.

2.4 Reasonable Alternatives to the Plan to Revoke the Regional Strategies

Regional strategies set targets such as housing numbers for local authorities. In some areas this proved highly controversial, generated thousands of objections and is not consistent with the principles of localism. This Government believes that democratically elected local authorities working with their local people are better placed to assess and plan for the needs of their community, and make planning decisions, rather than unelected regional bodies. The Government therefore proposes revoking the South East Regional Strategy.

Consideration of the reasonable alternatives to a proposed policy or plan is a fundamental aspect of policy and planning development. Providing clear, reasoned justification for selection of a preferred planning policy following assessment of the alternatives is a pre-requisite for the preferred direction to gain wider and long term support. Recording the reasons for the selection of the preferred option can also aid any subsequent review, particularly if the assumptions that underpin any alternatives change over time.

In order to meet the requirements of the SEA Directive and the relevant UK transposing regulations, the Government is also required to present specific information concerning reasonable alternatives. Article 5 (1) of the SEA Directive 2001/42/EC requires that “*an environmental report shall be prepared in which the likely significant effects on the environment of implementing the plan or programme, **and reasonable alternatives** taking into account the objectives and the geographical scope of the plan or programme, are identified, described and evaluated*”. Information to be provided includes “*an outline of the reasons for selecting the alternatives dealt with*” (Annex I (h)).

The European Commission guidance on the SEA Directive discusses possible interpretations of handling ‘reasonable alternatives’ as required by Article 5(1). It states that “*The alternatives chosen should be realistic. Part of the reason for studying alternatives is to find ways of reducing or avoiding the significant adverse effects of the proposed plan or programme*”.

On this basis, the starting point for identifying alternatives to the revocation of the South East Regional Strategy has been the powers of the Secretary of State in regard to the regional strategies. As previously stated, the Secretary of State has the power to partially revoke or fully revoke the Regional Strategies by Order.

The previous Environmental Report on the proposed revocation of the South East Regional Strategy, published for consultation in October 2011, suggested two alternatives – either to revoke the South East Regional Strategy entirely, or to retain it. Responses to the consultation suggested a number of other alternatives (see **Appendix F**) including partial revocation. These were:

- reviewing the Regional Strategies;
- revoking the Regional Strategies but saving key policies;

- the retention of the Regional Strategy system with regional groupings of local authorities responsible for drafting them and adoption by the Secretary of State;
- maintaining the plans and revising certain policies in order to make the plans more acceptable, as well as the possibility of local authorities producing joint development plans to cover specific issues;
- revoking certain chapters or parts of the strategies and introducing transitional arrangements.

A number of alternatives are therefore considered as follows:

- **Retention**
 - Retention of the South East Regional Strategy but not updating it in the future; or
 - Retention of the South East Regional Strategy and updating and maintaining it in the future. This would be done either by the Secretary of State; or regional groupings of local authorities followed by adoption by the Secretary of State; or by groups of local authorities working together to produce joint development plans to cover specific issues; or
- **Partial revocation of the South East Regional Strategy either by**
 - Revoking all the quantified and spatially specific policies (for instance where a quantum of development, land for development or amounts of minerals to be extracted or waste disposal is allocated to a particular location in the region) and retaining for a transitional period the non spatial policies, ambitions and priorities; or
 - Retaining for a transitional period all the spatially specific policies (for instance where a quantum of development, land for development or amount of minerals to be extracted or waste disposal is allocated to a particular location in the region) and revoking the non spatial policies, ambitions and priorities; or
 - Retaining for a transitional period sub-regional policies and priorities and revoking the rest of the Regional Strategy; or
 - Retaining for a transitional period policies, ambitions and priorities, the revocation of which may lead to likely significant negative environmental effects; or
- **Revocation** of the entire South East Regional Strategy.

Each alternative is discussed below in regard to its reasonableness.

2.4.1 Retention

Retention of the South East Regional Strategy but not updating it in the future

This option would mean that the South East Regional Strategy was not revoked, that all the policies within the South East Plan would remain part of the development plan for the purposes of determining

planning applications and that Local Plans would continue to need to be in general conformity with the Regional Strategy, but that the strategy would not be updated in the future. It is assumed that the policies, ambitions and priorities would not be revoked when the existing lifetime of the Regional Strategy was reached.

Some policies in the South East Plan are potentially in conflict with the intent of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which sets the Government's planning policies for England and how these are to be applied e.g. H1 on housing allocations, RE3 on employment and land provision.

The NPPF must be taken into account in the preparation of local and neighbourhood plans, and is a material consideration in planning decisions. The NPPF intends to ensure that the Local Plan is at the heart of the plan-led system and in preparing Local Plans local authorities should plan to meet objectively assessed needs for housing and other forms of development which should include collaboration with other bodies where appropriate. Since Local Plans are required to be in general conformity with the Regional Strategy, and planning decisions should be in accordance with the development plan, which includes the South East Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise, this also adds potential conflict with the policies set out in the NPPF.

Since there is no statutory power available for the Secretary of State to update the South East Regional Strategy, over time the strategy would become increasingly out of date. Therefore it is expected that retention of the policies, ambitions and priorities in the South East Regional Strategy, without update, could gradually lead to a decline in the positive effects that the strategy aimed to deliver and potential conflicts with policies that local communities wish to pursue will increase. Nevertheless, since the retention of the South East Regional Strategy forms an alternative approach to strategic planning across the region **it is considered to be a reasonable alternative.**

Retention, maintenance and updating of the South East Regional Strategy

This option would mean that the South East Regional Strategy was not revoked, that the South East Plan would remain part of the development plan for the purposes of determining planning applications, that Local Plans would continue to need to be in general conformity with the Regional Strategy and that it would continue to be maintained and updated in the future. However, the Localism Act has removed the regional planning tier and revoked the power to update the existing regional strategies. This means that the Secretary of State does not have the statutory powers to maintain or update the South East Regional Strategy and therefore, **the amendment of the regional strategies by the Secretary of State is not considered to be a reasonable alternative because there is no power to do it.**

The 2004 Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act does provide for joint working by local authorities and county councils. In addition the Localism Act sets out the Duty to Co-operate, which requires local planning authorities to work together when preparing strategic cross boundary policies in their local and marine plans. This means that groups of local authorities can work together and formally adopt a statutory Local Plan covering their joint areas and could choose to work together to adopt and maintain a plan over the region. Whilst there is substantial evidence of local authorities already working at the regional scale on specific issues of responsibility and mutual benefit (such as waste management), it

seems highly unlikely that all local authorities within the region, irrespective of background, circumstance and political composition would work in unison to update the South East Regional Strategy, particularly where such a position would place them in conflict with national government policy. **In consequence, this is not considered to be a reasonable alternative.**

2.4.2 Partial Revocation of the South East Regional Strategy

Revocation of all the quantified and spatially specific policies

This option would mean that all quantified policies (such as for a renewable energy target) or policies that are spatially specific and which allocate a quantum of development or land for development to a particular location and/or local authority in the region (i.e. within the South East Plan policies for housing allocations; employment (both land and jobs), mineral allocations; waste disposal) would be revoked, but that the non spatial policies would be retained. This would leave the policies in place which would set out a spatial vision for the region as well as policies that encourage particular types of development or seek to protect environmental resources and services as well as seeking wider sustainability objectives. These policies would not be updated in the future as the Secretary of State no longer has the statutory powers to do this. These policies would therefore be retained for a transitional period to allow local authorities in the region to have time to update their plans. **This is considered to be a reasonable alternative.**

Revocation of all the non quantitative and spatially specific policies

This option for partial revocation of the South East Regional Strategy would mean that all quantitative targets (such as the one for renewable energy) or the spatially specific policies which allocate a quantum of development or land for development to a particular location and/or local authority in the region (i.e. housing allocations; employment land and/or jobs, mineral allocations; waste allocations) would be retained and the non-spatially specific policies, ambitions and priorities would be revoked (such as protection and enhancement of biodiversity, the historic environment, the quality of the built environment).

As set out above, the policies in the South East Regional Strategy that establish a quantum of development or land for development to a particular location and/or local authority in the South East region may result in some confusion with the intent of the National Planning Policy Framework which sets the Government's planning policies for England and how these are to be applied. Regard must be had to the NPPF in the preparation of local and neighbourhood plans, and the NPPF is a material consideration in planning decisions. The NPPF intends to ensure that the Local Plan is at the heart of the plan-led system and expects local authorities and communities to plan to meet objectively assessed needs for housing and other forms of development for their areas, and working collaboratively with other bodies where appropriate. Since Local Plans need to be in general conformity with the South East Regional Strategy, and planning decisions need to be made in line with the South East Plan this could create confusion and potential conflict in the planning system.

Nevertheless, the retention of the quantified policies or the spatially specific policies which allocate a quantum of development or land for development to a particular location and/or local authority in the region, provides an alternative approach to strategic planning, particularly where Local Plans are out of date, and do not contain up-to-date quantified policies such as for housing. These quantified policies could therefore be retained for a transitional period, to allow local authorities in the region to have updated their plans. **This is considered to be a reasonable alternative.**

Revoking all regional policies, ambitions and priorities and retaining all sub-regional policies, ambitions and priorities

This option for partial revocation would retain the sub-regional policies, ambitions and priorities and revoke the rest of the strategy. However, as for the option above which considered retention of policies that set out a quantum of development to be delivered in a broad location or within a local planning authority area, this is in conflict with the intent of the National Planning Policy Framework. Since Local Plans need to be in general conformity with the Regional Strategy, and planning decisions need to be in accordance with the RSS (as part of the development plan) unless material considerations indicate otherwise, this could create confusion and potential conflict in the planning system.

Furthermore, it is questionable whether the sub-regional policies would function correctly in the absence of regional scale policies such as on spatial planning (SP1 – SP5), environmental protection, water resources and the high level apportionment policies on housing due to the integrated nature of the South East Plan. In addition, over time the Regional Strategy policies are becoming increasingly out of date as the regional tier of planning has been removed and the regional strategies are not being kept up to date. **This is not therefore considered to be a reasonable alternative.**

Revoking all policies, ambitions and priorities except those where revocation would lead to significant negative environmental effects

The NPPF sets out national planning policies which support and protect the environment (for example: Green Belt land, meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change and those policies conserving and enhancing the natural and historic environment, including policies to minimise impacts on biodiversity and providing net gains in biodiversity).

This option for partial revocation of the South East Regional Strategy would mean that individual policies, ambitions and/or priorities would be retained if revoking them may lead to likely significant negative environmental effects once mitigating measures have been taken account.

This reasonable alternative would lead to the retention of individual policies in the Regional Strategy which are not likely to be in conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework, do not undermine the localist approach to plan making and decision making and, if removed, would result in a significant environmental impact taking account of mitigation. These policies could therefore be retained for a transitional period to allow local authorities in the region to have updated their plans. **This is considered to be a reasonable alternative.**

2.5 Summary

Following the application of the reasonableness test in compliance with Article 5(1) of the SEA Directive, the following have been taken forward for assessment within the SEA:

- **Revocation** of the entire South East Regional Strategy.
- **Retention** of the South East Regional Strategy but not updating it in the future.
- **Partial revocation of the South East Regional Strategy either by**
 - Revoking all the quantified and spatially specific policies (for instance where a quantum of development, land for development or amounts of minerals to be extracted or waste disposal is allocated to a particular location in the region) and retaining for a transitional period the non spatial policies, ambitions and priorities; or
 - Retaining for a transitional period all the spatially specific policies (for instance where a quantum of development, land for development or amounts of minerals to be extracted or waste disposal is allocated to a particular location in the region) and revoking the non spatial policies, ambitions and priorities; or
 - Retaining for a transitional period policies, ambitions and/or priorities, the revocation of which may lead to likely significant negative environmental effects.

Each alternative has been assessed using the approach outlined in **Section 3**. The results of the assessment are presented in **Section 4**, with the detailed assessment contained in **Appendix D** and **E**.

3. SEA Methodology

3.1 Overview

This section sets out how the SEA has been carried out. This includes the steps in the SEA process, when it was undertaken and by whom (**Section 3.1**), the scope of the assessment and the topics considered (**Section 3.2**), the baseline and contextual information used (**Section 3.3**) and the approach taken to completing the assessment (**Section 3.4**). Technical difficulties encountered during the assessment are also summarised (**Section 3.5**).

The approach to this assessment builds on the methodology employed in the Environmental Report published in October 2011. The steps that have been undertaken to-date and their relationship to the requirements of the SEA Directive are summarised in **Table 3.1**.

Table 3.1 The SEA process and key steps undertaken during the environmental assessment of the proposed revocation of the regional strategies

SEA process	Key steps in the environmental assessment of the revocation of the regional strategies
<p>Article 3 (1) requires that an environmental assessment shall be carried out for certain plans (as defined in Article 3 paragraphs 2-4) which are likely to have significant environmental effects.</p> <p>Member States are required to determine whether these plans are likely to have significant environmental effects either through case-by-case examination and/or by specifying types of plans in order to ensure that plans with likely significant effects on the environment are covered by the Directive (Article 3(5)).</p> <p>Member States must make their conclusions under Article 3(5), including the reasons for not requiring an environmental assessment, available to the public (Article 3(7)).</p>	<p>The Government announced its intention to carry out an environmental assessment of the revocation of the regional strategies in a Written Ministerial Statement on 5 April 2011. The requirements of Articles 3(5) and (7) did not therefore apply.</p>
<p>Article 5 (4) requires that 'designated environmental authorities' for strategic environmental assessment are consulted when deciding the scope and level of detail which must be included in the environmental reports.</p> <p>The Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 define these "Consultation Bodies" for plans that relate to England as the Countryside Agency and English Nature (now amalgamated to form Natural England), the Environment Agency and English Heritage.</p>	<p>The Consultation Bodies in England¹⁷ were consulted on the scope and level of detail of the Environmental Reports on 6 May 2011, and were given 5 weeks as required by regulations to respond. The equivalent bodies in the Devolved Administrations were also consulted.</p> <p>Their comments were used as the basis for deciding the scope and level of detail of the material included in the Environmental Reports. Consideration was also given to more detailed textual comments provided by the consultation bodies.</p>

¹⁷ The Environment Agency, English Heritage and Natural England

SEA process	Key steps in the environmental assessment of the revocation of the regional strategies
<p>Article 5 (1) states that where an environmental assessment is required under Article 3(1), an environmental report shall be prepared in which the likely significant effects on the environment of implementing the plan, and reasonable alternatives taking into account the objectives and the geographical scope of the plan, are identified, described and evaluated.</p> <p>The environmental report shall include the information that may reasonably be required taking into account current knowledge and methods of assessment, the contents and level of detail of the plan, its stage in the decision making process and the extent to which certain matters are more appropriately assessed at different levels in that process to avoid duplication.</p>	<p>An Environmental Report was prepared for each region. Each considered the likely significant effects of revoking the Regional Strategy within the context of wider reforms to the planning system. This included the publication of the NPPF, decentralising planning powers to local authorities, and introducing a Duty to Co-operate to support local authorities in both delivering for their local communities and addressing strategic cross-boundary issues.</p>
<p>Article 6 requires that the draft plan and the environmental report shall be made available to the designated consultation bodies and to the public.</p>	<p>The completed Environmental Reports were sent to the Consultation Bodies in England and the equivalent bodies in the devolved administrations and simultaneously published for public consultation on 20 October 2011. The consultation period ended on 20 January 2012. As the Environmental Reports dealt with the effects of the revocation and not the adoption of plans, there were no draft plans to consult on.</p>
<p>Article 7 sets out provisions for consulting on draft plans which are likely to have a significant effect on the environment in another member State.</p>	<p>The Government did not consult any other Member State. The revocation of the regional strategies was not considered likely to have a significant effect on the environment of any other Member State, and no other Member States indicated otherwise.</p>
<p>Article 8 states that the environmental report prepared pursuant to Article 6 and the results of any trans boundary consultations entered into pursuant to Article 7 shall be taken into account during the preparation of the plan and before its adoption or submission to the legislative procedure.</p>	<p>A total of 103 comments were received in response to the previous consultation. Annex F provides a summary of the responses that are relevant to the revocation of the Regional Strategy for the South East. Each response has been carefully considered and as appropriate informed this updated environmental assessment.</p>

As a result of considering the responses received, the changes made to the approach to this assessment have included:

- Providing additional contextual information for the assessment including the review of plans and programmes and updated baseline for each of the 12 SEA Directive Annex I(f) topics and presenting this in separate topic chapters.
- Providing additional information on the details of the plan to revoke the regional strategies and the reasonable alternatives to them, including reasons for the selection of some alternatives and the discontinuation of others.
- Providing additional information in the assessment of revocation and retention of each Regional Strategy policy explicitly against all 12 of the SEA Directive Annex I(f) topics.
- Identifying, characterising and assessing any likely significant effects of the plan and the reasonable alternatives, based on a common interpretation of what constitutes a significant effect for each topic and reflecting the possible timing effects.

- Providing additional information on likely secondary, cumulative and synergistic effects of the plan to revoke the regional strategies.
- Assessing the likely significant effects at a number of geographic levels (national, regional, sub-regional and local) depending on the content, intent and specificity of the individual policy.
- Providing further information that includes proposals to mitigate effects including more sub-regional information on an understanding of the duty to co-operate.
- Providing further information that includes proposals to monitor any significant effects.

This SEA of the plan to revoke the South East Regional Strategy was undertaken in 2012 by AMEC on behalf of DCLG.

3.2 Scope of the Assessment

The scope of this assessment reflects the potential environmental effects of revoking the regional strategies. **Section 3.2.1** sets out the core topics required for consideration by the SEA Directive and their interpretation for the purposes of the assessment. **Section 3.2.2** sets out the geographic scope of the SEA.

3.2.1 Environmental Categories Included in the Scope of the Assessment

The range of potential environmental effects under consideration has been informed primarily by the SEA Directive and Regulations, using published government guidance¹⁸. Annex I of the SEA Directive and Schedule 2 of the SEA Regulation requires that the assessment includes information on the “*likely significant effects on the environment, including on issues such as: biodiversity; population; human health; fauna; flora; soil; water; air; climatic factors; material assets; cultural heritage, including architectural and archaeological heritage; landscape; and the inter-relationship between the issues referred to*”. These environmental categories have been used throughout this report.

In the absence of detailed guidance on their content, a number of these environmental categories (e.g. population, human health and material assets) can be subject to varying interpretation. Within this report:

- ‘population’ includes information on demographics and generic social and socio-economic issues including accessibility issues;
- ‘human health’ includes information on mortality, illness and indices of perceived well-being;
- ‘material assets’ includes information on waste management and minerals.

¹⁸ Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (2005). A Practical Guide to the Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive.

Land use is not explicitly identified in the list of 12 SEA topics; however, for the purposes of this assessment and in particular given that these are assessments of strategies whose primary objectives include the determination of the location of development, it is included under the topic of soil. The soil topic has also been expanded to include consideration of geology.

Table 3.2 shows how the categories in this report reflect those in the SEA Regulations.

Table 3.2 Categories of Effects Considered by the SEA of the plan to revoke the regional strategies

Categories in the SEA Regulations	Categories used in the SEA of the revocation of regional strategies
Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna	Biodiversity and Nature Conservation (which includes flora and fauna, and the functioning of ecosystems)
Population	Population (including socio-economic effects and accessibility)
Human Health	Human Health
Soil	Soil and Geology (including land use, important geological sites, and the contamination of soils)
Water	Water Quality and Resources (including inland surface freshwater and groundwater resources, and inland surface freshwater, groundwater, estuarine, coastal and marine water quality)
Air	Air Quality
Climatic factors	Climate Change (including greenhouse gas emissions, predicted effects of climate change such as flooding and the ability to adapt)
Material assets	Material Assets (including waste management and minerals)
Cultural heritage, including architectural and archaeological heritage	Cultural Heritage (including architectural and archaeological heritage)
Landscape	Landscape and Townscape

3.2.2 Geographic Scope of the Assessment

The SEA considers the effects of revocation, partial revocation or retention of the Regional Strategies. In so doing, it examines the effects of each alternative for each policy contained in each Regional Strategy. Consideration of these effects therefore occurs at a number of geographic levels, dependent on the content, intent and specificity of the individual policy. This is at one (or more) of the following levels:

- **the national level** – the cumulative assessment includes consideration of the effects of the plan to revoke all eight Regional Strategies across England. This draws together the effects of the individual regional assessments and provides a view at the broader geographic scale;
- **the regional level** – the assessment includes the consideration of the effects of the plan to revoke individual Regional Strategy policies that apply at a regional level e.g. policies that encourage an integrated approach to conserving and enhancing the landscape, natural environment and historic environment;

- **the sub-regional level** – the assessment includes consideration of the effects of the plan to revoke individual Regional Strategy policies that apply to an identified sub-region or area e.g. policies that seek to promote economic regeneration of a sub-region, recognised as having a specific identity or character;
- **the local level** – the assessment includes consideration of the effects of the plan to revoke Regional Strategy policies that will have a specific effect at a local planning authority level, or will affect a specific designated area or identified infrastructure project.

The range of effects considered by the assessment therefore span from the national to the local. To ensure comprehensive geographic coverage of the potential effects, contextual information has been collated at the appropriate levels; one at national level (England) and the other at the regional level that includes reference to specific local information and sites where relevant and appropriate to do so.

Notwithstanding this, the SEA is strategic, and does not assess the detailed local or site specific issues in the same degree of detail that would typically be required for an SEA of a Local Plan document (in line with Article 4(3) and 5(2) of the SEA Directive).

3.2.3 Short, Medium and Long-Term Timescales

When considering the timing of potential effects of the plan to revoke the Regional Strategies, the commentary classifies effects as ‘short,’ ‘medium’ or ‘long term.’ This reflects an intention to capture the differences that could arise from the plan to revoke regional strategies due to timing. For example, if the plan leads to the revocation of a specific policy that does not have an immediate equivalent (such as suitable piece of legislation or an alternate national policy) to effect ongoing delivery of the policy intent, there could be transitory effects until an alternative mechanism (such as additional policy guidance) was identified and implemented. It is also consistent with the direction contained in Annex II (2) of the SEA Directive where the characteristic of the effects should have regard to ‘the probability, **duration**, frequency and reversibility of the effects’.

Annex 1, paragraph 214 of the NPPF identifies a 12 month implementation period in which ‘decision-takers may continue to give full weight to relevant policies adopted since 2004 even if there is a limited degree of conflict with this Framework.’ The period began when the NPPF was published in March 2012 and will end in March 2013.

Given the time to prepare, consult and update a Local Plan, it is assumed that all local planning authorities in England will have adopted a Local Plan within 5 years of the NPPF being published. This is a pragmatic judgement (informed by the progress of local planning authorities to produce Core Strategies in compliance with the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004) and has been made solely for the purposes of this assessment.

Finally, for the purposes of this assessment, the overall duration of the Regional Strategy to be revoked provides a defined limit to the duration of the assessment (i.e. approximately out to 2026).

Using this as the basis, ‘short term’ is defined as the remaining time in the transition period (9 months or 0.75 years), ‘medium term’ as more than 0.75 and no more than 5 years and ‘long term’ as over 5 years to the end of the Regional Strategy lifetime.

It should be noted that in practice when applying the definitions of the different terms within the assessment, the boundaries between terms are more flexible than a strict reading of the definitions implies. There are for example, instances where effects in the short term extend for a limited period into

the medium term. Where this occurs, it is recorded in the assessment commentary although it will still be only assessed as short term in the assessment matrix itself (see Section 3.4 for an explanation of the approach to the assessment).

3.3 Context and Baseline

3.3.1 Review of Plans and Programmes

The SEA Regulation requires a review of the plan to revoke the regional strategies “*relationship with other relevant plans and programmes*”. One of the first steps in undertaking the SEA is to identify and review other relevant plans, programmes, policies and strategies (herein after referred to as ‘plans and programmes’) that could have an effect on the plan to revoke regional strategies. These may be plans and programmes at an international/ European, national, regional or sub-regional level, as relevant to the scope of the revocation plan. The summary within each topic section in **Appendix E** identifies the relationships between the revocation plan and these other documents; i.e. how the plan could be affected by the other plans’ and programmes’ aims, objectives and/or targets, or how it could contribute to the achievement of any environmental and sustainability objectives and targets set out in these plans and programmes.

The review of plans and programmes also helped complete the environmental baseline and help determine the key issues. The review also provided the policy context for the assessment.

3.3.2 Collecting Baseline Evidence

An essential part of the SEA process is to identify the current state of the environment and its likely evolution under a ‘business as usual’ scenario. Only with sufficient knowledge of the existing baseline conditions can the likely significant effects of the revocation plan be identified and assessed. The SEA also requires that the actual effects of implementing the revocation plan on baseline conditions are monitored.

All the environmental topics listed in the SEA Directive and Regulations have been found to be relevant for the revocation plan (see **Table 3.2**). These were consulted upon at the scoping stage and have been amended to reflect the views of the statutory consultees.

A primary source of information has been the published sustainability appraisal, completed to accompanying the consultation on the draft South East Plan to provide information regarding the likely evolution of the current state of the environment without the implementation of the revocation plan. However, it is recognised that such information reflects data collected a number of years past and as such has been supplemented with more recent information from a variety of sources, including (amongst others) Defra, DECC, the Environment Agency, English Heritage, Natural England and the Office of National Statistics.

3.3.3 Presenting the Context and Baseline Information

Appendix E sets out the collated contextual and baseline information, on a topic-by-topic basis, for each of the 10 assessment topics (see **Table 3.2**), structured as follows:

- **introduction** - provides an overview and definition of the topic;
- **summary of national and regional plans and programmes** - provides an overview of the policy context in which the revocation plan sits;
- **relevant aspects of the current state of the environment at a national and regional level** - provides an overview of the baseline and the key topic specific baseline factors which will need to be considered as part of the assessment;
- **the likely evolution of these baseline conditions without the implementation of the revocation plan** - provides an overview of how the baseline is likely to change in the absence of the revocation plan, an understanding of this is key to understanding the effects of the revocation plan on the topic area;
- **the environmental characteristics of areas likely to be significantly affected;**
- **current problems in areas of particular environmental importance** (such as those designated under the Wild Birds and Habitats Directives);
- **guidance as to how the significance of potential effects has been determined;**
- **the assessment of likely significant effects arising from the revocation plan** - including information on the potential nature and scale of effects, proposed mitigation measures (where appropriate) and measures for enhancement, assumptions and uncertainties and additional information that may be required;
- **proposed mitigation measures** – including an expansion of those measures identified including more detailed commentary on, for example, the duty to co-operate;
- **proposed measures to monitor** the effects of the revocation plan.

3.4 Approach to Assessing the Effects

3.4.1 Prediction and Evaluation of Effects

In line with the ODPM (now CLG) *Practical Guide to the SEA Directive*¹⁹, the assessment process seeks to *predict the significant environmental effects of the plan or programme*. This is done by identifying the likely changes to the baseline conditions as a result of the implementing the proposed plan (or reasonable alternative). These changes are described (where possible) in terms of their geographic scale, the timescale over which they could occur, whether the effects would be temporary or permanent, positive or negative, likely or unlikely, frequent or rare. Where numerical information has not been available, the assessment has been based on professional judgement and with reference to relevant legislation, regulations and policy.

¹⁹ ODPM (2005) *A Practical Guide to the Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive*. Available online at: <http://www.communities.gov.uk/publications/planningandbuilding/practicalguidesea>

To reflect the specific nature of the plan to revoke the regional strategies, the assessment has been completed in two stages:

- **A high level (or screening) assessment** of the effects of the proposals for each Regional Strategy policy against all SEA topics to identify those where there could be a likely significant effect (using definitions as outlined in **Table 3.4**); and
- **A detailed assessment of the likely significant effects** (both positive and negative) identified through the high level assessment process of each Regional Strategy policy, presented under each SEA topic.

The high level assessment is presented in **Appendix D** in an assessment matrix (see **Table 3.3**) and the detailed assessment is presented in **Appendix E** at the end of each topic chapter and summarised in **Section 4**, and **5** of this report.

The high level assessments record the following in the associated commentary:

- the identification and description of the potential effects;
- when the effect(s) could occur, and how long they could last (e.g. short, medium or long term);
- the assumptions and uncertainties that underpin the assessment (and any information needed to address uncertainties);
- potential avoidance or mitigation measures for any likely significant negative effects; and
- possible enhancement measures where positive effects are identified.

Table 3.3 High Level Assessment Matrix

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil and Geology			Water Quality and Resources			Air Quality			Climatic Change			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape and Townscape			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																												Likely Significant Effects of Retention Mitigation Measures Assumptions

Alternative	Biodiversity, flora and fauna			Population & human Health			Soil and Geology			Water Quality and Resources			Air Quality			Climatic Change			Material assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape and Townscape			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
																											
Revocation																												Etc

Score Key:	++ Significant Positive effect	+ Minor effect positive	0 No overall effect	- Minor negative effect	-- Significant negative effect	? Score uncertain
<p><i>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 in the colour used. A conclusion of uncertainty arises where there is insufficient evidence for expert judgement to conclude an effect.</i></p> <p>S – short term (less than 0.75 year), M – medium term (between 0.75 and 5 years) and L – long term (> 5 years)</p>						

3.4.2 Determining Significance

Topic-specific definitions have been developed for what constitutes a significant effect, a minor effect or a neutral effect for each of the 10 environmental issues; these can be found in the relevant topic chapters in **Appendix E**. **Table 3.4** shows an example of these definitions along with the symbols used to record the effects within the assessment.

Table 3.4 Illustrative Guidance for the Assessment of Significance for Biodiversity and Nature Conservation

Effect	Description	Illustrative Guidance
++	Significant positive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alternative would have a significant and sustained positive impact on European or national designated sites and/or protected species. (e.g. – fully supports all conservation objectives on site, long term increase in population of designated species) Alternative would have a strong positive effect on local biodiversity (e.g. – through removal of all existing disturbance/pollutant emissions, or creation of new habitats leading to long term improvement to ecosystem structure and function). Alternative will create new areas of wildlife interest with improved public access in areas where there is a high demand for access to these sites.

<i>Effect</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Illustrative Guidance</i>
+	Positive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alternative would have a minor positive effect on European or national designated sites and/or protected species (e.g. – supports one of the conservation objectives on site, short term increase in population of designated species). Alternative may have a positive net effect on local biodiversity (e.g. – through reduction in disturbance/pollutant emissions, or some habitat creation leading to temporary improvement to ecosystem structure and function). Alternative will enhance existing public access to areas of wildlife interest in areas where there is some demand for these sites.
0	No (neutral effects)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alternative would not have any effects on European or national designated sites and/or any species (including both designated and non-designated species). Alternative would not affect public right of way or access to areas of wildlife interest.
-	Negative	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alternative would have minor short-term (direct or indirect) negative effects on non-designated conservation sites and species (e.g. – through a minor increase in disturbance/pollutant emissions, or some loss of habitat leading to temporary loss of ecosystem structure and function). Alternative will decrease public access to areas of wildlife interest in areas where there is some demand for these sites.
--	Significant negative	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alternative would have a negative and sustained effect on European or national designated sites and/or protected species (e.g. – prevents reaching all conservation objectives on site, long term decrease in populations of designated species). These impacts could not reasonably be compensated for. Alternative would have strong negative effects on local biodiversity (e.g. – through an minor increase in disturbance/pollutant emissions, or considerable loss of habitat leading to long term loss of ecosystem structure and function).
?	Uncertain	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> From the level of information available the impact that the Alternative would have on this objective is uncertain.

3.4.3 Specific Issues Considered When Assessing the Effects of the Plan to Revoke the Regional Strategies

When considering the effects of retention of a Regional Strategy policy, we have used the prediction of effects contained in the relevant sustainability appraisal (for this report for the South East Plan) completed to accompany the consultation on the draft Regional Strategy. Using this information does have limitations (in that the effects identified use an evidence base of varying age, are presented in differing forms and assess effects over differing timeframes) and where these occur, additional information has been identified to supplement the assessment; however, the principle remains consistent with the requirements of Article 5(3) of the SEA Directive, '*relevant information available on environmental effects of the plans and programmes and obtained at other levels of decision making ... may be used*'.

When assessing the effects of revocation, the following has been considered:

- **Whether the purpose, intent or specific target could be delivered by other existing legislation or government policy?** Where the answer to this question is yes, the relevant legislation, policy or guidance has been identified, along with any relevant regionally specific evidence to substantiate the conclusion. In many instances, particularly for policies of a pervasive and non-spatially specific nature, the specific paragraphs of the NPPF have been referenced in the individual policy assessments to provide a substantial alternative source of planning policy relevant to the Local Plan. For a number of Regional Strategy policies it has

also been considered relevant to reference the duty to co-operate. Where this is the case, specific local examples of current cooperation are also cited where available. Revocation of the Regional Strategy and the reliance on the NPPF creates a situation where there will be a delay, as some authorities will need to review and update their Local Plan to reflect NPPF policies and the needs of their local communities. In these instances where there is a lack of an up to date Local Plan, the uncertainty over policy, including the quantum and preferred location of development, is likely to affect whether developers submit planning applications for new development. As a result, it is AMEC's view that there will be a lessening in the short and medium term of development activity and the resulting effects occurring; although it is noted that the application of the NPPFs presumption in favour of sustainable development and its policies to boost the supply of housing will help where plans or policies are absent, silent or out of date.

- **If the purpose, intent or specific target of the Regional Strategy policy is not likely to be sustained beyond revocation, the effects have been identified, described and assessed.** Where such policy changes are determined, the effects identified, described and assessed will also be proportionate to the scope of the policy considered. For example, where the Regional Strategy policy applies uniformly across the region e.g. priorities to increase more sustainable modes of transport for passengers and freight, the promotion of agri-environment schemes or the provision of regional renewable targets, such effects will be described at the regional level. However, there are Regional Strategy policies that do have a direct and explicit consequence for local authorities such as housing, infrastructure projects, pitches for gypsies and travellers, and mineral and waste. In these instances, we have also considered the implications and effects on individual Local Plans.

Considering Effects on Local Plans

Where we have identified that revocation of a Regional Strategy policy will have an effect on the environment and that this will have a consequence for Local Plan policies and/or local areas, we have examined these effects in more detail. We have compared the policies in the South East Plan on housing allocations, allocations of pitches for gypsies, travellers and showpeople, employment (both jobs and employment land), renewable energy, land won aggregates and rock and waste apportionment with the equivalent policies in Local Plan and /or core strategies in the region. This analysis is set out in **Appendix C** and has then been reflected, where relevant in the assessment of individual Plan policies (**Appendix D**).

It is also noted that the plans adopted after July 2006 are also highly likely to have been subject to SEA, given that the SEA regulation came into effect in July 2004 with a two year transitional arrangement. Where SEA has been undertaken of Local Plans and the information is in the public domain, the assessments (usually presented as a combined Sustainability Appraisal and SEA) have been reviewed when relevant to provide additional information and evidence within the assessment presented in **Appendix D**.

Considering the Effects of the Regional Economic Strategy

The vision, targets, priorities, implementation priorities and growth areas of the former Regional Economic Strategy (RES) have been presented in **Appendix H**. The vision, targets, priorities,

implementation priorities have been mapped onto the policies of the former Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) for the South East. The mapping demonstrates that the RES and RSS are inextricably linked and in many instances the policies in the RSS are the same as the commitments in the RES. Where this occurs and in order to avoid duplication of assessment, the mapping demonstrates how the effects of both have been considered in detail in **Appendix D**.

3.4.4 Secondary, Cumulative and Synergistic Effects Assessment²⁰

SEA also requires that secondary, cumulative and synergistic effects of the options are assessed. These terms are explained in **Table 3.5**.

Table 3.5 Definitions of Secondary, Cumulative and Synergistic Effects

Type of Effect	Definition*
Secondary (or indirect)	Effects that do not occur as a direct result of the plan to revoke the Regional Strategy, but occur at distance from the direct impacts or as a result of a complex pathway. Examples of a secondary effect of the plan to revoke could include the materials (and embedded carbon) used in any development or infrastructure project identified.
Cumulative	Effects that occur where the revocation or retention of several individual Regional Strategy policies which each may have an insignificant effect, combine to have a significant effect. Examples of a cumulative effect of the plan to revoke Regional Strategy could include the potential effects on a European designated site, where a habitat or species is vulnerable and the cumulative effects of disturbance arising from uncoordinated development occurring simultaneously in adjacent local authorities causes a significant impact. Cumulative effects could also occur across a region or across more than one region.
Synergistic	Effects that interact to produce a new effect that could be greater than the sum of the individual effects.

*Adapted from SEA guidance, ODPM (2005)

For the assessment of secondary, cumulative and synergistic effects to be effective, they should be considered as part of each assessment, rather than to being seen as a separate assessment. For the purposes of brevity, these effects which tend to be grouped together are captured subsequently under the heading of cumulative effects.

3.4.5 Assumptions used in the Assessment

The assumptions that have been used in the assessment are as follows:

- **The effects and findings of the relevant Sustainability Appraisal are valid over the lifetime of the relevant Regional Strategy; however, that there may be some variation in the short term.** For example, all regional strategies contain housing allocations, quantified on an annual basis and over the lifetime of the plan at the region and local authority level. It

²⁰ This includes consideration of the effects in the short, medium and long term; permanent and temporary and positive and negative effects.

is evident that since adoption of the regional strategies, actual housing completions per annum are below the levels expected in each strategy. In consequence, when considering the quantum of growth in the short term, based on the actual figures to date, retention may lead to a lessening of some effects identified in the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal (both benefits of increased housing provision and any negative effects arising from land take and loss of any natural resources); however, we have assumed that over the lifetime of the Regional Strategy that the housing policy will still be delivered and that the medium and long term effects would remain unchanged by the short term deviation. It is appreciated that whilst this appears to be a reasonable assumption, it could be affected by the health of the economy or market changes. However, determining alternative credible views on the likely future outcome of regional strategies and their expectations for new development risks adding an extra layer of subjectivity to a process that is already relying heavily on judgements about future impacts in an uncertain world.

- **For revocation, the assessments anticipate that Local Plans will be put in place consistent with the principles and policies set out in the NPPF.** This includes the presumption in favour of sustainable development and the expectation that “to achieve sustainable development, economic, social and environmental gains should be sought jointly and simultaneously through the planning system” and that “the planning system should play an active role in guiding development to sustainable solutions”. These expectations are reflected in the assessment of effects at the local level. However, it will take time for Local Plans to be put in place which may result in some uncertainties over the effects of revocation in the short and medium terms. The application of the NPPFs presumption in favour of sustainable development and its policies to boost the supply of housing will help where plans or policies are absent, silent or out of date.
- **For the purposes of providing a consistent interpretation of short, medium and long term, the definitions, as set out in section 3.2.3, have been applied.** The definitions of short, medium and long term reflected the assumption that for the purposes of the assessment, revocation was considered to have occurred concurrent with when the assessment was undertaken. This minimised the need to speculate over when exactly the regional strategies could be revoked, was compatible with the Government’s proposal to rapidly abolish the Regional Strategies subject to the outcome of consultation process, enabled the assessment to optimise the use of baseline information as evidence to inform the assessment of effects and enabled the assessment to consider the effects during any transitional period. The approach was also consistent with current SEA guidance and practice.
- **It is assumed that local authorities will continue to work together on cross boundary strategic issues.** This will be supported by the new duty to co-operate in relation to the planning of sustainable development. The duty will ensure that local authorities and other public bodies are involved in a continual process of constructive and active engagement which will maximise effective working on development planning in relation to strategic planning issues that cross administrative boundaries.

It should be noted that the effects of the recent Government housing and planning package changes²¹ have not been considered in detail in this assessment as policy detail is still being developed; however, it may prove that the increased emphasis on growth and development given by these proposals addresses some of the effects on the short and medium term arising from the uncertainties in those 47 authorities without Local Plans in conformity with the Regional Strategy.

3.5 Technical Difficulties

3.5.1 Assessing the Effects of Revocation is a New Requirement

Until the European Court judgement²² in March 2012, SEA was applied to the preparation and modification of relevant plans and programmes. The ruling confirms the application to the revocation of land use plans. Whilst there is guidance and relatively well established processes available to assess the effects of a plan's preparations, there is no equivalent for revocation and no established practice on how to undertake such an assessment. Necessarily then, this assessment is part of a body of emerging practice and is the first such that is in compliance with the SEA Directive requirements in the UK.

The method adopted to assess the likely environmental effects of revoking the regional strategies has therefore had to take account of this lack of established practice. The approach taken builds on the previous voluntary approach contained in the previous assessment of the plan to revoke the regional strategies published in October 2011 as well as the comments received from consultees.

3.5.2 Ensuring Consistency

The assessment of effects, in particular of retention of the Regional Strategy has used information from the relevant sustainability appraisal of each Regional Strategy. Whilst each sustainability appraisal has been completed in a manner consistent with government guidance, they are different in approach, format and assessment of effects which has created difficulties in ensuring that the assessment of the plan to revoke regional strategies is consistent across all eight regions. For example, some appraisals have assessed the effects of each proposed policy (South East Plan) whilst others present the assessment findings thematically (the North East). Furthermore, the SEA topics considered vary in depth and detail, and their assessment (through differing assessment frameworks comprising of assessment objectives which number from 14 to 25) is also marked different. Lastly, the sustainability appraisals were completed iteratively at different times between mid 2004 and mid 2009 and so used differing baselines to provide context for the respective assessments.

The Sustainability Appraisal of the South East Plan was undertaken iteratively reflecting the stages in the Plan's development (Draft Regional Spatial Strategy, Proposed Changes and Final Revisions). To support this assessment we have used information from the sustainability appraisal of the Final Revisions, a copy of which can be found at:

http://www.sefs.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/fSA_and_HRA_Assessment.pdf.

²¹ <http://www.communities.gov.uk/news/housing/2211918>

²² The judgment in Case C-567/10 *Inter-Environnement Bruxelles ASBL v Région de Bruxelles-Capitale*

3.5.3 Uncertainty and Future Effects

The assessments inevitably reflect the fact that until adopted Local Plans are in place there must be some uncertainty as to their likely effects, notwithstanding the expectation that they will be drawn up to be consistent with national policy and subject to rigorous environmental assessment through sustainability appraisal. The environmental effects of revoking the regional strategies will clearly be dependent, to a greater or lesser extent depending on the impact under consideration, on future decisions by local authorities, individually and collectively. The uncertainty arising from local decisions has been reflected as appropriate in the assessment of the individual policies in **Appendix D** and in the consideration in the topic chapters contained in **Appendix E**.

4. Assessment of Effects of Revoking the South East Regional Strategy and the Reasonable Alternatives

4.1 Overview

This section presents the results of the assessment which has been carried out with sub-sections dealing with the effects of revocation, retention and partial revocation. The assessment has been carried out using the methodology described in **Section 3**.

This chapter draws in particular on detailed evidence in **Appendices D** and **E**. **Appendix D** presents the details of the assessment on a policy by policy basis and **Appendix E** presents detailed comments on each SEA topic including comments on significant effects where these have been identified.

4.2 Effects of Revoking the South East Regional Strategy

Table 4.1 summarises the effects of revoking the South East Plan against the 12 SEA topics. As noted in section 3.4.3, the Regional Economic Strategy commitments have been mapped onto the RSS policies (**Appendix H**). Due to the intentional overlap between them, the RSS policies include those of the RES and in order to avoid duplication, the assessment summarised in **Table 4.1** has focussed on the South East Plan policies.

The following key has been used in completing the assessment.

Score Key:	++ Significant Positive effect		+ Minor positive effect		0 No overall effect		- Minor negative effect		-- Significant negative effect	? Score uncertain
<p><i>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.</i></p> <p><i>The reasons for the assessment are presented in Appendix D for each policy.</i></p> <p><i>S – short term (less than 0.75 year), M – medium term (between 0.75 and 5 years) and L – long term (> 5 years)</i></p>										

Table 4.1 Summary of the Effects of Revoking the South East Regional Strategy (with reference to the South East Plan policies)

RS Policy No.	RS Policy Title	Alternative	Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna			Population and Human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic Factors			Material Assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape		
			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
RS Policy SP1	Sub-Regions in the South East	Revocation	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	
RS Policy SP2	Regional Hubs	Revocation	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
RS Policy SP3	Urban Focus and Urban Renaissance	Revocation	+	+	+	+	+	+	?	?	?	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	?	?	?	+	+	+
RS Policy SP4	Regeneration and Social Inclusion	Revocation	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
RS Policy SP5	Green Belts	Revocation	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	

RS Policy No.	RS Policy Title	Alternative	Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna			Population and Human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic Factors			Material Assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape		
			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
RS Policy CC1	Sustainable Development	Revocation	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	
RS Policy CC2	Climate Change	Revocation	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
RS Policy CC3	Resource Use	Revocation	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	
RS Policy CC4	Sustainable Design and Construction	Revocation	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	
RS Policy CC5	Supporting An Ageing Population	Revocation	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
RS Policy CC6	Sustainable Communities and Character of the Environment	Revocation	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	

RS Policy No.	RS Policy Title	Alternative	Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna			Population and Human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic Factors			Material Assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape		
			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
RS Policies CC7	Infrastructure and Implementation	Revocation	?	?	?	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	
RS Policy CC8	Green Infrastructure	Revocation	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+
RS Policy CC9	Use of Public Land	Revocation	?	?	?	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	+	+	+	
RS Policy RE1	Contributing to the UK's Long Term Competitiveness	Revocation	0	-	-	+	+	+	0	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-
RS Policy RE2	Supporting Nationally and Regionally Important Sectors and Clusters	Revocation	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	?	?	?	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	?	?	?	-	-	-	

RS Policy No.	RS Policy Title	Alternative	Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna			Population and Human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic Factors			Material Assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape		
			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
RS Policy RE3	Employment and Land Provision	Revocation	0	-	-	+	+	+	0	-	-	-	-	-	0	?	?	0	?	?	-	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-
RS Policy RE4	Human Resource Development	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
RS Policy RE5	Smart Growth	Revocation	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+
RS Policy RE6	Competitiveness and Addressing Structural Economic Weakness	Revocation	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	--	--	--	-	?	?	-	?	?	--	--	--	-	-	-	-	-	-
RS Policy H1	Regional Housing Provision 2006 – 2016	Revocation	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	--	--	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	--	--	?	?	?	-	-	-
RS Policy H2	Managing The Delivery of Regional Housing Provision	Revocation	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	--	--	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	--	--	?	?	?	-	-	-
RS Policy H3	Affordable Housing	Revocation	?	-	-	+	+	+	0	+	?	-	-	-	0	?	?	0	?	?	-	-	-	0	?	?	0	?	?

RS Policy No.	RS Policy Title	Alternative	Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna			Population and Human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic Factors			Material Assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape		
			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
RS Policy H4	Type and Size of New Housing	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
RS Policy H5	Housing Density and Design	Revocation	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	
RS Policy H6	Making Better Use of the Existing Stock	Revocation	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+
RS Policy T1	Manage and Invest	Revocation	?	?	?	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	
RS Policy T2	Mobility Management	Revocation	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
RS Policy T3	Charging	Revocation	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
RS Policy T4	Parking	Revocation	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
RS Policy T5	Travel Plans and Advice	Revocation	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

RS Policy No.	RS Policy Title	Alternative	Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna			Population and Human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic Factors			Material Assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape		
			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
RS Policy T6	Communications Technology	Revocation	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
RS Policy T7	Rural Transport	Revocation	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
RS Policy T8	Regional Spokes	Revocation	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
RS Policy T9	Airports	Revocation	?	?	?	+	+	+	?	?	?	-	-	-	--	--	--	--	--	--	-	-	-	?	?	?	?	?	?
RS Policy T10	Ports and Short Sea Shipping	Revocation	?	?	?	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	+	+	+	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?
RS Policy T11	Rail Freight	Revocation	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
RS Policy T12	Freight and Site Safeguarding	Revocation	?	?	?	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

RS Policy No.	RS Policy Title	Alternative	Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna			Population and Human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic Factors			Material Assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape		
			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
RS Policy T13	Intermodal Interchanges	Revocation	?	?	?	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
RS Policy T14	Transport Investment and Management Priorities	Revocation	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	?	?	?	?	?	?	-	-	-	?	?	?	-	-	-
RS Policy NRM1	Sustainable Water Resources and Groundwater Quality	Revocation	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
RS Policy NRM2	Water Quality	Revocation	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+
RS Policy NRM3	Strategic Water Resources Development	Revocation	?	?	?	+	+	+	0	0	-	+	+	+	0	0	0	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?
RS Policy NRM4	Sustainable Flood Risk Management	Revocation	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

RS Policy No.	RS Policy Title	Alternative	Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna			Population and Human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic Factors			Material Assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape		
			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
RS Policy NRM5	Conservation and Improvement of Biodiversity	Revocation	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+
RS Policy NRM6	Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area	Revocation	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+
RS Policy NRM7	Woodlands	Revocation	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+
RS Policy NRM8	Coastal Management	Revocation	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
RS Policy NRM9	Air Quality	Revocation	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	+	+	0	0	0
RS Policy NRM10	Noise	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

RS Policy No.	RS Policy Title	Alternative	Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna			Population and Human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic Factors			Material Assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape		
			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
RS Policy NRM11	Development Design For Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy	Revocation	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
RS Policy NRM12	Combined Heat and Power	Revocation	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
RS Policy NRM13	Regional Renewable Energy Targets	Revocation	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	?	?	?
RS Policy NRM14	Sub-Regional Targets for Land-based Renewable Energy	Revocation	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	?	?	?
RS Policy NRM15	Location of Renewable Energy Development	Revocation	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

RS Policy No.	RS Policy Title	Alternative	Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna			Population and Human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic Factors			Material Assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape		
			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
RS Policy NRM16:	Renewable Energy Development Criteria	Revocation	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+
RS Policy W1	Waste Reduction	Revocation	?	?	+	0	0	+	?	?	+	0	0	+	0	0	+	0	0	+	0	0	+	?	?	+	?	?	+
RS Policy W2:	Sustainable Design, Construction and Demolition	Revocation	?	?	+	0	0	+	?	?	+	0	0	+	0	0	+	0	0	+	+	+	+	?	?	+	?	?	+
RS Policy W3:	Regional Self-Sufficiency	Revocation	?	?	?	?	+	+	?	?	?	?	+	+	?	-	+	?	-	+	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?
RS Policy W4:	Sub-Regional Self-Sufficiency	Revocation	?	?	?	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?
RS Policy W5	Targets For Diversion From Landfill	Revocation	?	?	?	+	+	+	?	?	?	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	?
RS Policy W6:	Recycling and Composting	Revocation	?	?	?	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	+	+	+	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?

RS Policy No.	RS Policy Title	Alternative	Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna			Population and Human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic Factors			Material Assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape		
			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
RS Policy W7:	Waste Management Capacity and Requirements	Revocation	?	?	?	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	+	+	+	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?
RS Policy: W8	Waste Separation	Revocation	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0
RS Policy W9	New Markets	Revocation	?	?	?	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	+	+	+	0	0	0	?	?	?
RS Policy W10	Regionally Significant Facilities	Revocation	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?
RS Policy W11	Biomass	Revocation	-	-	-	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	?	?	?	0	0	0	-	-	-
RS Policy W12	Other Recovery and Diversion Technologies	Revocation	-	-	-	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	?	?	?	-	-	-
RS Policy: W13	Landfill Requirements	Revocation	-	-	-	?	?	?	-	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	?	?	?	-	-	-

RS Policy No.	RS Policy Title	Alternative	Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna			Population and Human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic Factors			Material Assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape		
			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
RS Policy W14	Restoration	Revocation	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+
RS Policy W15	Hazardous and Other Specialist Waste Facilities	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	0	0
RS Policy W16	Waste Transport Infrastructure	Revocation	?	?	?	+	+	+	0	0	0	?	?	?	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	?	?	?	?	?	?
RS Policy W17	Location of Waste Management Facilities	Revocation	?	?	?	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	+	+	+	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?
RS Policy M1	Sustainable Construction	Revocation	0	+	+	+	+	+	0	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	+	+
RS Policy M2	Recycled and Secondary Aggregates	Revocation	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	+	+
RS Policy M3	Primary Aggregates	Revocation	-	-	?	+	+	+	-	-	?	-	-	-	?	?	?	?	?	?	0	+	+	?	?	?	-	-	?

RS Policy No.	RS Policy Title	Alternative	Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna			Population and Human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic Factors			Material Assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape		
			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
RS Policy M4	Other Minerals	Revocation	-	-	?	+	+	+	-	-	?	-	-	-	0	?	?	0	?	?	-	-	-	?	?	?	-	-	?
RS Policy M5	Safeguarding of Mineral Reserves, Wharves and Rail Depots	Revocation	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+
RS Policy C1	The New Forest National Park	Revocation	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+
RS Policy C2	The South Downs	Revocation	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+
RS Policy C3	Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty	Revocation	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	?	?	?

RS Policy No.	RS Policy Title	Alternative	Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna			Population and Human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic Factors			Material Assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape		
			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
RS Policy C4	Landscape and Countryside Management	Revocation	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+
RS Policy C5	Managing the Rural – Urban Fringe	Revocation	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
RS Policy C6	Countryside Access and Rights of Way Management	Revocation	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
RS Policy C7	The River Thames Corridor	Revocation	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	+	+
RS Policy BE1	Management of an Urban Renaissance	Revocation	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	0	+	+

RS Policy No.	RS Policy Title	Alternative	Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna			Population and Human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic Factors			Material Assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape		
			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
RS Policy BE2	Suburban Intensification	Revocation	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	0	0	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	0	0	0	?	?
RS Policy BE3	Suburban Renewal	Revocation	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?	?
RS Policy BE4	The Role of Small Rural Towns ('Market Towns')	Revocation	0	0	0	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	+	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	+	+
RS Policy BE5	Village Management	Revocation	0	-	-	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	+	+
RS Policy BE6	Management of the Historic Environment	Revocation	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+

RS Policy No.	RS Policy Title	Alternative	Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna			Population and Human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic Factors			Material Assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape		
			S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L			
RS Policy TC1	Strategic Network of Town Centres	Revocation	?	?	?	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?			
RS Policy TC2	New Development and Redevelopment in Town Centres	Revocation	0	?	?	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	0	0	?	?	?	?	?	?	0	-	-	0	+	+	0	+	+
RS Policy TC3	Out-of-Centre Regional/Sub-Regional Shopping Centres	Revocation	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	0	0	0	?	?	0	?	?	?	?	?	0	?	?	0	?	?
RS Policy TRS1	Coastal Resorts	Revocation	-	-	-	+	+	+	0	0	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	?	?	?
RS Policy TRS2	Rural Tourism	Revocation	?	?	?	+	+	+	?	?	?	0	0	0	?	?	?	?	?	?	0	0	0	?	?	?	?	?	?

RS Policy No.	RS Policy Title	Alternative	Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna			Population and Human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic Factors			Material Assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape		
			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
RS Policy TRS3	Regionally Significant Sports Facilities	Revocation	?	?	?	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	0	0	0	?	?	?	?	?	?
RS Policy TRS4	Tourism Attractions	Revocation	?	?	?	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?
RS Policy TRS5	Tourist Accommodation	Revocation	?	?	?	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?
RS Policy TRS6	Visitor Management	Revocation	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?
RS Policy TRS7	Priority Areas for Tourism	Revocation	?	?	?	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?

RS Policy No.	RS Policy Title	Alternative	Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna			Population and Human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic Factors			Material Assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape		
			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
RS Policy S1	Supporting Healthy Communities	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	
RS Policy S2	Promoting Sustainable Health Services	Revocation	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
RS Policy S3	Education and Skills	Revocation	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
RS Policy S4	Higher and Further Education	Revocation	0	?	?	+	+	+	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	?	?
RS Policy S5	Cultural and Sporting Activity	Revocation	?	?	?	0	0	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	

RS Policy No.	RS Policy Title	Alternative	Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna			Population and Human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic Factors			Material Assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape		
			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
RS Policy S6	Community Infrastructure	Revocation	0	-	-	0	+	+	0	-	-	0	0	0	?	?	?	?	?	?	0	-	-	?	?	?	0	-	-
RS Policy SH1	Core Policy	Revocation	0	-	-	+	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	0	?	?	0	?	?
RS Policy SH2	Strategic Development Areas	Revocation	0	?	-	+	+	+	0	?	-	0	?	-	0	?	-	0	?	-	-	-	-	0	?	?	0	?	?
RS Policy SH3	Scale, Location and Type of Employment Development	Revocation	0	0	-	0	+	+	0	0	-	0	0	-	0	0	-	0	0	-	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	?
RS Policy SH4	Strategy for Main Town Centres	Revocation	0	?	?	+	+	+	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	?	-	0	?	?	0	?	?

RS Policy No.	RS Policy Title	Alternative	Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna			Population and Human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic Factors			Material Assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape		
			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
RS Policy SH5	Scale and Location of Housing Development 2006-2026	Revocation	0	?	-	+	+	+	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	?	-	0	?	-	0	?	-	0	?	?	0	?	?
RS Policy SH6	Affordable Housing	Revocation	0	?	-	+	+	+	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	?	-	0	?	-	0	?	-	0	?	?	0	?	?
RS Policy SH7	Sub-Regional Transport Strategy	Revocation	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0
RS Policy SH8	Environmental Sustainability	Revocation	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
RS Policy SH9	Implementation Agency	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	0	0

RS Policy No.	RS Policy Title	Alternative	Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna			Population and Human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic Factors			Material Assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape		
			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
RS Policy SCT1	Core Policy	Revocation	0	?	-	+	+	+	0	?	-	0	?	-	0	?	-	0	?	-	-	-	-	0	?	?	0	?	?
RS Policy SCT2	Enabling Economic Regeneration	Revocation	0	?	-	+	+	+	0	?	-	0	?	-	0	?	-	0	?	-	-	-	-	0	?	?	0	?	?
RS Policy SCT3	Management of Existing Employment Sites and Premises	Revocation	0	0	-	0	+	+	0	0	-	0	0	-	0	0	-	0	0	-	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	?
RS Policy SCT4	Employment Priority in New Land Allocations	Revocation	0	?	?	+	+	+	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	?	-	0	?	?	0	?	?
RS Policy SCT5	Housing Distribution	Revocation	0	?	-	+	+	+	0	?	-	0	?	-	0	?	-	0	?	-	-	-	-	0	?	?	0	?	?

RS Policy No.	RS Policy Title	Alternative	Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna			Population and Human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic Factors			Material Assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape		
			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
RS Policy SCT6	Affordable Housing	Revocation	0	?	?	+	+	+	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	?	-	0	?	-	0	?	-	0	?	?	0	?	?
RS Policy SCT7	Implementation and Delivery	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	0	0
RS Policy EKA1	Core Strategy	Revocation	0	-	-	+	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	0	+	0	0	+
RS Policy EKA2	Spatial Framework for Ashford Growth Area	Revocation	0	?	?	+	+	+	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	?	?
RS Policy EKA3	Amount and Distribution of Housing	Revocation	0	?	-	+	+	+	0	?	-	0	?	-	0	?	-	0	?	-	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	?	-

RS Policy No.	RS Policy Title	Alternative	Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna			Population and Human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic Factors			Material Assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape		
			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
RS Policy EKA4	Urban Renaissance of the Coastal Towns	Revocation	0	?	?	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	?	-	0	?	-	0	?	-	0	?	-	0	?	+	0	?	+
RS Policy EKA5	The Gateway Role	Revocation	0	-	-	+	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	-	-
RS Policy EKA6	Employment Locations	Revocation	0	-	-	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	-	-
RS Policy EKA7	Integrated Coastal Management and Natural Park	Revocation	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+
RS Policy EKA8	Effective Delivery	Revocation	0	?	?	+	+	+	0	?	?	0	+	+	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	?	?

RS Policy No.	RS Policy Title	Alternative	Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna			Population and Human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic Factors			Material Assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape		
			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
RS Policy KTG1	Core Strategy	Revocation	0	?	?	+	+	+	0	?	?	0	-	-	0	?	-	0	?	-	0	?	-	0	?	+	0	?	?
RS Policy KTG2	Economic Growth and Employment	Revocation	0	?	-	+	+	+	0	?	-	0	?	-	0	?	-	0	?	-	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	?	-
RS Policy KTG3	Employment Locations	Revocation	0	?	-	+	+	+	0	?	-	0	?	-	0	?	-	0	?	-	0	?	-	0	0	0	0	?	-
RS Policy KTG4	Amount and Distribution of Housing Development	Revocation	0	?	-	+	+	+	0	?	+	?	?	--	0	?	-	0	?	-	0	?	-	0	0	0	0	?	-
RS Policy KTG5	The Role of the Retail Centres	Revocation	0	?	?	0	+		0	?	?	0	0	0	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	?	?

RS Policy No.	RS Policy Title	Alternative	Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna			Population and Human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic Factors			Material Assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape		
			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
RS Policy KTG6	Flood Risk	Revocation	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+
RS Policy KTG7	Green Initiatives	Revocation	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+
RS Policy LF1	Core Strategy	Revocation	0	?	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	-	--	0	?	-	0	?	-	0	?	-	0	?	+	0	?	+
RS Policy LF2	Economic Development	Revocation	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0
RS Policy LF3	Broad Mount and Distribution of Future Housing Development	Revocation	0	0	-	+	+	+	0	0	-	0	-	--	0	0	-	0	0	-	0	0	-	0	0	0	?	?	?

RS Policy No.	RS Policy Title	Alternative	Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna			Population and Human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic Factors			Material Assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape		
			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
RS Policy LF4	Affordable Housing	Revocation	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	?	+	0	?	-	0	?	?	0	?	?	0		-	0	?	?	0	?	?
RS Policy LF5	Urban Areas and Regional Hubs	Revocation	0	0	?	+	+	+	0	0	?	0	-	-	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	+	+
RS Policy LF6	Development at Former DERA Site, Chertsey	Revocation	0	0	-	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	-
RS Policy LF7	Town Centres	Revocation	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	+	+
RS Policy LF8	Sub-Regional Transport Hubs and Spokes	Revocation	0	?	?	0	0	0	0	?	?	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?	?

RS Policy No.	RS Policy Title	Alternative	Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna			Population and Human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic Factors			Material Assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape		
			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
RS Policy LF9	Green Belt Management	Revocation	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+
RS Policy LF10	Small Scale Site Tariff	Revocation	0	-	?	0	+	+	0	-	?	0	0	0	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	-	?
RS Policy WCBV1	Policy WCBV1: Core Strategy	Revocation	0	0	?	+	+	+	0	0	?	0	0	?	0	0	?	0	0	?	-	-	-	0	0	?	0	0	?
RS Policy WCBV2	Employment Land	Revocation	0	0	?	+	+	+	0	0	?	0	0	?	0	0	?	0	0	?	0	-	-	0	0	?	0	0	?
RS Policy WCBV3	Scale and Distribution of Housing Development	Revocation	0	-	?	+	+	+	0	0	?	0	0	?	0	0	?	0	0	?	0	-	-	0	0	?	0	0	?

RS Policy No.	RS Policy Title	Alternative	Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna			Population and Human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic Factors			Material Assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape		
			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
RS Policy WCBV4	The Blackwater Valley	Revocation	0	-	?	+	+	+	0	0	?	0	0	?	0	0	?	0	0	?	0	-	-	0	0	?	0	0	?
RS Policy WCBV5	The Colne Valley Park	Revocation	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	
RS Policy CO1	Core Strategy	Revocation	0	0	?	+	+	+	0	0	?	0	0	?	0	0	?	0	0	?	0	-	-	0	0	?	0	0	?
RS Policy CO2	Economy	Revocation	0	0	?	+	+	+	0	0	?	0	0	?	0	0	?	0	0	?	0	-	-	0	0	?	0	0	?
RS Policy CO3	Scale and Distribution of Housing	Revocation	0	-	?	+	+	+	0	0	?	0	0	?	0	0	?	0	0	?	-	-	-	0	0	?	0	0	?

RS Policy No.	RS Policy Title	Alternative	Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna			Population and Human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic Factors			Material Assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape		
			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
RS Policy CO4	Green Belt	Revocation	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	0	0	0	?	?	?	?	?	?
RS Policy CO5	Transport	Revocation	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0
RS Policy MKAV1	Housing Distribution by District 2006-2026	Revocation	0	0	?	+	+	+	0	0	?	0	-	--	0	?	-	0	?	-	0	-	-	0	0	?	0	0	?
RS Policy MKAV2	Spatial Framework for Milton Keynes Growth Area	Revocation	0	0	?	+	+	+	0	0	?	0	-	?	0	0	?	0	0	?	0	-	-	0	0	?	0	-	?
RS Policy MKAV3	Spatial Framework for Aylesbury Growth Area	Revocation	0	0	?	0	+	+	0	0	?	0	?	-	0	?	-	0	?	-	0	?	-	0	0	0	0	0	?

RS Policy No.	RS Policy Title	Alternative	Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna			Population and Human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic Factors			Material Assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape		
			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
RS Policy MKAV4	Effective Delivery	Revocation	0	0	-	+	+	+	0	0	-	+	+	+	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	-
GAT1, GAT2, GAT 3	Core Strategy, Economic Development and Housing Distribution	Revocation	0	0	?	+	+	+	0	0	?	0	0	?	0	0	?	0	0	?	0	-	-	0	0	?	0	0	?
RS Policy IW1	Enabling Economic Regeneration	Revocation	0	-	-	+	+	+	0	-	-	0	--	--	0	-	-	0	-	-		-	-	0	0	0	0	-	-
RS Policy IW2	Housing Development	Revocation	0	-	-	+	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	--	0	-	-	0	-	-		-	-	0	0	0	0	-	-
RS Policy IW3	Rural Areas	Revocation	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	+	+

RS Policy No.	RS Policy Title	Alternative	Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna			Population and Human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic Factors			Material Assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape		
			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
RS Policy IW4	Strategic Transport Links	Revocation	0	0	?	0	+	+	0	0	?	0	0	0	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	?
RS Policy IW5	Infrastructure	Revocation	0	?	-	0	+	+	0	?	-	0	?	?	0	?	-	0	?	-	0	?	-	0	0	0	0	?	-
RS Policy AOSR1	Scale and Location of Housing Development 2006-2026	Revocation	0	0	-	+	+	+	0	0	-	0	0	-	0	0	-	0	0	-	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-
RS Policy AOSR2	Scale and Location of Housing Development 2006-2026	Revocation	0	0	-	+	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	-	-
RS Policy AOSR3	The Whitehill/Bordon Opportunity	Revocation	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	+	+

RS Policy No.	RS Policy Title	Alternative	Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna			Population and Human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic Factors			Material Assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape		
			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
RS Policy AOSR4	Scale and Location of Housing Development 2006-2026	Revocation	0	?	?	0	?	+	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	0	0	0	?	?
RS Policy AOSR5	Scale and Location of Housing Development 2006-2026	Revocation	0	?	?	+	+	+	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	0	0	0	?	?
RS Policy AOSR6	Scale and Location of Housing Development 2006-2026	Revocation	0	-	-	+	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	-	-
RS Policy AOSR7	Maidstone Hub	Revocation	0	0	-	+	+	+	0	0	-	0	0	-	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	0	-	0	0	+	0	0	-
RS Policy AOSR8	Tonbridge/Tunbridge Wells Hub	Revocation	?	?	?	+	+	+	?	?	?	0	-	-	0	-	?	0	0	?	0	-	-	0	0	0	?	?	?

RS Policy No.	RS Policy Title	Alternative	Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna			Population and Human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic Factors			Material Assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape		
			S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L			
RS Policy IMR1	Monitoring the RSS	Revocation	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+			

4.2.1 Likely Significant Effects

Revocation of the South East Plan will lead to a range of effects across the different SEA topics and over short, medium and long terms as identified in **Appendices D and E**.

A summary of the likely significant effects of revocation on the Core Regional policy areas and Sub-Regional Policy areas are presented below. Where relevant, reference is also made to the Regional Economic Strategy; however, given the duplication of policies and commitments between the two documents, it was considered appropriate to present the findings of the assessment using the broader range of policy issues presented in the South East Plan. The effects summarised below are for the absolute effects that will occur if the Regional Strategy were to be revoked (i.e. they are not presented as the marginal difference between retaining and revoking the Regional Strategy).

Core Spatial Strategy

Policies SP1–SP5 set out the core Spatial Strategy for the South East which is based on six spatial planning principles underpinning the plan. This includes: taking a co-ordinated approach to managing development and change; focusing new development on the South East's network of regional hubs; encouraging accessible mixed use development in the region's network of town centres; protection of the region's identified Green Belts; and supporting the vitality and character of the region's rural areas. Five policies based on the principles are presented for five Sub-Regions, 22 Regional Hubs, Urban Areas and Regeneration, Regeneration and Social Inclusion and Green Belts.

The assessment has revealed that revocation of the South East Plan core spatial policies would maintain the effects identified as a result of retention which are either positive or have no overall effect for all the SEA topic areas.

The positive effects are significant across many of the SEA topics with focus on urban areas, regeneration and sub-regional areas resulting in significant positive effects or no overall effects across all SEA topics.

Whilst the NPPF is not regionally specific, it does seek to promote sustainable development as a core planning principle and to build a strong competitive economy. Local planning authorities are required through their Local Plans to set out a clear economic vision for their area which positively and proactively encourages economic growth and to identify priority areas for economic regeneration, infrastructure provision and environmental enhancement. This will help to regenerate deprived areas of the South East and to boost the economic performance of the region which will have significant positive effects on the population and human health following revocation of the policy for regeneration and social inclusion.

As the analysis of revocation of the sub-regional policies shows there will still be positive impacts if the policies for the sub regional areas are revoked because other measures will help including the NPPF and other national policy such as the UK Sustainable Development Strategy. The duty to co-operate as

set out in the NPPF will help in those areas where cross boundary working is required following revocation.

The NPPF requires developments which generate significant movement to be located where the need to travel can be minimised and use of sustainable transport modes can be maximised and states that transport solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion should be encouraged. Reduction in emissions to air resulting from more sustainable transport will have a significant positive impact on air quality, climate and human health. Measures which encourage walking and cycling will also have a positive impact on human health.

Revocation of the SP3 removes a specific regional target for use of brownfield land. Whilst the NPPF does reference and require preferential use of brownfield land there is no specific target for use of brownfield land. Local planning authorities may set local targets; however, the removal of the specific target could reduce the amount of brownfield land reused for development and lead to an increase in development on greenfield sites. However, the stock of previously developed land (PDL) suitable for housing is the largest of any region and the high proportion of development on PDL (78% in 2008) is likely to continue.

Revocation of Green Belt policy SP5 is likely to result in the same significant positive effects as retention for biodiversity/flora/fauna, population health and landscape; however, that pressure for review of boundaries will be reduced following revocation. The policy identified that the existing extent of Green Belt in region is appropriate and will be retained. Following revocation, local planning authorities will follow the policy set out in their own Local Plan and the NPPF. Section 9 of the NPPF seeks to protect the Green Belt and establishes that the fundamental aim of the Green Belt is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. The NPPF states that once Green Belts have been defined '*local authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the green belt, such as looking for opportunities to provide access; to provide opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation; to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity, or to improve damaged and derelict land.*' Policy SP5 also outlined that selective reviews of the Green Belt would be required to allow development in sustainable locations, with the Metropolitan Green Belt to the north east of Guildford and the Oxford Green Belt to the south of the City identified. However, following a high court challenge, a Green Belt review for Guildford has been ruled out and this part of the SP5 was deleted (see section 2.3.2 and Appendix A). There is no mention in the Oxford City Core Strategy (adopted 2011) of a selective review of Green Belt boundaries on the southern edge of Oxford (this accords with the concession made in relation to the challenge to this policy). The South Oxfordshire Local Plan (adopted 2011) includes a policy (GB1) setting out the boundaries to the Green Belt and not anticipating any change. In consequence, it is concluded that revocation of the South East Plan is likely to lead to a lessening of the pressure on the Oxford Green Belt to the south of the city compared to retention as the presence of the RS policy would remain a consideration in any future reviews of the either the Oxford Core Strategy or South Oxfordshire Local Plan.

The assessment has not identified any areas where revocation of those policies which make up the Core Spatial Strategy would have any negative effects - either minor or significant.

Cross Cutting Policies

Policies CC1-CC7 set out a series of cross cutting policies that underpin the whole Plan. They cover a range of generic topics including sustainable development, climate change, sustainable communities, resource use, sustainable design/construction, supporting an ageing population, and infrastructure including green infrastructure.

The assessment has identified that revocation of the South East Plan's Cross Cutting policies would bring the same effects as retention with those effects being either neutral or positive, and significantly positive for many of the SEA topics. The assessment has not identified any negative effects.

Several of these policies relate directly to sustainable development (CC1, CC4, CC6) and reference the UK Sustainable Development Strategy: *Securing the Future*. This is given equally strong emphasis in the NPPF. As the NPPF makes clear, the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. The NPPF makes specific reference to the five 'guiding principles' of sustainable development (taken from the UK Sustainable Development Strategy: *Securing the Future*). Each of the elements contributing to the creation of sustainable, inclusive and mixed communities are reflected in the NPPF, particularly in the core planning principles but also in more detail in specific policies.

The assessment has also identified significant positive effects under climatic factors and material assets for sustainable design and construction - the NPPF promotes the use of the Code for Sustainable Homes which sets a national standard for the sustainable design and construction of new homes. The code aims to reduce carbon emissions and helps ensure that new homes are more sustainable. There are also local level planning documents for a number of the local authorities across the South East, such as Supplementary Planning Documents which have specific standards for sustainable design and construction.

The revocation of the policy on climate change (CC2) would bring positive effects due to the strong emphasis given to climate change in the NPPF. 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. In addition the NPPF states that local planning authorities should adopt proactive strategies to mitigate and adapt to climate change. There is legislation and policy, for example the EU Renewables Directive and the Code for Sustainable Homes which will help to reduce carbon emissions and have positive impacts on climate change. The UK Carbon Plan (2011) will also have a positive impact on carbon reduction whilst bringing other associated environmental benefits. The revocation of this policy would not remove the requirement for Local Plans to be consistent with legal and national policy requirements on climate change including supporting the move to a low carbon future and avoiding increased vulnerability to the range of impacts arising from climate change. There should therefore be the same positive effects on climatic factors as with retention of the policy.

Significant positive effects are identified in the assessment for revocation of the Supporting Ageing Population Policy (CC5). The policy is reflected in the NPPF in a number of areas. For example the

NPPF seeks to deliver a wide choice of high quality homes and to plan for a mix of housing based on current and future demographic trends and the needs of different groups. This will undoubtedly involve catering for the elderly given the ageing population of the South East. The NPPF also seeks to promote healthy communities, to deliver social, recreational and cultural facilities the community needs and to protect existing sports and recreation facilities.

Revocation of the policy on infrastructure and implementation (CC7) would bring significant positive effects under population/health but for all other areas there would be uncertainties. Local planning authorities are required through the NPPF to take into consideration in drawing up Local Plans the need to identify areas for infrastructure provision and environmental enhancement. Identifying areas for infrastructure provision will help with economic growth which will boost the economic performance of the South East and have significant positive effects on population and human health. The NPPF states that planning policies should avoid the long term protection of sites for employment where there is no reasonable prospect of the site being used for that purpose and that land allocations should be regularly reviewed. If a site cannot reasonably be expected to be developed for economic uses other uses for the site should be considered on their merits. This flexible approach may allow undeveloped sites to be brought forward for development for infrastructure provision, which would have positive impacts for population and human health. However, given that there are uncertainties over the location and scale of infrastructure that would be needed, the consequential environmental effects are also uncertain.

The assessment has revealed that revocation of the policy on green infrastructure (CC8) would bring significant positive benefits for many SEA topics due to the emphasis in the NPPF which seeks to conserve and enhance the natural and local environment. Paragraph 114 of the NPPF states that local planning authorities should “*set out a strategic approach in their Local Plans, planning positively for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure*”. The NPPF notes that planning for green infrastructure can be a suitable adaptation measure to managing risks, including flood risks, arising when new development is brought forward in areas vulnerable to climate change impacts.

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. Such partnerships will be able to work across administrative boundaries enable planning of networks at the scale that has the most impact.

The NPPF seeks to minimise impacts on biodiversity and geodiversity and to combat the adverse impacts of climate change. At an overarching level, sustainable development is at the heart of the NPPF and together with efforts to conserve and enhance the local/natural environment and to plan positively for green infrastructure, there will be significant positive effects for many of the SEA subject areas following revocation of the policy for green infrastructure

Sustainable Economic development

Policies RE1-RE7 set out the South East Plan's policies for economic development. The policies aim to support the Regional Economic Strategy's 2006-2016 vision to be a world class region achieving sustainable prosperity.

The assessment has identified that under revocation the significant positive effects (also identified under retention) on population and health through improved job opportunities and other socio economic benefits would continue to be experienced. The negative effects of development identified under retention will also be experienced following revocation

One of the core planning principles identified in the NPPF is that planning should drive and support sustainable economic development to deliver the homes, businesses, industrial units, infrastructure and thriving local places that the country needs. In consequence, with revocation of the South East Plan, the strong emphasis on supporting economic development and the significant positive effects accruing would continue under the NPPF and be cascaded through Local Plans and through implementing the duty to co-operate where cross boundary approaches are required.

Although the regional development agency (SEEDA) has been abolished many of its functions have been transferred to successor bodies. These have included inward investment activities (now managed by PA Consulting, industry partner for UK Trade and Industry) and management of the European Regional Development Fund (now undertaken by Department for Communities and Local Government). In addition SEEDA has transferred economic intelligence resources to South East England Councils (SEEC). Seven Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEP) have been established with the objective of enabling strategic business growth in the region. Several of these comment specifically on strategic sectors. In addition three Enterprise Zones have been established in the region: Discovery Park (Sandwich); Science Vale (Harwell, Oxford); and Solent Enterprise Zone (Gosport). These are hubs for specialist high technology development in the region.

In revising Local Plans, local planning authorities will need to ensure policies are in accordance with the NPPF. One of the key planning principles set out in the NPPF is to proactively drive and support sustainable economic development to deliver the homes, business and industrial units, infrastructure and thriving local places that the country needs. The NPPF seeks to ensure that Local Plans are based on adequate, up-to-date and relevant evidence about the economic characteristics and prospects of the area. In addition local authorities are required to co-operate across administrative boundaries on planning issues.

The framework provided by the NPPF policies, together with the duty to co-operate across administrative boundaries mean that under revocation local authorities should continue to support growth in the type of development identified in the South East Plan. Investment has already been committed to initiate hubs in the region. Thus the likely effects (positive and negative) associated with retention would also be likely following revocation.

This policy on the provision of land for employment has been examined in all adopted Local Plans and/or core strategies in the South East region. This analysis shows that the indicative targets for net growth in jobs are reflected in the 21 Local Plans or core strategies adopted after the adoption of the South East Plan, or just before the South East Plan was adopted. These plans and core strategies also contain policies that allocate land for employment and, in some cases, set out details of allocations of floor space for buildings required for different types of employment. In the short term, (i.e. including day one of revocation of the Regional Strategy) there will be no impact of removing the South East policy in these authorities. The other 47 authorities are at varying stages in the preparation of updated plans. The majority allocate land for employment although there may be no link to the number of jobs they are intended to support. For these authorities the short and medium term impact is more difficult to determine.

Revocation will not be likely to affect the ongoing delivery of employment land, although there is likely to be a temporary (short/medium term) period whilst those 47 authorities without an updated and adopted plan, develop a Local Plan which takes into account the NPPF.

The NPPF requires local planning authorities to set out a clear economic vision and strategy for their area and to set criteria, or identify sites, for local and inward investment to match the strategy and meet anticipated needs. In addition, planning authorities should avoid the long term protection of sites allocated for employment use where there is no reasonable prospect of a site being used for that purpose.

One of the key planning principles set out in the NPPF is to proactively drive and support sustainable economic development to deliver the homes, business and industrial units, infrastructure and thriving local places that the country needs. This is likely to provide similar significant benefits as retention of the South East of England Plan in the longer term.

The provision of new employment development is likely to have negative effects on many of the environmental topics due to the impacts of new building including building on previously undeveloped land. The demand for construction materials and energy is also likely to increase as is traffic in the region and the amount of waste generated. There are likely to be negative effects on most of the SEA topics with significant negative effects in relation to material assets and water (the same effects have been identified for retention). A key issue relating to water resources is the ability to continue to supply existing developments and deal with forecast growth including economic development without having adverse effects on the environment. The Environment Agency predicts that in the future, the conflicting demands for water resources between agriculture, an increasing population, and the environment will increase as climate change makes the region even drier, increasing demand on reducing supplies. Measures to address these negative effects and to meet the challenges of effective water supply and water management in the region as a result of growth will be provided in part through the work of the water companies in the region. Further mitigation in the form of initiatives such as the Code for Sustainable Homes, and the NPPF requirement for local authorities to develop proactive strategies to mitigate the effects of climate change should be beneficial in this regard.

The revocation of the policies RE1-RE7 is unlikely to affect the need for local authorities to continue to provide for employment growth within the region. Providing for development and employment opportunities are expected to have significant positive effects on population and health although there will be negative effects arising through new construction and development including development on previously undeveloped land. Adverse effects arising from development will be subject to the mitigation measures set out in the NPPF and the provisions in an authority's own Local Plan.

Housing

Policies H1-H5 set out the South East's Plan for housing. The policies seek to allocate sufficient land to facilitate the delivery of 654,000²³ net additional dwellings between 2006 and 2026 including a substantial increase in the amount of affordable housing. In addition the policies seek to raise the quality of new housing and make better use of the existing stock.

The assessment has identified that under revocation (as with retention) there would be significant positive effects on population and human health arising from the revocation of the South East of England Plan as a result of an anticipated increase in housing development over the long term (above current completion rates) where more people are housed with ensuing socio-economic benefits and benefits to health.

Revocation of the South East Plan will not remove the need for more houses within the South East region. It is Government policy to boost significantly the supply of new housing, for example through initiatives such as the Community Infrastructure Levy, New Homes Bonus and the local retention of business rates, which are intended to encourage a more positive attitude to growth and allow communities to share the benefits and mitigate the negative effects of growth. Current housing completion rates have clearly diverged from those anticipated in the annual targets contained in the Plan. Whilst the South East saw the largest number of new build homes completed in the 12 months to March 2012 with 22,240²⁴ (or 19 per cent of all completions in England), this figure compares to policy H1 which had a net annual average provision of 32,700.

The NPPF sets out a policy approach to boost significantly the supply of housing. Paragraph 47 states that local planning authorities should use their evidence base to ensure that their Local Plans meet 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. Paragraph 159 of the NPPF states that local planning authorities should have a clear understanding of housing needs in their area.

Provision of an increased level of affordable housing is also a theme within the Regional Economic Strategy (RES). One of the key objectives of the RES is 'Smart Growth' and the physical development

²³ 8,440 additional dwellings allocated to Guildford were struck out following a successful High Court challenge; however, the total number of net additional dwellings in the South East Plan remained unchanged

²⁴ CLG May 2012, House Building: March Quarter 2012, England

required to support this objective include ensuring ‘... sufficient and affordable housing and employment space of the right type and size to meet the needs of the region and support its competitiveness....’

The assessment has identified that revocation of the policy on affordable housing²⁵ is likely to result in the same significant long term positive effects as retention on population/human health due to the emphasis on the provision of affordable housing in the NPPF. Whilst it is noted that revocation removes the regional targets for social rented accommodation and intermediate affordable housing, the NPPF requires that Local Plans meet ‘*the full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing in the housing market area*’ (para 47). The NPPF also seeks to deliver a ‘*wide choice of high quality homes and to plan for a mix of housing based on current and future demographic trends... and the needs of different groups in the community such as older people*’ (para. 50). The regional target (and subregional targets) have been reflected in the 21 Local Plans or core strategies adopted after the adoption of the South East Plan, or just before the South East Plan was adopted. However, the other 47 authorities who are at varying stages in the preparation of updated plans are less likely to have a quantitative target or a clear current picture of local housing need. For these authorities, the short and medium term impact on the total number of affordable homes is more difficult to determine, although it is AMEC’s opinion that in the interim period until updated plans are in place, the uncertainty over local planning policy and its effect on development applications is likely to lead to fewer affordable houses being completed.

The NPPF also seeks to ensure that housing provided reflects local demand and takes into consideration of future demand for housing. This will undoubtedly involve catering for the elderly given the ageing population of the South East.

Providing for future housing needs in the region will involve substantial new areas of development and whilst the NPPF encourages local authorities to make effective use of land by re-using land that is previously developed, there will still need to be significant development on greenfield sites. This seems, on balance, more likely to occur given long term demand for housing and the removal of the brownfield target (policy SP3). In consequence, the assessment has indicated that this new development would be likely to have negative effects on a number of SEA topics (biodiversity/flora/fauna, soils, water, air, climatic factors, material assets, landscape) although there will be uncertainties as the scale and location of development is unknown. It is on water and material assets that the negative effects are identified as being significant (as with retention). Measures to address the negative effects on water and to meet the challenges of effective water supply and water management in the region will be provided in part through the work of the water companies in the region. Further mitigation in the form of initiatives such as the Code for Sustainable Homes, and the NPPF requirement for local authorities to develop proactive strategies to mitigate the effects of climate change should be beneficial in this regard.

The effects of revocation will be uncertain in the short and medium terms in those local authorities that do not have a plan that was in general conformity with the South East Plan. For those authorities without

²⁵ In 2010-11 year, 9,280 affordable homes were provided in the South East, approximately 48% of the total 19,360 houses completed in the South East in that period.

an adopted plan, the South East 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 whilst some of the 47 local authorities update their plans, and in the interim make planning decisions based on policies that may not be fully reflective of current local needs. In consequence, the amount of development anticipated in this period may be lower than if the Regional Strategy were in place. This will mean that the negative effects associated with development (on biodiversity, water, air, material assets etc) will be lessened as would the beneficial effects (on population). The application of the NPPFs presumption in favour of sustainable development and its policies to boost the supply of housing will help where plans or policies are absent, silent or out of date.

Policy H4 of the South East Plan requires local authorities to identify the full range of existing and future housing needs required in their areas and to work with local authorities where appropriate and includes consideration of gypsies and travellers. Of the total 68 local authorities in the South East, 11 have Local Plans which do not make any provision for gypsies and travellers; although in the case of 2, submission Core Strategies do propose pitches although are yet to be adopted. Following revocation of this policy, local authorities will follow the Government's planning policy for traveller sites which is to be read alongside the NPPF and provides the policy framework for these sites. The assessment has revealed that, as with housing more generally, there will be significant positive effects on population and human health as the NPPF requires local authorities to '*plan for a mix of housing based on current and future demographic trends, market trends and the needs of different groups in the community*'; however, for the 11 authorities without specific policies, there may be a delay in the short and medium term whilst policies are updated in line with the NPPF and the planning policy for Traveller sites.

The assessment has shown that the revocation of policies H1-H5 will result in significant benefits for population and human health although there will be negative effects on environmental factors as a result of new housing development including development on previously undeveloped land.

Transport

Policies T1-T14 set out the Regional Transport Strategy (RTS) for the South East of England through to 2026. Faced with an increase in overall travel per person since 2004 including an increase in travel by car, the RTS identifies the need to re-balance the transport system in favour of sustainable modes whilst accepting that it is unrealistic to achieve an overall reduction in traffic. The RTS policies seek to integrate spatial planning and transportation at the regional level through a variety of measures specifically identified in the policies.

The assessment identifies positive effects of revocation on population/health, air and climatic factors due to improved air quality and reduced potential for reduced greenhouse gas emissions arising from the emphasis on sustainable transport modes. These effects are significant for population and health in a number of cases.

These positive effects reflect the NPPF's policy approach which promotes sustainable transport.²⁶ The NPPF seeks to 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. The NPPF recognises the important role that transport plays in facilitating sustainable development and in contributing to wider sustainability and health objectives. It encourages solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion. Local authorities are also encouraged to work with neighbouring authorities and transport providers to develop strategies for the provision of viable infrastructure to support sustainable developments.

In preparing Local Plans, local planning authorities should support a pattern of development which, where reasonable to do so, facilitates the use of sustainable modes of transport. The NPPF requires local authorities to '*work with neighbouring authorities and transport providers to develop strategies for the provision of viable infrastructure necessary to support sustainable development*'. The NPPF also requires that plans and decisions should ensure developments that generate significant movements are located where the need to travel will be minimised and use of sustainable modes of transport can be maximised. This will also have positive impacts on air and climatic factors.

Many of the effects of the transport policies will depend on the ability to change travel behaviour and the demand for transport - the extent that these will be achieved is unknown and hence there will be uncertainty over the impacts. However, it is noted that there is a requirement for policies and proposals to include measures to mitigate environmental impacts of transport, and where possible, to enhance the environment and communities through such interventions. Several policies deal with new transport infrastructure provision including ports, rail, and inter modal interchanges; in addition the RTS sets out transport investment and management priorities and states that regional partners need to work together to produce an implementation for delivery.

It is assumed that local planning and transport authorities will operate under the duty to co-operate to deliver positive outcomes. The Highways Agency will continue to have responsibility for motorways and trunk roads and County Highway authorities and Unitary Authorities will exercise their transport responsibilities in liaison with local authorities and LEPs where appropriate.

With the exception of the policy on airports, other effects through revocation will be largely neutral, or uncertain due to the uncertainty over location of particular elements of transport infrastructure.

In relation to airports and following revocation, future development will continue to be driven by evolving national aviation policy/strategy which is still as set out in the 2003 Aviation White Paper (until it is replaced). The assessment has revealed that revocation of the regional policy for airports is likely to result in similar environmental effects to retention. Whilst the policy provides for increase in airport capacity leading to increased regional connectivity, increased business activity, and provision of direct

²⁶ The NPPF defines sustainable transport modes 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'. (page 57, Annex 2 Glossary to the NPPF)

and indirect employment (all bringing positive effects on population/health), it does also increase the likelihood that there will be negative effects on communities living close to airports. These negative effects could include potential increases in nuisance from noise and emissions due to increases in both air and ground traffic. These could have significant negative effects on air and climatic factors. There would also be negative effects on material assets from construction of airport infrastructure, and on water quality from run-off.

For the transport policies overall, the assessment has shown that revocation will maintain the significant positive effects for population and health, air and climatic factors due to improved air quality and reduced potential for greenhouse gas emissions arising from the emphasis on sustainable transport modes encouraged in the NPPF. There will, however, be significant negative effects on air and climatic factors resulting from increased airport developments which will also be retained following revocation.

Natural Resource Management

Policies NRM1-NRM14 set out the South East Plan's policies for sustainable natural resource management which is a key theme of the plan. The policies aim to ensure mitigation of climate change impacts, greater efficiency in the use of natural resources, the reduction of pollution and waste and ensure that features of importance are protected and enhanced including wildlife and landscapes.

The assessment has identified for many of the policies across the SEA topics that the effects of revocation will be positive or neutral with some of the effects being significantly positive.

Effects on biodiversity/flora/fauna, population/human health and water will be significantly positive following revocation of the policy for Sustainable Water Resources and Ground Water Quality (NRM1) and neutral on all other factors. Effects of revocation of other policies related to water (NRM2, 3 and 4) will be positive, neutral or uncertain. Water company Water Resource Management Plans 2010-2035 will set out how water companies aim to ensure there will be sufficient water to meet potable demand without environmental consequences during the South East Plan period. Water companies have therefore already considered future supply and demand in terms of planning water consumption for the region in their approved and emerging plans. This along with the duty to co-operate, NPPF policies relating to planning strategically across local boundaries will mean that local authorities should continue to plan for and address water infrastructure implications of development through policies in their Local Plans, reflecting local circumstances and priorities and to actively engage with interested parties.

In making provision for future growth in the demand for water resources, water companies need to consider the role and broad location of large scale infrastructure such as reservoirs (e.g. Havant Thicket, Hampshire or the Upper Thames reservoir, Oxfordshire that are identified in policy NRM3). Such infrastructure requirements will be considered by water companies in the current 2014 water resource management planning process; however, if such an infrastructure option is identified as the preferred one and subsequently adopted in the final Water Resource Management Plan, the likely substantial local effects (such as land take, soil loss, material use, resource sterilisation and landscape changes) will need to be considered as part of any individual planning application, consistent with Local Plan policies and

may well be subject to statutory environmental assessments. Water companies have an opportunity to work with local authorities on water infrastructure implications as part of Local Plan preparation (as evidenced for Portsmouth Water and Havant Borough Council by the inclusion of Havant Thicket Reservoir as a strategic site under policy CS19 of the Havant Core Strategy, adopted 2012).

River Basin Management Plans for the region identify the pressures that the water environment faces and include action plans requiring cross boundary and input from a range of organisations. Local authorities can be expected to continue to work together on cross boundary strategic issues where they need to do so. The Code for Sustainable Homes encourages higher levels of water efficiency. Local authorities can require housing developments in their area to meet specified Code levels, however, development will continue and there will continue to be the potential for significant negative effects on water resources and natural habitats.

The assessment has also identified that there will be significant positive effects on biodiversity/flora/fauna and landscape following revocation of those policies dealing with biodiversity (NRM5), Thames Basin Heaths SPA (NRM6), woodlands (NRM7) and Coastal Management (NRM8). These are the same effects as under retention. The NPPF makes clear that the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural environment, including by protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, minimising impacts on biodiversity and providing net gains in biodiversity where possible. The Framework underlines that pursuing sustainable development means moving from a net loss of biodiversity to achieving net gains for nature. This means that local planning policies should 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. In particular NPPF section 11 on conserving and enhancing the natural environment, and paragraphs 109 to 119 are particularly relevant as are NPPF policies relating to green infrastructure and planning for climate change to mitigate the effects on biodiversity. The NPPF also makes clear that planning permission should be refused for development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats, including ancient woodland and the loss of aged or veteran trees found outside ancient woodland, unless the need for, and benefits of, the development in that location clearly outweigh the loss.

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.

The duty to co-operate, NPPF and Local Nature Partnerships mean that local authorities should continue to ensure that land uses are mutually consistent, and deliver the most sustainable and effective development for their areas.

In relation to coastal areas the NPPF sets out how local planning authorities should reduce risk from coastal change and apply Integrated Coastal Zone Management across local authority and land/sea boundaries. Through their Local Plans, local planning authorities should identify Coastal Change

Management Areas and be clear as to what development is appropriate in such areas, and in what circumstances; and make provision for development and infrastructure that needs to be relocated away from these areas. In addition the NPPF provides for the maintenance of the character of the undeveloped coast, protecting and enhancing its distinctive landscapes, particularly in areas defined as Heritage Coast, and seeks improvement to public access to and enjoyment of the coast.

Overall given the policy framework in the NPPF and commitments 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 it is concluded that revocation will leave a strong policy framework in place covering all of the natural resource management policies resulting in positive effects across all policy areas.

Waste

Policies W1-W18 set out the South East Plan's policies for managing the growing amount of waste in the Region recognising that a new approach is needed reflecting the waste hierarchy and the long term aspiration of 'zero waste'. The Plan's policies present a shift in emphasis to achieve this resource management approach.

The NPPF does not have specific waste policies as national waste planning policy is to be published as part of the National Waste Management Plan for England - until this is published the Waste Planning Policy Statement will remain in place. However there are many policies in the NPPF which are relevant to the preparation of waste plans and should therefore be taken into account. Also the NPPF states that 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.

The assessment has revealed that following revocation there will be minor positive or neutral effects across many of the SEA policy areas. Significant positive effects for population and human health are likely in relation to sustainable design/construction (W2) and targets for diversion from landfill (W5). The reduction in the disposal to landfill will have positive effects on water (less risk of water contamination), air (reduced methane), climatic factors (less greenhouse gas emissions) and material assets. Significant positive effects across many of the SEA topic areas result from the revocation of the policy on restoration (W14) - there is significant potential for environmental benefits due to increased biodiversity, reinstatement of soil, ceasing of transport activities and landscape features. These are all the same effects as under retention.

The assessment identifies negative effects on biodiversity, soils, air and landscape for the revocation of policies for 'Other recovery and diversion technologies' (W12) and 'Landfill requirements' (Policy W13). These are the same effects as under retention.

Minerals

Policies M1-M5 set out the South East Plan's policies for minerals which seek to meet identified and justified needs for mineral supply in the region by making significantly more efficient use of natural

resources with reduced overall environmental impact - this natural resource management approach mirrors the plan's approach to waste management.

The NPPF sets out a policy framework to support a sufficient supply of materials to provide for the infrastructure, buildings, energy and goods that the country needs. It provides guidelines for facilitating the sustainable use of minerals. Whilst acknowledging that minerals are essential to support sustainable economic growth, it states the importance of making best use of them to secure their long-term conservation. In addition the NPPF provides strong protection for the natural and historic environment, human health and important landscapes.

The NPPF sets out national policy for aggregates. It requires each minerals planning authority to prepare a local aggregate based 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 achieve provision of a steady and adequate supply of minerals in a sustainable manner.

There are 17 mineral and waste authorities, excluding the South Downs National Park Authority which has yet to adopt its own local minerals and waste policies. Some authorities are working together to prepare minerals and waste policies under a single plan or core strategy, others are working individually and have separate minerals and waste policies, and one authority includes minerals and waste policies form part of its wider Core Strategy. Of the 15 mineral and waste plans, 2 are consistent with the policies set out within the South East Plan since they were published in or after May 2009, or shortly beforehand, and 13 were adopted prior to May 2009 and therefore not necessarily consistent with the regional plan. In addition a revision of policy M3 was nearly complete, which proposed lower aggregate apportionment levels for each mineral planning authority. Uncertainty remains therefore on the extent to which individual Mineral Planning Authorities (MPAs) aim to implement the specific targets set in the South East Plan.

Excavation of primary aggregates from terrestrial sources will have an adverse impact on biodiversity, soil and landscape, and may have an adverse impact on cultural heritage, dependent on the relative location of areas of historic/archaeological interest. The national policy context is for increased use of secondary and recycled aggregates and this will result in a positive impact on material assets in the longer term.

Against this background the assessment has shown that revocation of the NPF will produce similar results to retention. There are positive effects across many policy areas due to the sustainable approach to minerals provided through the NPPF outlined above - those effects are significant in a number of SEA topic areas.

Countryside and Landscape Management

Policies C1-C7 set out the South East Plan's policies for countryside and landscape management including specific policies for national parks, AONBs and the River Thames corridor.

The assessment has identified that revocation would lead to continued positive or neutral effects across most of the SEA topics with those effects being significant in relation to population/health, cultural heritage and landscape for revocation of National Park and AONB policies. Following revocation, national legislative protection for national parks and AONBs would continue. Furthermore and in relation to all of the countryside and landscape management policies, the NPPF would continue to provide effective safeguards and an effective policy framework. For example, one of the core planning principles in the NPPF is to contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment. The effectiveness of countryside and landscape management following revocation would require local authorities to work together such as in the Thames Corridor - the duty to co-operate would provide the basis for such joint work to take place.

Management of the Built Environment

Policies BE1-BE6 set out the South East Plan's policies for the built environment including policies for an urban renaissance as well as for neighbourhood management, suburbs and small market towns.

The assessment has identified that the effects following revocation are positive or neutral across most of the SEA topic areas. This is due to the strong support to urban areas given by the NPPF. For example, achieving high quality design and a good standard of amenity is one of the core planning principles identified in the NPPF. Supporting this principle, section 7 of the NPPF is devoted to 'good design' and, taken in conjunction with other policies in the NPPF should minimise the potential adverse effects of development.

The effects of revocation of the policy for management of the historic environment (BE6) are significantly positive in relation to the cultural heritage topic. Alongside the legislative protection that will continue for the region's internationally and nationally designated historic assets, the NPPF sets out the policy framework for conservation and enhancement of the historic environment. It states that local planning authorities should set out in their Local Plans a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment, including heritage assets most at risk through neglect, decay or other threats.

Town Centres

Policies TC1-TC3 set out the South East Plan's policies for city and town centres covering business, residential, leisure, culture, arts, tourism and retail. The policies identify a strategic network of town centres and a policy framework for development within them; in addition there is a policy for out-of-centre shopping.

The assessment as identified that revocation will result in continued significant positive effects for population/health arising from a variety of factors including from new housing and employment provision.

The NPPF places great emphasis on town centres stating that planning policies in Local Plans should be positive, promote competitive town centre environments and set out policies for their management and growth.

However, the assessment has identified areas of uncertainty and minor negative effects as a result of the potential impacts of new development and urban intensification the locations of which are unknown.

Tourism and related sports and recreation

Policies TRS1- TRS7 set out the South East Plan's policies for tourism and related sports and recreation. The plan recognises the region's role as the largest tourism market in the UK as well as the significant untapped tourism potential. The policies seek to provide for tourism growth to be managed in a sustainable way.

The assessment has identified that revocation will lead to continued positive effects for population/health with those effects being significant for rural tourism. This is due to the support to tourism given by the Government's Tourism Policy March 2011 which sets out the importance of this industry to the UK and the support given to tourism in the NPPF. The NPPF states that LPAs should allocate a range of suitable sites to meet tourism needs and also refers specifically to the important role of tourism in rural areas. Also LEPs and Local Tourism bodies have key roles in promoting tourism in the region. These factors along with the implementation of the duty to co-operate, will mean that local authorities should continue achieve the positive effects of tourism following revocation of the Regional Strategy.

While the encouragement of visitor numbers to the coast through diversification has significant positive benefits for the economy and population and human health there is the potential that increased visitor numbers will have minor negative or uncertain environmental effects, especially through increased transport (air quality and climatic factors) pollution and waste generation. These effects are identified in the assessment and apply to retention as well as revocation.

The assessment has identified that many of the effects of revocation are uncertain as the scale and location of increased tourism pressures and development are unknown – this applies to retention as well as revocation.

Social and Community Infrastructure

Policies S1-S6 set out the South East Plan's policies for social and community infrastructure. These policies are aimed at facilitating the development of health, education, cultural and leisure amenities necessary to meet the needs of a growing population.

The assessment has identified that there will be continued significant positive effects on population and human health following revocation of those policies relating to health services (S2), education and skills (S3) and higher and further education (S4). Effects across the other factors and for other policies are largely neutral or uncertain and are the same for retention and revocation.

The significant positive effects following revocation reflect the core planning principle within the NPPF that planning 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’. This is supported by section 8 (Promoting healthy communities) and section 4 (Promoting sustainable transport). The NPPF also requires that local planning authorities should work with public health leads and health organisations to understand and take account of the health status and needs of the local population including needs for sport and recreation. Implementation of the NPPF, in combination with other government guidance and strategy relating to healthy communities, would have the same positive impact on human health as would be achieved by the South East Plan’s policies S1-S6.

South Hampshire sub-region

Policies SH1-SH9 set out the South East Plan’s policies for the South Hampshire sub-region. The policies state that development in South Hampshire will be led by sustainable economic growth and urban regeneration. Portsmouth and Southampton will be dual focuses for investment and development as employment, retail, entertainment, higher education and cultural centres for the sub-region. The other towns will play a complementary role serving their more local areas.

The assessment has identified that revocation will lead to significant positive environmental effects for population and human health for all of the policies apart from one relating to implementation which is neutral. The positive effects are due to the benefits arising from new housing and economic opportunities as well as sustainable transport measures which will continue following revocation within the policy framework set by the NPPF.

Revocation of these policies will not remove the need for more houses and other development within the sub-region. Indeed it is Government policy to boost significantly the supply of housing, for example through initiatives such as the Community Infrastructure Levy, New Homes Bonus and the local retention of business rates. These measures are intended to encourage a more positive attitude to growth and allow communities to share the benefits and mitigate the negative effects of growth.

The sub-regional area covered by the South Hampshire policy includes a partnership of the unitary authorities of Portsmouth and Southampton; Hampshire County Council and district authorities of Eastleigh, East Hampshire, Fareham, Gosport, Havant, Test Valley and Winchester. The partnership (PUSH) has evolved to deliver a shared vision of a more prosperous and sustainable South Hampshire. This includes policies on growth, housing and affordable housing, broadly consistent with the Regional Strategy policies (SH1 – SH9). For example, the key sub-regional policy principles relating to affordable housing are reflected in a Common Affordable Housing Policy Framework²⁷ adopted for local authority members of the partnership. The Solent Local Economic Partnership (LEP) is taking forward setting the conditions for economic development in the sub-region. The LEP now includes the Isle of Wight. The LEP focus for growth remains in the Portsmouth and Southampton area.

²⁷ PUSH (2008), Common Affordable Housing Policy Framework, A Report to the the PUSH Joint Committee, 28th January 2008.

Given the presence of PUSH and the Solent LEP, over the long term, the scale of development in the sub-region is considered unlikely to change substantially in the absence of the Regional Strategy. However, current Local Plans are at variance with the overall commitment, albeit that some are yet to be adopted. In the short and medium term this may introduce some delays with associated delayed positive and negative effects.

Depending on the location of the development, given the change in policy in the NPPF on the priority to be given to the use of previously developed land, there could be less concentrated forms of development in urban centres and, where available, more greenfield development. The extent to which this would affect biodiversity, landscape and soil will depend on the eventual location, scale and nature of development.

Ultimately, the environmental effects will depend on the quantum of housing delivered across the sub-region, the location and other factors such as their design. Much of the NPPF seeks to mitigate as far as possible adverse effects on the environment.

The continued presence of PUSH, LEPs and other joint working under the duty to co-operate within the policy framework set by the NPPF will mean that the effects of revocation will be largely the same as retention.

Sussex Coast sub-region

Policies SCT1-SCT7 set out the South East Plan's policies for the Sussex Coast sub-region. The policies state that local authorities and other agencies should as a priority pro-actively pursue and promote the sustainable economic growth and regeneration of the Sussex Coast aiming to reduce intra-regional disparities and bring the performance of the sub-regional economy up to the South East average.

Revocation of the policies will not remove the need for growth or new homes in the sub-region. The assessment has identified significant positive effects on population/ health from the creation of employment opportunities and housing provided within the policy framework set by the NPPF. However there are also likely to be minor negative, neutral and uncertain effects on other environmental factors given the impacts of the new development some of which will be located in large urban extensions on greenfield land.

The effects of revocation are largely the same as retention although with more uncertainty and with benefits to population/health delayed until the medium and longer terms in some instances whilst revised Local Plan policies are put in place.

With revocation of the South East Plan, LEPs and other joint working under the duty to co-operate will provide a means of addressing cross boundary local authority issues to achieve the economic growth and regeneration being sought. For example the Coast to Capital and South East Local Enterprise Partnerships provide a locally and private sector supported approach to support economic development

and partnership working. The Coast to Capital LEP is based on a functional market economic area that goes across the regional (RSS) boundary with London.

East Kent and Ashford sub-region

Policies EK1-EK4 set out the South East Plan's policies for the East Kent and Ashford sub-region. The core strategy states that the sub region should exploit the potential for housing and businesses served by the Channel Tunnel Rail Link especially at Ashford and at other main centres.

Revocation of the policies will not remove the need for growth or new homes in the sub-region. The assessment has identified significant positive effects on population/ health from the creation of employment opportunities and housing provided within the policy framework set by the NPPF. However there are also likely to be minor negative, neutral and uncertain effects on other environmental factors given the impacts of new development some of which will be located in large urban extensions on greenfield land.

The effects of revocation are largely the same as retention although with more uncertainty and with benefits to population/health delayed until the medium and longer terms in some instances whilst new Local Plans are put in place. With revocation of the South East Plan, LEPs and other joint working under the duty to co-operate will provide a means of addressing cross boundary local authority issues to achieve the economic growth and regeneration being sought.

The assessment has identified that revocation of the policy for integrated coastal management and natural park (EKA7) would result in significant positive effects for biodiversity/flora/fauna, population/health and landscape - all as with retention. This is due to existing wildlife legislation which protects sites of national and international importance for wildlife as well as the implementation of the NPPF which contains policies on climate change, flooding and coastal change, and conserving and enhancing the natural environment.

Kent Thames Gateway

Policies KT1-KTG7 set out the South East Plan's policies for the Kent Thames Gateway sub-region. The sub region is seen as a national and regional priority for regeneration and growth with a focus on regeneration of large previously developed sites, improvement of a poor urban environment and stimulus to the economy.

The assessment has identified that the emphasis on economic development, increased standards of skills and education in the workforce and an increased supply of new housing including affordable housing will have significant positive impacts on the population. Protection of the Green Belt and the AONB will provide positive benefit to biodiversity and landscape although, if development outside previously developed land is required, this could have an adverse impact on biodiversity, soils and landscape. Establishment of high design standards, and improvement of existing urban areas, will

benefit cultural heritage and townscape. The residual impact on biodiversity, soils and landscape/townscape is uncertain.

As with any policy which promotes growth and development, there will be adverse effects on material assets resulting from the use of building materials, and greater pressure on waste management. Given the proposed scale of the growth there are potential significant negative effects associated with the demand for water. The policies include measures to encourage more sustainable travel including transfer of freight from road to rail and water. In view of the scale of development proposed adverse impacts on local air quality from vehicle emissions and on climate change are considered likely.

The Kent Thames Gateway Partnership has been established and comprises regional local authority and private sector representation. This partnership, together with the South East Local Economic Partnership (LEP) and other joint working under the duty to co-operate will take forward the conditions for economic development in the sub-region.

In the absence of the South East Plan there remains uncertainty regarding the extent to which individual authorities would seek to set levels of development which comply with the Plan. Overall, the scale of development in the sub-region is unlikely to change in the absence of the Regional Strategy although there may be uncertainty in the short term, in advance of the publication of Local Plans, and the confirmation of strategic policies. The effect of this would be to delay the significant positive benefits to the population and any adverse impacts associated with development. Impacts on biodiversity, soil, air quality, climate and landscape are uncertain in the medium/long term.

London Fringe

Policies LF1-LF10 set out the South East Plan's policies for the London Fringe sub-region. The policies seek to provide for development and infrastructure to support the sustainable economic growth of the sub region recognising its importance to the wider region and London whilst conserving and enhancing its environmental assets.

The assessment has identified that under revocation as with retention the emphasis on economic development and an increased supply of new housing including affordable housing will have significant positive effects on population/health. Protection of the Green Belt will provide positive benefits to biodiversity and landscape.

Concentration of development in existing areas will have the benefit of minimising adverse impacts on biodiversity, soil and landscape. Policy measures to enhance biodiversity and the quality of the built environment, together with the character of natural and cultural resources will have a positive impact on biodiversity, cultural heritage and landscape. Development involving new construction will have an adverse impact on mineral resources and material assets. Greater demand on water resources in urban areas will have an adverse impact on water, and may prejudice water quality.

The effects of revocation are largely the same as retention although with more uncertainty and with benefits to population/health delayed until the medium and longer terms in some instances whilst new

Local Plans are put in place. With revocation of the Plan, LEPs and other joint working under the duty to co-operate will provide a means of addressing cross boundary local authority issues to achieve the economic growth and development being sought whilst safeguarding the sub-region's environmental assets.

Western Corridor and Blackwater Valley

Policies WCBV1-WCBV5 set out the South East Plan's policies for the Western Corridor and Blackwater Valley. The policies state that local authorities will provide for development and infrastructure to sustain the economic growth of the sub-region. Regional and sub-regional hubs will be the main focus for transport investment and development in the sub-region.

The assessment has identified that with revocation (as with retention) there are likely to be significant positive effects on population/health from the creation of employment opportunities and new housing development. There are also significant positive effects on population/health from the revocation of the policies for the Blackwater Valley and Colne Valley Park due to the recreational, amenity and other benefits. However there are also likely to be minor negative, neutral and uncertain effects on other environmental factors given the impacts of new development some of which will be located in large urban extensions on greenfield land.

The Thames Valley Berkshire and Enterprise M3 Local Economic Partnerships are setting the conditions for economic development in the sub-region. This along with the duty to co-operate and NPPF policies will mean that local authorities should continue to ensure that land use policies are mutually consistent, and deliver the most sustainable and effective development for their area.

Growth is focused on four regional hubs: Basingstoke, High Wycombe, Reading and Slough with specific reference to the potential to provide for sustainable urban extensions. Ultimately, the environmental effects will depend on the quantum of housing delivered across the sub-region, the location and other factors such as their design. Much of the NPPF seeks to mitigate as far as possible adverse effects on the environment.

Central Oxfordshire

Policies CO1-CO5 set out the South East Plan's policies for the Central Oxfordshire sub-region. The policies set out to create new jobs and dwellings building on the sub-region's economic strengths in education, science and technology.

Housing development will be focused on four locations: Oxford, Bicester, Didcot, and Wantage and Grove. The policies anticipate that to deliver the level of growth would require sustainable urban extensions to a number of settlements including Oxford, Didcot and Grove and a selective review of the Oxford Green Belt. Although the conceded challenge on the green belt review (see page 21 and Appendix A) is likely to affect this, albeit that the terms of relief have not been agreed. It is now less certain, given the varying status of the relevant local authority plans, whether development will be

located in this way. However, revocation of the policy will not remove the need for new homes in the sub-region given the inherent strengths of the local economy, population projections and current housing affordability. With regard to the review of the Oxford Green Belt, there is no mention in the Oxford City Core Strategy (adopted 2011) of a selective review of Green Belt boundaries on the southern edge of Oxford (this accords with the concession made in relation to the challenge to this policy). The South Oxfordshire Local Plan (adopted 2011) includes a policy (GB1) setting out the boundaries to the Green Belt and not anticipating any change. In consequence, it is concluded that revocation of the South East Plan is likely to lead to a lessening of the pressure on the Oxford Green Belt to the south of the city compared to retention as the presence of the RS policy would be a consideration in any future reviews of the either the Oxford Core Strategy or South Oxfordshire Local Plan.

It is noted that revocation of the RS would not affect the proposal to retain the saved Structure Plan policy regarding the development of land at RAF Upper Heyford. This will safeguard the site and its heritage value in interim until the Proposed Submission draft Cherwell Local Plan (which includes reference to the conservation of the heritage interest of the site in policy 'Villages 5) is adopted.

The assessment has identified that with revocation (as with retention) there are likely to be significant positive effects on population/health from the creation of employment opportunities and new housing development. However there are also likely to be minor negative, neutral and uncertain effects on other environmental factors given the impacts of new development some of which will be located in large urban extensions on greenfield land. The effects of revocation are largely the same as retention although with more uncertainty and with benefits to population/health delayed until the medium and longer terms in some instances whilst new Local Plans are put in place.

Milton Keynes and Aylesbury Vale

Policies MKAV1-MKAV 4 set out the South East Plan's policies for Milton Keynes and Aylesbury Vale. The policies provide for housing expansion in the Milton Keynes Unitary Authority and Aylesbury Vale District.

The assessment has identified that with revocation (as with retention) there are likely to be significant positive effects on population/health from the creation of new housing and employment development. In the short to medium term following revocation, there is likelihood that the dwellings delivered will not meet the South East Plan's housing figures. As a consequence the beneficial impacts on the population will be lower than would be expected if the policy was implemented as would any negative effects arising from the development.

The proposed development would be likely to include areas of previously undeveloped land and green belt and would have an adverse impact on biodiversity, soils, landscape and cultural heritage. The use of construction materials would have an adverse impact on material assets. Generation of increased traffic would have an adverse impact on air quality and climate.

The extent of impacts on biodiversity, soil, cultural heritage and landscape will be governed, principally, by the extent of greenfield development. On the basis that this is unlikely to occur in the short term to medium term, the impact on these three aspects is considered to be neutral with longer term impacts are uncertain. The effects on water are assessed as significantly negative in the longer term although these are also noted for retention.

Within this sub-region the South East Midlands LEP is taking forward the delivery of sustainable development. Aylesbury Vale Advantage will merge into the LEP. The Milton Keynes Partnership Committee (MKPC) has been disbanded and the work carried out by Milton Keynes Partnership forms part of the Homes and Communities Agency's (HCA) Midlands area. The work of inward investment is carried out by Milton Keynes Council. Revised delivery mechanisms have therefore been established which would continue following revocation and the outcome would have similar effects to those envisaged in the South East Plan.

Gatwick

Policies GA1-GA3 set out the South East Plan's policies for the Gatwick sub-region. The policies set out the strategy to maximise opportunities arising from the Gatwick-Crawley area, recognising the need to maintain the importance of Gatwick Airport as an international gateway and the links between the sub-region and London and the South Coast. The strategy recognises the need to balance growth opportunities in an area containing significant environmental assets including the High Weald and South Downs AONBs.

The assessment has identified under revocation (as with retention) that there would be potential for significant positive effects on population from the creation of housing and employment opportunities. The assessment also identifies negative effects from these developments given that some of the development could be located on greenfield land leading to anticipated negative effects on biodiversity from land take. Also there would be negative effects from greater water resource and increased commuting along the principal road networks leading to increased emissions.

The policies anticipate that to deliver the level of growth there would need to be sustainable urban extensions for Crawley, Horsham, East Grinstead and Burgess Hill. It is now less certain, given the varying status of the relevant local authority plans whether development will be located in this way. However, revocation of the policies will not remove the need for new homes in the sub-region given the inherent strengths of the local economy, population projections and current housing affordability. At present, the quantum of development is lower than that envisaged in the South East Plan. Until all local authorities have adopted up to date NPPF compliant Local Plans the effects in the short and medium term will be lessened. In the long term, there will be potential significant effects on population as development proceeds in line with local community aspirations.

Isle of Wight and Areas outside the sub regions

Policies IW1-IW5 set out the policies for areas of the south east region not covered by the nine identified sub-regions together with the Isle of Wight. The policies provide for the economic regeneration and additional housing in the Isle of Wight as well as housing development in other areas as well.

The assessment has identified that with revocation (as with retention) there are likely to be significant positive effects on population/health from the creation of employment opportunities and new housing development. New housing and employment developments will involve use of construction materials which will have an adverse impact on material assets. Also, additional development would be likely to increase traffic movements which would increase emissions to air and have a negative impact on air quality and climate.

The level of water stress on the Isle of Wight is defined as 'serious' by the Environment Agency, the highest category of designation. Additional housing and employment development would have significant negative effects on water in the medium to long term which is also noted for retention.

4.2.2 Other Effects

The effects of revocation of the Regional Strategy have been presented in Appendix D and summarised above in relation to the issues identified in the EU Directive (Annex 1). Where other potential effects have been identified these are referred to in Appendix D.

4.2.3 Proposed Mitigation Measures

A number of mitigation measures have been identified in the detailed assessment in Appendix D.

Mitigation of the effects will be diverse and may need to be specific sub-regionally. For example, in planning for water provision as part of new development, there may be greater reliance on Water Resource Management Plans and co-operation between interested parties. Similarly, for issues such as biodiversity, continued co-operation and resources could be required to achieve similar commitments to that intended under the South East Plan.

Effects of Retention of the South East Regional Strategy

Retention of the South East Plan will lead to a range of effects across the different SEA topics and is identified in Appendices D and E. A summary of the likely significant effects of revocation are presented in **Table 4.2** and commented on below.

Table 4.2 summarises the effects of retaining the South East Plan against the 12 SEA topics. As noted in section 4.2, the Regional Economic Strategy commitments have been mapped onto the RSS policies (Appendix H). Due to the intentional overlap between them, the RSS policies include those of the RES and in order to avoid duplication, the assessment summarised in Table 4.2 has focussed on the South East Plan policies. Please note that within this alternative, retention is defined as the retention of all the policies within the South East Plan and all the commitments in the RES but without their future update. Local authorities would be expected to refer to the NPPF and to place greater weight on the NPPF, as the Plan aged, as without update it would gradually lose relevance to the changing circumstances of local communities

The following key has been used in completing the assessment.

Score Key:	++ Significant Positive effect	+ Minor effect positive	0 No overall effect	- Minor negative effect	-- Significant negative effect	? Score uncertain
<p><i>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.</i></p> <p><i>The reasons for the assessment are presented in Appendix D for each policy.</i></p>						
<p><i>S – short term (less than 0.75 year), M – medium term (between 0.75 and 5 years) and L – long term (> 5 years)</i></p>						

Table 4.2 Summary of the Effects of Retention of the South East Regional Strategy (with reference to the South East Plan policies)

RS Policy No.	RS Policy Title	Alternative	Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna			Population and Human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic Factors			Material Assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape		
			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
RS Policy SP1		Retention	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	
RS Policy SP2	Regional Hubs	Retention	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
RS Policy SP3	Urban Focus and Urban Renaissance	Retention	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	?	?	?	+	+	+	
RS Policy SP4	Regeneration and Social Inclusion	Retention	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
RS Policy SP5	Green Belts	Retention	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	

RS Policy No.	RS Policy Title	Alternative	Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna			Population and Human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic Factors			Material Assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape		
			S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L			
RS Policy CC1	Sustainable Development	Retention	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		
RS Policy CC2	Climate Change	Retention	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
RS Policy CC3	Resource Use	Retention	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+
RS Policy CC4	Sustainable Design and Construction	Retention	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	
RS Policy CC5	Supporting An Ageing Population	Retention	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
RS Policy CC6	Sustainable Communities and Character of the Environment	Retention	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	

RS Policy No.	RS Policy Title	Alternative	Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna			Population and Human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic Factors			Material Assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape		
			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
RS Policies CC7	Infrastructure and Implementation	Retention	?	?	?	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	
RS Policy CC8	Green Infrastructure	Retention	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+
RS Policy CC9	Use of Public Land	Retention	?	?	?	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	+	+	+	
RS Policy RE1	Contributing to the UK's Long Term Competitiveness	Retention	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
RS Policy RE2	Supporting Nationally and Regionally Important Sectors and Clusters	Retention	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	?	?	?	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	?	?	?	-	-	-	

RS Policy No.	RS Policy Title	Alternative	Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna			Population and Human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic Factors			Material Assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape		
			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
RS Policy RE3	Employment and Land Provision	Retention	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	?	?	-	?	?	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
RS Policy RE4	Human Resource Development	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
RS Policy RE5	Smart Growth	Retention	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	+
RS Policy RE6	Competitiveness and Addressing Structural Economic Weakness	Retention	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	?	?	-	?	?	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
RS Policy H1	Regional Housing Provision 2006 – 2016	Retention	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	?	?	?	-	-	-
RS Policy H2	Managing The Delivery of Regional Housing Provision	Retention	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	?	?	?	-	-	-

RS Policy No.	RS Policy Title	Alternative	Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna			Population and Human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic Factors			Material Assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape		
			S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L			
RS Policy H3	Affordable Housing	Retention	?	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	?	?	?	?	?	?	-	-	-	0	?	?	0	?	?
RS Policy H4	Type and Size of New Housing	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
RS Policy H5	Housing Density and Design	Retention	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	
RS Policy H6	Making Better Use of the Existing Stock	Retention	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+
RS Policy T1	Manage and Invest	Retention	?	?	?	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	

RS Policy No.	RS Policy Title	Alternative	Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna			Population and Human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic Factors			Material Assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape		
			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
RS Policy T2	Mobility Management	Retention	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
RS Policy T3	Charging	Retention	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
RS Policy T4	Parking	Retention	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
RS Policy T5	Travel Plans and Advice	Retention	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
RS Policy T6	Communications Technology	Retention	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
RS Policy T7	Rural Transport	Retention	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

RS Policy No.	RS Policy Title	Alternative	Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna			Population and Human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic Factors			Material Assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape		
			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
RS Policy T8	Regional Spokes	Retention	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
RS Policy T9	Airports	Retention	?	?	?	+	+	+	?	?	?	-	-	-	--	--	--	-	-	-	-	-	-	?	?	?	?	?	?
RS Policy T10	Ports and Short Sea Shipping	Retention	?	?	?	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	+	+	+	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?
RS Policy T11	Rail Freight	Retention	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
RS Policy T12	Freight and Site Safeguarding	Retention	?	?	?	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
RS Policy T13	Intermodal Interchanges	Retention	?	?	?	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
RS Policy T14	Transport Investment and Management Priorities	Retention	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	?	?	?	?	?	?	-	-	-	?	?	?	-	-	-

RS Policy No.	RS Policy Title	Alternative	Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna			Population and Human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic Factors			Material Assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape		
			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
RS Policy NRM1	Sustainable Water Resources and Groundwater Quality	Retention	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
RS Policy NRM2	Water Quality	Retention	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+
RS Policy NRM3	Strategic Water Resources Development	Retention	?	?	?	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	0	0	0	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?
RS Policy NRM4	Sustainable Flood Risk Management	Retention	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
RS Policy NRM5	Conservation and Improvement of Biodiversity	Retention	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+
RS Policy NRM6	Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area	Retention	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+

RS Policy No.	RS Policy Title	Alternative	Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna			Population and Human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic Factors			Material Assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape		
			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
RS Policy NRM7	Woodlands	Retention	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+
RS Policy NRM8	Coastal Management	Retention	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
RS Policy NRM9	Air Quality	Retention	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	+	+	0	0	0
RS Policy NRM10	Noise	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
RS Policy NRM11	Development Design For Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy	Retention	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	-	-
RS Policy NRM12	Combined Heat and Power	Retention	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

RS Policy No.	RS Policy Title	Alternative	Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna			Population and Human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic Factors			Material Assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape		
			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
RS Policy NRM13	Regional Renewable Energy Targets	Retention	0	0	0	?	?	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	-	-
RS Policy NRM14	Sub-Regional Targets for Land-based Renewable Energy	Retention	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	?	?	?
RS Policy NRM15	Location of Renewable Energy Development	Retention	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
RS Policy NRM16:	Renewable Energy Development Criteria	Retention	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+
RS Policy W1	Waste Reduction	Retention	?	?	+	0	0	+	?	?	+	0	0	+	0	0	+	0	0	+	0	0	+	?	?	+	?	?	+
RS Policy W2:	Sustainable Design, Construction and Demolition	Retention	?	?	+	0	0	+	?	?	+	0	0	+	0	0	+	0	0	+	+	+	+	?	?	+	?	?	+

RS Policy No.	RS Policy Title	Alternative	Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna			Population and Human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic Factors			Material Assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape		
			S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L			
								+														+							
RS Policy W3:	Regional Self-Sufficiency	Retention	?	?	?	+	+	+	?	?	?	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	
RS Policy W4:	Sub-Regional Self-Sufficiency	Retention	?	?	?	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	
RS Policy W5	Targets For Diversion From Landfill	Retention	?	?	?	+	+	+	?	?	?	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	
RS Policy W6:	Recycling and Composting	Retention	?	?	?	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	+	+	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	
RS Policy W7:	Waste Management Capacity and Requirements	Retention	?	?	?	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	+	+	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	
RS Policy: W8	Waste Separation	Retention	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	
RS Policy W9	New Markets	Retention	?	?	?	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	+	+	+	0	0	0	?	?	?	

RS Policy No.	RS Policy Title	Alternative	Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna			Population and Human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic Factors			Material Assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape		
			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
RS Policy W10	Regionally Significant Facilities	Retention	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	?	?	?	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-
RS Policy W11	Biomass	Retention	-	-	-	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	?	?	?	0	0	0	-	-	-
RS Policy W12	Other Recovery and Diversion Technologies	Retention	-	-	-	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	?	?	?	-	-	-
RS Policy: W13	Landfill Requirements	Retention	-	-	-	?	?	?	?	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	?	?	?	-	-	-
RS Policy W14	Restoration	Retention	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+
RS Policy W15	Hazardous and Other Specialist Waste Facilities	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	0	0

RS Policy No.	RS Policy Title	Alternative	Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna			Population and Human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic Factors			Material Assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape		
			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
RS Policy W16	Waste Transport Infrastructure	Retention	?	?	?	+	+	+	0	0	0	?	?	?	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	?	?	?	?	?	?
RS Policy W17	Location of Waste Management Facilities	Retention	?	?	?	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	+	+	+	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?
RS Policy M1	Sustainable Construction	Retention	0	+	+	+	+	+	0	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0
RS Policy M2	Recycled and Secondary Aggregates	Retention	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+
RS Policy M3	Primary Aggregates	Retention	-	-	?	+	+	+	-	-	?	-	-	-	?	?	?	?	?	?	0	+	+	?	?	?	-	-	?
RS Policy M4	Other Minerals	Retention	-	-	?	+	+	+	-	-	?	-	-	-	0	0	+	0	0	+	-	-	-	?	?	?	-	-	?
RS Policy M5	Safeguarding of Mineral Reserves, Wharves and Rail Depots	Retention	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+

RS Policy No.	RS Policy Title	Alternative	Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna			Population and Human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic Factors			Material Assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape		
			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
RS Policy C1	The New Forest National Park	Retention	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+
RS Policy C2	The South Downs	Retention	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+
RS Policy C3	Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty	Retention	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+
RS Policy C4	Landscape and Countryside Management	Retention	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+
RS Policy C5	Managing the Rural – Urban Fringe	Retention	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+

RS Policy No.	RS Policy Title	Alternative	Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna			Population and Human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic Factors			Material Assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape		
			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
RS Policy C6	Countryside Access and Rights of Way Management	Retention	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
RS Policy C7	The River Thames Corridor	Retention	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
RS Policy BE1	Management of an Urban Renaissance	Retention	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	0	+	+
RS Policy BE2	Suburban Intensification	Retention	0	?	?	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	+	+
RS Policy BE3	Suburban Renewal	Retention	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+

RS Policy No.	RS Policy Title	Alternative	Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna			Population and Human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic Factors			Material Assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape		
			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
RS Policy BE4	The Role of Small Rural Towns ('Market Towns')	Retention	0	0	0	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	+	+
RS Policy BE5	Village Management	Retention	-	-	-	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+
RS Policy BE6	Management of the Historic Environment	Retention	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+
RS Policy TC1	Strategic Network of Town Centres	Retention	?	?	?	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?
RS Policy TC2	New Development and Redevelopment in Town Centres	Retention	0	?	?	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	0	0	?	?	?	?	?	?	0	-	-	0	+	+	0	+	+

RS Policy No.	RS Policy Title	Alternative	Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna			Population and Human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic Factors			Material Assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape		
			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
RS Policy TC3	Out-of-Centre Regional/Sub-Regional Shopping Centres	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	0	
RS Policy TRS1	Coastal Resorts	Retention	-	-	-	+	+	+	0	0	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	?	?	?	
RS Policy TRS2	Rural Tourism	Retention	?	?	?	+	+	+	?	?	?	0	0	0	?	?	?	?	?	?	0	0	0	?	?	?	?	?	
RS Policy TRS3	Regionally Significant Sports Facilities	Retention	?	?	?	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	0	0	0	?	?	?	?	?	?	
RS Policy TRS4	Tourism Attractions	Retention	?	?	?	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	

RS Policy No.	RS Policy Title	Alternative	Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna			Population and Human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic Factors			Material Assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape		
			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
RS Policy TRS5	Tourist Accommodation	Retention	?	?	?	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	
RS Policy TRS6	Visitor Management	Retention	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	
RS Policy TRS7	Priority Areas for Tourism	Retention	?	?	?	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	
RS Policy S1	Supporting Healthy Communities	Retention	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
RS Policy S2	Promoting Sustainable Health Services	Retention	0	0	0	+	++	++	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

RS Policy No.	RS Policy Title	Alternative	Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna			Population and Human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic Factors			Material Assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape		
			S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L			
RS Policy S3	Education and Skills	Retention	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
RS Policy S4	Higher and Further Education	Retention	0	?	?	+	+	+	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	?	?
RS Policy S5	Cultural and Sporting Activity	Retention	?	?	?	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?
RS Policy S6	Community Infrastructure	Retention	0	-	-	0	+	+	0	-	-	0	0	0	?	?	?	?	?	?	0	-	-	?	?	?	0	-	-
RS Policy SH1	Core Policy	Retention	0	-	-	+	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	0	?	?	0	?	?

RS Policy No.	RS Policy Title	Alternative	Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna			Population and Human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic Factors			Material Assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape		
			S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L			
RS Policy SH2	Strategic Development Areas	Retention	0	-	-	+	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	?	?	0	?	?	
RS Policy SH3	Scale, Location and Type of Employment Development	Retention	0	-	-	+	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	?	?	0	?	?
RS Policy SH4	Strategy for Main Town Centres	Retention	0	?	?	+	+	+	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	?	-	0	?	?	0	?	?
RS Policy SH5	Scale and Location of Housing Development 2006-2026	Retention	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
RS Policy SH6	Affordable Housing	Retention	?	?	?	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	?	?	?	?	?	?	

RS Policy No.	RS Policy Title	Alternative	Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna			Population and Human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic Factors			Material Assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape		
			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
RS Policy SH7	Sub-Regional Transport Strategy	Retention	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0
RS Policy SH8	Environmental Sustainability	Retention	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
RS Policy SH9	Implementation Agency	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	0	0
RS Policy SCT1	Core Policy	Retention	0	-	-	+	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	0	?	?	0	?	?
RS Policy SCT2	Enabling Economic Regeneration	Retention	0	-	-	+	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	?	?	0	?	?

RS Policy No.	RS Policy Title	Alternative	Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna			Population and Human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic Factors			Material Assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape		
			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
RS Policy SCT3	Management of Existing Employment Sites and Premises	Retention	0	-	-	+	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	?	?	0	?	?
RS Policy SCT4	Employment Priority in New Land Allocations	Retention	0	?	?	+	+	+	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	?	-	0	?	?	0	?	?
RS Policy SCT5	Housing Distribution	Retention	0	-	-	+	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	0	?	?	0	?	?
RS Policy SCT6	Affordable Housing	Retention	?	?	?	+	+	+	+	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	?	?	?	?	?	?
RS Policy SCT7	Implementation and Delivery	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	0	0

RS Policy No.	RS Policy Title	Alternative	Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna			Population and Human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic Factors			Material Assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape		
			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
RS Policy EKA1	Core Strategy	Retention	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	--	--	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	+	+	0	+	+
RS Policy EKA2	Spatial Framework for Ashford Growth Area	Retention	0	?	?	+	+	+	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	?	?
RS Policy EKA3	Amount and Distribution of Housing	Retention	0	-	-	+	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	--	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	-	-
RS Policy EKA4	Urban Renaissance of the Coastal Towns	Retention	0	?	?	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	-	-	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	-	-	0	+	+	0	+	+
RS Policy EKA5	The Gateway Role	Retention	0	-	-	+	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	-	-

RS Policy No.	RS Policy Title	Alternative	Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna			Population and Human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic Factors			Material Assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape		
			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
RS Policy EKA6	Employment Locations	Retention	0	-	-	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	-	-
RS Policy EKA7	Integrated Coastal Management and Natural Park	Retention	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+
RS Policy EKA8	Effective Delivery	Retention	0	?	?	+	+	+	0	?	?	0	+	+	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	?	?
RS Policy KTG1	Core Strategy	Retention	0	?	?	+	+	+	0	?	?	0	--	--	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	+	+	0	?	?
RS Policy KTG2	Economic Growth and Employment	Retention	0	-	-	+	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	-	-

RS Policy No.	RS Policy Title	Alternative	Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna			Population and Human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic Factors			Material Assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape		
			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
RS Policy KTG3	Employment Locations	Retention	0	-	-	+	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	-	-
RS Policy KTG4	Amount and Distribution of Housing Development	Retention	0	-	-	+	+	+	0	0	0	-	--	--	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	-	-
RS Policy KTG5	The Role of the Retail Centres	Retention	0	0	0	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	?	?
RS Policy KTG6	Flood Risk	Retention	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+
RS Policy KTG7	Green Initiatives	Retention	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+

RS Policy No.	RS Policy Title	Alternative	Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna			Population and Human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic Factors			Material Assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape		
			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
RS Policy LF1	Core Strategy	Retention	0	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	--	--	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	-	+	+	0	+	+
RS Policy LF2	Economic Development	Retention	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0
RS Policy LF3	Broad Mount and Distribution of Future Housing Development	Retention	0	-	-	+	+	+	0	-	-	0	--	--	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	0	0	?	?	?
RS Policy LF4	Affordable Housing	Retention	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	+	+	0	-	-	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	?	?
RS Policy LF5	Urban Areas and Regional Hubs	Retention	0	0	?	+	+	+	0	0	?	0	-	-	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	+	+

RS Policy No.	RS Policy Title	Alternative	Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna			Population and Human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic Factors			Material Assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape			
			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	
RS Policy LF6	Development at Former DERA Site, Chertsey	Retention	0	0	-	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	
RS Policy LF7	Town Centres	Retention	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	+	+	
RS Policy LF8	Sub-Regional Transport Hubs and Spokes	Retention	0	?	?	0	0	0	0	?	?	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?	?	
RS Policy LF9	Green Belt Management	Retention	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	
RS Policy LF10	Small Scale Site Tariff	Retention	0	-	?	0	+	+	0	-	?	0	0	0	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	-	?	

RS Policy No.	RS Policy Title	Alternative	Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna			Population and Human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic Factors			Material Assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape		
			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
RS Policy WCBV1	Policy WCBV1: Core Strategy	Retention	0	-	-	+	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	0	?	?	0	?	?
RS Policy WCBV2	Employment Land	Retention	0	-	-	+	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	?	?	0	?	?
RS Policy WCBV3	Scale and Distribution of Housing Development	Retention	0	-	-	+	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	?	?	0	?	?
RS Policy WCBV4	The Blackwater Valley	Retention	0	-	-	+	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	0	?	?	0	?	?
RS Policy WCBV5	The Colne Valley Park	Retention	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	

RS Policy No.	RS Policy Title	Alternative	Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna			Population and Human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic Factors			Material Assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape		
			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
RS Policy CO1	Core Strategy	Retention	0	-	-	+	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	0	?	?	0	?	?
RS Policy CO2	Economy	Retention	0	-	-	+	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	?	?	0	?	?
RS Policy CO3	Scale and Distribution of Housing	Retention	0	-	-	+	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	0	?	?	0	?	?
RS Policy CO4	Green Belt	Retention	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	0	0	0	?	?	?	?	?	?	
RS Policy CO5	Transport	Retention	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0

RS Policy No.	RS Policy Title	Alternative	Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna			Population and Human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic Factors			Material Assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape		
			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
RS Policy MKAV1	Housing Distribution by District 2006-2026	Retention	0	-	-	+	+	+	0	-	-	0	--	--	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-
RS Policy MKAV2	Spatial Framework for Milton Keynes Growth Area	Retention	0	0	-	+	+	+	0	0	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	0	?	0	0	-
RS Policy MKAV3	Spatial Framework for Aylesbury Growth Area	Retention	0	0	-	+	+	+	0	0	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	0	+	0	0	-
RS Policy MKAV4	Effective Delivery	Retention	0	0	-	+	+	+	0	0	-	+	+	+	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	-
GAT1, GAT2, GAT 3	Core Strategy, Economic Development and Housing Distribution	Retention	0	-	-	+	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	?	?		?	?

RS Policy No.	RS Policy Title	Alternative	Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna			Population and Human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic Factors			Material Assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape		
			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
RS Policy IW1	Enabling Economic Regeneration	Retention	0	-	-	+	+	+	0	-	-	0	--	--	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	-	-
RS Policy IW2	Housing Development	Retention	0	-	-	+	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	--	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	-	-
RS Policy IW3	Rural Areas	Retention	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	+	+
RS Policy IW4	Strategic Transport Links	Retention	0	0	?	0	+	+	0	0	?	0	0	0	0	?	?	0	?	?	0		-	0	0	0	0	0	?
RS Policy IW5	Infrastructure	Retention	0	-	-	0	+	+	0	-	-	0	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	-	-

RS Policy No.	RS Policy Title	Alternative	Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna			Population and Human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic Factors			Material Assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape		
			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
RS Policy AOSR1	Scale and Location of Housing Development 2006-2026	Retention	0	-	-	+	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	-	-
RS Policy AOSR2	Scale and Location of Housing Development 2006-2026	Retention	0	-	-	+	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	-	-
RS Policy AOSR3	The Whitehill/Bordon Opportunity	Retention	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	+	+
RS Policy AOSR4	Scale and Location of Housing Development 2006-2026	Retention	0	-	-	0	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	-	-
RS Policy AOSR5	Scale and Location of Housing Development 2006-2026	Retention	0	-	-	+	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	-	-

RS Policy No.	RS Policy Title	Alternative	Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna			Population and Human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic Factors			Material Assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape		
			S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L	S	M	L			
RS Policy AOSR6	Scale and Location of Housing Development 2006-2026	Retention	0	-	-	+	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	-	-
RS Policy AOSR7	Maidstone Hub	Retention	0	-	-	+	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	-	-
RS Policy AOSR8	Tonbridge/Tunbridge Wells Hub	Retention	?	?	?	+	+	+	?	?	?	0	-	-	0	0	?	0	0	?	0	-	-	0	0	0	?	?	?
RS Policy IMR1	Monitoring the RSS	Retention	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	

4.3.1 Likely Significant Effects

Core Spatial Strategy

The effects of retaining these policies will be largely the same as under revocation with positive effects identified as a result of the retention across many of the SEA topics with significant positive effects on population/health. Also the sub-regional focus and the focus on urban areas and regeneration would result in significant positive effects or no overall effect across all SEA topics as with revocation.

Retaining the policy on Urban Focus and Regeneration would bring positive benefits across all SEA topics although the effects may only be minor positive as a result of the loss of a target for use of previously developed land. Retention of Green Belt policy would bring the same significant positive effects as revocation for biodiversity/ flora/fauna, population health and landscape.

Also, as discussed in relation to revocation and in Appendix D, the NPPF would provide additional strong policy support for the South East Plan's spatial planning policies.

The assessment has not identified any areas where retention of those policies which make up the Core Spatial Strategy would have any negative effects - either minor or significant.

Cross Cutting Policies

The assessment has identified that retention of the South East Plan's Cross Cutting policies would bring the same effects as revocation with those effects being either neutral or positive, and significantly positive for many of the SEA topics particularly population/health. The assessment has not identified any negative effects either minor or significant.

National and international legislation and policy would still continue under retention. For example the EU Renewables Directive and the Code for Sustainable Homes will help reduce carbon emissions and have positive impacts on climate change. The UK Carbon Plan (2011) will also have a positive impact on carbon reduction.

Seven Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEP) have been established in the South East region which would continue under retention. In addition, the introduction of Local Nature Partnerships announced in the Natural Environment White Paper will complement existing local partnerships which deal with matters such as provision of green infrastructure supporting the cross cutting policies.

Also, as discussed in relation to revocation and in Appendix D, the NPPF would provide additional strong policy support for the South East Plan's cross cutting policies.

Sustainable Economic Development

The assessment has identified that the effects of retention of the South East Plan's policies for sustainable economic development would be largely the same as under revocation. There would be significant positive effects on population and health through improved job opportunities and other socio economic benefits. There would also be negative effects of development, being significant in relation to water and material assets.

Retaining the South East Plan's economic policies will remove some uncertainty over the levels of future employment development compared to revocation due to the new arrangements having to be put in place under revocation and time taken for Local Plans to be updated where plans are out of date. This will mean that the beneficial effects on population/health would be more significant in the short term compared to revocation, but conversely the negative effects (eg on water and material assets) would be greater. However, these differences do not change any of the effects from positive to negative or vice versa.

Although the regional development agency (SEEDA) has been abolished many of its functions have been transferred to successor bodies. These have included inward investment activities (now managed by PA Consulting, industry partner for UK Trade and Industry) and management of the European Regional Development Fund (now managed by the Department for Communities and Local Government). In addition SEEDA has transferred economic intelligence resources to South East England Councils (SEEC). Seven Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEP) have also been established with the objective of enabling strategic business growth in the region. These functions and organisations would all continue to operate complementing the retained policies in the Plan.

As discussed in relation to revocation and in Appendix D, the NPPF would provide additional strong policy support for the South East Plan's policies for sustainable economic development.

Housing

The assessment has identified that the effects of retention of the South East Plan's policies for housing would be largely the same as under revocation. There would be significant positive effects on population and human health as a result of an increase in housing development with ensuing socio-economic benefits and benefits to health.

Provision of an increased level of affordable housing is also a theme within the Regional Economic Strategy (RES). The assessment has identified that the policy on affordable housing will bring significant positive effects on population/human health. However, the policy and hence its benefits will be very much dependent upon the market being able/willing to deliver the level of affordable housing proposed.

The assessment has indicated that the new development arising from these policies would be likely to have negative effects on a number of SEA topics (biodiversity/ flora/fauna, soils, water, air, climatic factors, material assets, landscape) although there will be uncertainties as the scale and location of development is unknown. It is on water and material assets that the negative effects are identified as

being significant. Measures to address the negative effects on water and to meet the challenges of effective water supply and water management in the region will be provided in part through the work of the Water Companies in the region. Further mitigation in the form of initiatives such as the Code for Sustainable Homes, and the NPPF requirement for local authorities to develop proactive strategies to mitigate the effects of climate change should be beneficial in this regard.

Retaining the South East Plan's housing policies will remove some uncertainty over the levels of housing development required, particularly for the 47 authorities that do not have an up to date plan adopted under the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. This means that the beneficial effects on population/health from the policy provision for an increase in housing would be significantly positive in the short term when compared to revocation and the regional policy is removed. However, the clarity provided by the South East Plan policy on housing figures and the quantum anticipated will also lead to a range of significant negative effects on water resources and material assets. At present there is a significant divergence between current housing completion rates and those anticipated in the annual targets contained in the South East Plan. The policy anticipated an annual average basis of 32,700, whereas for the 12 month period ending March 2012, 22,240 houses were completed. However, although lower than anticipated in the South East Plan policy, when assessed at the regional level, the effects of housing completions for population, water and material assets are still considered significant.

The assessment has shown that the retention of policies H1-H5 will result in significant benefits for population and human health although there will be negative effects on environmental factors as a result of new housing development including development on previously undeveloped land.

Transport

The assessment has identified that the effects of retention of the South East Plan's policies for transport would be largely the same as under revocation.

The assessment identifies positive effects on population/health, air and climatic factors due to improved air quality and reduced potential for greenhouse gas emissions arising from the emphasis on sustainable transport modes. These effects are significant for population and health for a number of policies.

Many of the effects of the transport policies will depend on the ability to change travel behaviour and the demand for transport - the extent that these will be achieved is unknown and hence there will be uncertainty over impacts. However, it is noted that there is a requirement for policies and proposals to include measures to mitigate environmental impacts of transport, and where possible, to enhance the environment and communities through such interventions. As the detail of the implementation plan is not known environmental impacts are therefore uncertain.

The Highways Agency will continue to have responsibility for motorways and trunk roads, and County Highway authorities and Unitary Authorities will exercise their transport responsibilities in liaison with local authorities and LEPs where appropriate.

With the exception of the policy on airports, other effects will be largely neutral, or uncertain due to the uncertainty over location of particular elements of transport infrastructure.

In relation to airports future development will continue to be driven by evolving national aviation policy/strategy which is still as set out in the 2003 Aviation White Paper (until it is replaced). The assessment has revealed that the regional policy for airports is likely to bring positive effects on population/health, but it does also increase the likelihood that there will be negative effects on communities living close to airports. These negative effects could include potential increases in nuisance from noise and emissions due to increases in both air and ground traffic. These will have significant negative effects on air and climatic factors. There would also be negative effects on material assets from construction of airport infrastructure and on water quality from run-off.

The assessment has shown that retention will continue the significant positive effects for population and health, air and climatic factors due to improved air quality and reduced potential for greenhouse gas emissions arising from the emphasis on sustainable transport modes encouraged in the NPPF. Significant negative effects on air and climatic factors resulting from increased airport developments have also been identified.

As discussed in relation to revocation and in Appendix D, the NPPF would provide additional strong policy support for the South East Plan's policies for transport.

Natural Resource Management

The assessment has identified that the effects of retention of the South East Plan's policies for natural resource management would be largely the same as under revocation.

The assessment has identified for many of the policies across the SEA topics that the effects would be positive or neutral with some of the effects being significantly positive.

The assessment has also identified that there will be significant positive effects on biodiversity/flora/fauna and landscape for those policies dealing with biodiversity (NRM5), Thames Basin Heaths SPA (NRM6), woodlands (NRM7) and Coastal Management (NRM8).

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 retention.

The Plan's targets for renewable energy would result in significant positive effects on climatic factors but also potential negative effects on landscape due to the potential negative landscape and visual effects of new renewable energy infrastructure e.g. wind turbines.

Compared to revocation, the assessment has shown that for some policies eg Energy Efficiency / Renewable Energy (NRM11) and Regional Energy Targets (NRM13) there would be significant positive

effects on climatic factors but negative effects on landscape – this is due to the strong support given in the South East Plan to renewable energy projects. Under revocation in comparison the positive and negative effects would be less due to increased uncertainty over renewable energy projects. However, these differences do not change any of the effects from positive to negative or vice versa.

Water Company Water Resource Management Plans (WRM09) 2010-2035 will set out how water companies aim to ensure there will be sufficient water to meet potable demand without environmental consequences during the South East Plan period. Water companies have therefore already considered future supply and demand in terms of planning water consumption for the region in their approved and emerging plans.

As discussed in relation to revocation and in Appendix D, the NPPF would provide additional strong policy support for the South East Plan's policies for natural resource management.

Waste

The assessment has identified that the effects of retention of the South East Plan's policies for waste would be largely the same as under revocation.

The assessment has revealed that there will be minor positive or neutral effects across many of the SEA policy areas. Significant positive effects for population and human health are likely in relation to sustainable design/construction (W2) and targets for diversion from landfill (W5). The reduction in land filling will have positive effects on water (less risk of water contamination), air (reduced methane), climatic factors (less greenhouse gas emissions) and material assets. Significant positive effects across many of the SEA topic areas result from the policy on restoration (W14) - there is significant potential for environmental benefits due to increased biodiversity, reinstatement of soil, ceasing of transport activities and landscape features.

The assessment identifies negative effects on biodiversity, soils, air and landscape from the policies for 'Other recovery and diversion technologies' (W12) and 'Landfill requirements' (W13).

Two areas where there is a minor difference between retention and revocation are Policy W3 Regional Self Sufficiency and policy W10 Regionally Significant Facilities. For W3 the assessment has identified retention would achieve minor positive effects across many SEA topics whereas revocation would result in minor negative effects on air and climatic factors due in part to uncertainty over waste treatment and disposal arrangements under revocation. For W10 under revocation the assessment has identified minor negative effects for many SEA factors and minor positive effects for population and material assets - under retention the effects are identified as uncertain. In both these cases, although there are differences none of the effects are identified as being significant.

As discussed in relation to revocation and in Appendix D, the NPPF would provide additional strong policy support for the South East Plan's policies for waste.

Minerals

The assessment has identified that the effects of retention of the South East Plan's policies for minerals would be largely the same as under revocation. Where there are differences these relate to the increased uncertainty over future levels of extraction under revocation but these differences do not change any of the effects from positive to negative or vice versa.

The assessment has shown that retention of the policies for sustainable construction and recycled/secondary aggregates would result in positive or neutral effects across many SEA topic areas with those effects being significant for population/health and material assets.

Mineral extraction can have inherent negative effects on the environment and these is reflected in the negative scores in the assessment although these are identified as being minor due in part to environmental mitigation that would required.

Proposed changes to one of the mineral policies (M3) were circulated for public consultation between 19th March 2010 to 1st June 2010. They were not adopted. The proposed changes included revised, lower, targets were proposed (11.12 mt per annum sand and gravel, and 1.44 mt per annum crushed rock compared to the original targets of 13.25 million tonnes (mt) per annum and 2.2 mt per annum). Whilst the reductions in total aggregate requirements and the increasing sourcing from marine dredged sand and gravel will reduce the effects, the continued scale of aggregate demand allowed for in the apportionment will not affect the conclusions of the assessment – there will be negative effects on environmental receptors (such as biodiversity, water and landscape) and positive effects for population.

There are some differences between retention and revocation arising from the increased uncertainty over future levels of extraction under revocation.

Countryside and Landscape Management

The assessment has identified that the effects of retention of the South East Plan's policies for countryside and landscape management would be largely the same as under revocation.

The assessment has identified that retention would lead to positive or neutral effects across most of the SEA topics with those effects being significant in relation to population/health, cultural heritage and landscape for National Park and AONB policies - national legislative protection for national parks and AONBs would continue.

As discussed in relation to revocation and in Appendix D, the NPPF would provide additional strong policy support for the South East Plan's policies for countryside and landscape management.

Management of the Built Environment

The assessment has identified that the effects of retention of the South East Plan's policies for management of the built environment would be largely the same as under revocation although in relation

to policies for suburban areas the effects under revocation may be more uncertain. However these differences do not change any of the effects of revocation from positive to negative or vice versa.

The assessment has identified that the effects following retention would be positive or neutral across most of the SEA topic areas.

The effects of retention the policy for management of the historic environment (BE6) are significantly positive in relation to the cultural heritage topic. The legislative protection for the region's internationally and nationally designated historic assets would continue.

As discussed in relation to revocation and in Appendix D, the NPPF would provide additional strong policy support for the South East Plan's policies for then management of the built environment.

Town Centres

The assessment has identified that the effects of retention of the South East Plan's policies for town centres would be largely the same as under revocation although in relation to policies for out of centre regional/sub regional shopping centres the effects of revocation may be more uncertain. However these differences do not change any of the effects of revocation from positive to negative or vice versa.

The assessment as identified that retention will result in significant positive effects for population/health arising from a variety of factors including from new housing and employment provision. However the assessment has identified areas of uncertainty and minor negative effects as a result of the potential impacts of new development and urban intensification the locations of which are unknown.

As discussed in relation to revocation and in Appendix D, the NPPF would provide additional strong policy support for the South East Plan's policies for town centres.

Tourism and related sports and recreation

The assessment has identified that the effects of retention of the South East Plan's policies for town centres would be largely the same as under revocation.

The assessment has identified that retention will lead to positive effects for population/health with those effects being significant for rural tourism. This is due to the support to tourism given by the policies and Government's Tourism Policy March 2011 which sets out the importance of this industry to the UK. Also LEPs and Local Tourism Bodies have key roles in promoting tourism in the region. These factors along with the implementation of the duty to co-operate, will mean that local authorities should achieve the positive effects if tourism following retention of the South East Plan.

While the encouragement of visitor numbers to the coast through diversification has significant positive benefits for the economy and population and human health there is the potential that increased visitor numbers will have minor negative or uncertain environmental effects, especially through increased

transport (air quality and climatic factors) pollution and waste generation. These effects are identified in the assessment.

The assessment has identified that many of the effects of retention are uncertain as the scale and location of increased tourism pressures and development are unknown - this applies to revocation as well as retention.

As discussed in relation to revocation and in Appendix D, the NPPF would provide additional strong policy support for the South East Plan's policies for tourism and related sports and recreation.

Social and Community Infrastructure

The assessment has identified that the effects of retention of the South East Plan's policies for social and community infrastructure would be largely the same as under revocation although in relation to the policy for out Cultural and Sporting Activities (S5) the effects of revocation may be more uncertain. However these differences do not change any of the effects of revocation from positive to negative or vice versa.

The assessment has identified that there will be significant positive effects on population and human health under retention of those policies relating to health services (S2), education and skills (S3) and higher and further education (S4). Effects across the other topics and for other policies are largely neutral.

As discussed in relation to revocation and in Appendix D, the NPPF would provide additional strong policy support for the South East Plan's policies for social and community infrastructure.

South Hampshire sub-region

The assessment has identified that the effects of retention of the South East Plan's policies for the South Hampshire sub-region would be largely the same as under revocation. Where there are differences these relate to the increased uncertainty over future levels of employment and housing development under revocation which may lead to delayed effects. Under revocation there could also be less concentrated forms of development in urban centres and where available more greenfield development leading to more uncertain impacts on biodiversity, landscape and soils compared to retention. However, these differences do not change any of the effects from positive to negative or vice versa.

The assessment has identified that retention will lead to significant positive environmental effects for population and human health for all of the policies apart from one relating to implementation which is neutral. The positive effects are due to the benefits arising from new housing and economic opportunities as well as sustainable transport measures.

Ultimately, the environmental effects will depend on the quantum of housing delivered across the sub-region, the location and other factors such as their design.

The continued presence of PUSH, LEPs and other joint working under the duty to co-operate within the policy framework set by the Regional Strategy and NPPF will mean that the effects of retention will be largely the same as revocation.

As discussed in relation to revocation and in Appendix D, the NPPF would provide additional strong policy support for the South East Plan's policies for South Hampshire even though the NPPF is not location specific.

Sussex Coast sub-region

The assessment has identified that the effects of retention of the South East Plan's policies for the Sussex Coast sub-region would be largely the same as under revocation. Where there are differences these relate to the increased uncertainty over future levels of employment and housing development under revocation which may lead to delayed effects (positive and negative). However, these differences do not change any of the effects from positive to negative or vice versa.

The assessment has identified significant positive effects on population/health from the creation of employment opportunities and housing. However there are also likely to be minor negative, neutral and uncertain effects on other environmental factors given the impacts of the new development some of which will be located in large urban extensions on greenfield land. The effects of retention are largely the same as revocation although with less planning policy uncertainty in the short and medium term.

Also under both retention and revocation LEPs and other joint working under the duty to co-operate will provide a means of addressing cross boundary local authority issues to achieve the economic growth and regeneration being sought. For example the Coast to Capital and South East Local Enterprise Partnerships provide a locally and private sector supported approach to support economic development and partnership working. The Coast to Capital LEP is based on a functional market economic area that goes across the regional (RSS) boundary with London.

As discussed in relation to revocation and in Appendix D, the NPPF would provide additional strong policy support for the South East Plan's policies for the Sussex Coast sub-region even though the NPPF is not location specific.

East Kent and Ashford sub-region

The assessment has identified that the effects of retention of the South East Plan's policies for the East Kent and Ashford sub-region would be largely the same as under revocation. Where there are differences these relate to the increased uncertainty over future levels of employment and housing development under revocation which may lead to delayed effects (positive and negative). However, these differences do not change any of the effects from positive to negative or vice versa.

The assessment has identified significant positive effects on population/health from the creation of employment opportunities and housing. However there are also likely to be minor negative, neutral and

uncertain effects on other environmental factors given the impacts of new development some of which will be located in large urban extensions on greenfield land. The effects of retention are largely the same as revocation although with less planning policy uncertainty in the short and medium term.

Under retention and revocation, LEPs and other joint working under the duty to co-operate will provide a means of addressing cross boundary local authority issues to achieve the economic growth and regeneration being sought.

The assessment has identified that the policy for integrated coastal management and natural park would result in significant positive effects for biodiversity/flora/fauna, population/health and landscape - all as with revocation. This is due to the South East Plan's policies working together with existing wildlife legislation which protects sites of national and international importance for wildlife.

As discussed in relation to revocation and in Appendix D, the NPPF would provide additional strong policy support for the South East Plan's policies for East Kent and Ashford even though the NPPF is not location specific.

Kent Thames Gateway

The assessment has identified that the effects of retention of the South East Plan's policies for the Kent Thames Gateway sub-region would be largely the same as under revocation. Where there are differences these relate to the increased uncertainty over future levels of employment and housing development under revocation which may lead to delayed effects (positive and negative). However, these differences do not change any of the effects from positive to negative or vice versa.

The assessment has identified that the emphasis on economic development, increased standards of skills and education in the workforce and an increased supply of new housing including affordable housing will have significant positive impacts on the population. Protection of the Metropolitan Green Belt and the AONB will provide positive benefit to biodiversity and landscape although, if development outside previously developed land is required, this could have an adverse impact on biodiversity, soils and landscape. Establishment of high design standards, and improvement of existing urban areas, will benefit cultural heritage and townscape. The residual impact on biodiversity, soils and landscape/townscape is uncertain.

As with any policy which promotes growth and development, there will be adverse effects on material assets resulting from the use of building materials, and greater pressure on waste management. Given the proposed scale of the growth there are potential significant negative effects associated with the demand for water. The policies include measures to encourage more sustainable travel including transfer of freight from road to rail and water. In view of the scale of development proposed an adverse impact on local air quality from vehicle emissions and on climate is considered likely.

The Kent Thames Gateway Partnership has been established and comprises regional local authority and private sector representation. This partnership, together with the South East Local Economic

Partnership (LEP) and other joint working under the duty to co-operate will take forward the conditions for economic development in the sub-region.

As discussed in relation to revocation and in Appendix D, the NPPF would provide additional strong policy support for the South East Plan's policies for the Kent Thames Gateway sub-region even though the NPPF is not location specific.

London Fringe

The assessment has identified that the effects of retention of the South East Plan's policies for the London Fringe sub-region would be largely the same as under revocation. Where there are differences these relate to the increased uncertainty over future levels of employment and housing development under revocation which may lead to delayed effects (positive and negative). However, these differences do not change any of the effects from positive to negative or vice versa.

The assessment has identified that under retention as with revocation the emphasis on economic development and an increased supply of new housing including affordable housing will have significant positive effects on population/health. Protection of the Green Belt will provide positive benefits to biodiversity and landscape.

Concentration of development in existing areas will have the benefit of minimising adverse impacts on biodiversity, soil and landscape. Policy measures to enhance biodiversity and the quality of the built environment, together with the character of natural and cultural resources will have a positive impact on biodiversity, cultural heritage and landscape. Development involving new construction will have an adverse impact on mineral resources and material assets. Greater demand on water resources in urban areas will have an adverse impact on water, and may prejudice water quality.

As discussed in relation to revocation and in Appendix D, the NPPF would provide additional strong policy support for the South East Plan's policies for the London Fringe sub-region even though the NPPF is not location specific.

Western Corridor and Blackwater Valley

The assessment has identified that the effects of retention of the South East Plan's policies for the Western Corridor and Blackwater Valley sub-region would be largely the same as under revocation. Where there are differences these relate to the increased uncertainty over future levels of employment and housing development under revocation which may lead to delayed effects (positive and negative). However, these differences do not change any of the effects from positive to negative or vice versa.

The assessment has identified that with retention (as with revocation) there are likely to be significant positive effects on population/health from the creation of employment opportunities and new housing development. There are also significant positive effects on population/health from the revocation of the policies for the Blackwater Valley and Colne Valley Park due to the recreational, amenity and other

benefits. However there are also likely to be minor negative, neutral and uncertain effects on other environmental factors given the impacts of new development some of which will be located in large urban extensions on greenfield land.

The Thames Valley Berkshire and Enterprise M3 Local Economic Partnerships (LEPs) are taking forward setting the conditions for economic development in the sub-region to help ensure that land use policies are mutually consistent, and deliver the most sustainable and effective development for their area.

As discussed in relation to revocation and in Appendix D, the NPPF would provide additional strong policy support for the South East Plan's policies for the Western Corridor and Blackwater Valley sub-region even though the NPPF is not location specific.

Central Oxfordshire

The sub-regional policies for Central Oxfordshire include policies for housing development focused on four locations: Oxford, Bicester, Didcot, and Wantage and Grove. The policies anticipate that to deliver the level of growth would require sustainable urban extensions to a number of settlements including Oxford, Didcot and Grove and a selective review of the Oxford Green Belt (although note the concession following the legal challenge to the Strategic Development Area and 4,000 dwellings, albeit terms of relief have not been agreed— see Appendix A and 2.3.2 above).

The assessment has identified that the effects of retention of the South East Plan's policies for the Central Oxfordshire sub-region would be largely the same as under revocation. Where there are differences these relate to the increased uncertainty over future levels of employment and housing development under revocation which may lead to delayed effects (positive and negative). However, these differences do not change any of the effects from positive to negative or vice versa.

The assessment has identified that with retention (as with revocation) there are likely to be significant positive effects on population/health from the creation of employment opportunities and new housing development. However there are also likely to be minor negative, neutral and uncertain effects on other environmental factors given the impacts of new development some of which will be located in large urban extensions on greenfield land.

It is noted that retention of the saved Structure Plan policy regarding the development of land at RAF Upper Heyford will safeguard the site and its heritage value for the interim until the Proposed Submission draft Cherwell Local Plan (which includes reference to conservation of the heritage interest of the site under Policy Village 5) is adopted.

As discussed in relation to revocation and in Appendix D, the NPPF would provide additional strong policy support for the South East Plan's policies for the Central Oxfordshire sub-region even though the NPPF is not location specific.

Milton Keynes and Aylesbury Vale

The assessment has identified that the effects of retention of the South East Plan's policies for the Milton Keynes and Aylesbury Vale sub-region would be largely the same as under revocation. Where there are differences these relate to the increased uncertainty over future levels of employment and housing development under revocation which may lead to delayed effects (positive and negative). However, these differences do not change any of the effects from positive to negative or vice versa.

There are likely to be minor negative, neutral and uncertain effects on other environmental factors given the impacts of new development some of which will be located in large urban extensions on greenfield land.

The proposed development would be likely to include areas of previously undeveloped land and green belt and would have an adverse impact on biodiversity, soils, landscape and cultural heritage. The use of construction materials would have an adverse impact on material assets. Generation of increased traffic would have an adverse impact on air quality and climate. The effects on water are assessed as significantly negative

Within this sub-region the South East Midlands LEP is taking forward the delivery of sustainable development. Aylesbury Vale Advantage will merge into the LEP. The Milton Keynes Partnership Committee (MKPC) has been disbanded and the work carried out by Milton Keynes Partnership forms part of the Homes and Communities Agency's (HCA) Midlands area. The work of inward investment is carried out by Milton Keynes Council. A revised delivery mechanism has therefore been established which would continue under retention.

As discussed in relation to revocation and in Appendix D, the NPPF would provide additional strong policy support for the South East Plan's policies for the Milton Keynes and Aylesbury Vale sub-region even though the NPPF is not location specific.

Gatwick

The assessment has identified that the effects of retention of the South East Plan's policies for the Gatwick sub-region would be largely the same as under revocation. Where there are differences these relate to the increased uncertainty over future levels of employment and housing development under revocation which may lead to delayed effects (positive and negative). However, these differences do not change any of the effects from positive to negative or vice versa.

The assessment has identified under retention (as with revocation) that there would be potential for significant positive effects on population from the creation of housing and employment opportunities. The assessment also identifies negative effects from these developments given that some of the development could be located on greenfield land (anticipated negative effects on biodiversity from land take, loss of greenfield sites, greater water resource, increased commuting along the principal road networks leading to increased emissions).

As discussed in relation to revocation and in Appendix D, the NPPF would provide additional strong policy support for the South East Plan's policies for the Gatwick sub-region even though the NPPF is not location specific.

Isle of Wight and Areas outside the sub regions

The assessment has identified that the effects of retention of the South East Plan's policies for the Gatwick sub-region would be largely the same as under revocation. Where there are differences these relate to the effects of infrastructure provision which under revocation is uncertain. However, these differences do not change any of the effects from positive to negative or vice versa.

The assessment has identified that with retention (as with revocation) there are likely to be significant positive effects on population/health from the creation of employment opportunities and new housing development. New housing and employment developments will involve use of construction materials which will have an adverse impact on material assets. Additional development would be likely to increase traffic movements which would increase emissions to air and have a negative impact on air quality and climate. The level of water stress on the Isle of Wight is defined as 'serious' by the Environment Agency, the highest category of designation. Additional housing and employment development would have significant negative effects on water in the medium to long term.

As discussed in relation to revocation and in Appendix D, the NPPF would provide additional strong policy support for the South East Plan's policies for the Isle of Wight and areas outside the sub-regions even though the NPPF is not location specific.

4.3.2 Revoking all the Quantified and Spatially Specific Policies

Table 4.3 summarises the effects of revoking only those policies that are quantified or spatially specific.

Table 4.3 Summary of the Effects of Revoking all the Quantified and Spatially Specific Policies

RS Policy No.	RS Policy Title	Alternative	Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna			Population and Human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic Factors			Material Assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape		
			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
RS Policy H1	Regional Housing Provision 2006 – 2016	Revocation	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	?	?	?	-	-	-
RS Policy T9	Airports	Revocation	?	?	?	+	+	+	?	?	?	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	?	?	?	?	?	?
RS Policy T10	Ports and Short Sea Shipping	Revocation	?	?	?	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	+	+	+	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?

RS Policy No.	RS Policy Title	Alternative	Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna			Population and Human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic Factors			Material Assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape		
			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
RS Policy NRM3	Strategic Water Resources Development	Revocation	?	?	?	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	
RS Policy NRM6	Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area	Revocation	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	
RS Policy NRM14	Sub-Regional Targets for Land-based Renewable Energy	Revocation	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	?	?	?
RS Policy W3:	Regional Self-Sufficiency	Revocation	?	?	?	?	+	+	?	?	?	?	+	+	?	-	+	?	-	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	
RS Policy W7:	Waste Management Capacity and Requirements	Revocation	?	?	?	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	+	+	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	
RS Policy M2	Recycled and Secondary Aggregates	Revocation	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	+	+
RS Policy M3	Primary Aggregates	Revocation	-	-	?	+	+	+	-	-	?	-	-	-	?	?	?	?	?	?	0	+	+	?	?	?	-	-	?
RS Policy M4	Other Minerals	Revocation	-	-	?	+	+	+	-	-	?	-	-	-	0	?	?	0	?	?	-	-	-	?	?	?	-	-	?
RS Policy TC1	Strategic Network of Town Centres	Revocation	?	?	?	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	
RS Policy SH2	Strategic Development Areas	Revocation	0	?	-	+	+	+	0	?	-	0	?	-	0	?	-	0	?	-	-	-	-	0	?	?	0	?	?
RS Policy SH3	Scale, Location and Type of Employment Development	Revocation	0	0	-	0	+	+	0	0	-	0	0	-	0	0	-	0	0	-	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	?
RS Policy SH4	Strategy for Main Town Centres	Revocation	0	?	?	+	+	+	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	?	-	0	?	?	0	?	?
RS Policy SH5	Scale and Location of Housing Development 2006-2026	Revocation	0	?	-	+	+	+	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	?	-	0	?	-	0	?	-	0	?	?	0	?	?
RS Policy SH6	Affordable Housing	Revocation	0	?	-	+	+	+	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	?	-	0	?	-	0	?	-	0	?	?	0	?	?

RS Policy No.	RS Policy Title	Alternative	Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna			Population and Human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic Factors			Material Assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape		
			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
RS Policy SCT3	Management of Existing Employment Sites and Premises	Revocation	0	0	-	0	+	+	0	0	-	0	0	-	0	0	-	0	0	-	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	?
RS Policy SCT5	Housing Distribution	Revocation	0	?	-	+	+	+	0	?	-	0	?	-	0	?	-	0	?	-	-	-	-	0	?	?	0	?	?
RS Policy SCT7	Implementation and Delivery	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	0	0
RS Policy EKA3	Amount and Distribution of Housing	Revocation	0	?	-	+	+	+	0	?	-	0	?	-	0	?	-	0	?	-	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	?	-
RS Policy EKA4	Urban Renaissance of the Coastal Towns	Revocation	0	?	?	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	?	-	0	?	-	0	?	-	0	?	-	0	?	+	0	?	+
RS Policy EKA5	The Gateway Role	Revocation	0	-	-	+	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	-	-
RS Policy EKA6	Employment Locations	Revocation	0	-	-	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	-	-
RS Policy KTG2	Economic Growth and Employment	Revocation	0	?	-	+	+	+	0	?	-	0	?	-	0	?	-	0	?	-	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	?	-
RS Policy KTG3	Employment Locations	Revocation	0	?	-	+	+	+	0	?	-	0	?	-	0	?	-	0	?	-	0	?	-	0	0	0	0	?	-
RS Policy KTG4	Amount and Distribution of Housing Development	Revocation	0	?	-	+	+	+	0	?	+	-	?	-	0	?	-	0	?	-	0	?	-	0	0	0	0	?	-
RS Policy KTG5	The Role of the Retail Centres	Revocation	0	?	?	0	+	+	0	?	?	0	0	0	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	?	?
RS Policy LF3	Broad Mount and Distribution of Future Housing Development	Revocation	0	0	-	+	+	+	0	0	-	0	-	-	0	0	-	0	0	-	0	0	-	0	0	0	?	?	?
RS Policy LF4	Affordable Housing	Revocation	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	?	+	0	?	-	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	-	-	0	?	?	0	?	?
RS Policy LF5	Urban Areas and Regional Hubs	Revocation	0	0	?	+	+	+	0	0	?	0	-	-	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	+	+
RS Policy LF6	Development at Former DERA Site, Chertsey	Revocation	0	0	-	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	-

RS Policy No.	RS Policy Title	Alternative	Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna			Population and Human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic Factors			Material Assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape		
			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
RS Policy WCBV1	Policy WCBV1: Core Strategy	Revocation	0	0	?	+	+	+	0	0	?	0	0	?	0	0	?	0	0	?	-	-	-	0	0	?	0	0	?
RS Policy WCBV3	Scale and Distribution of Housing Development	Revocation	0	-	?	+	+	+	0	0	?	0	0	?	0	0	?	0	0	?	0	-	-	0	0	?	0	0	?
RS Policy CO1	Core Strategy	Revocation	0	0	?	+	+	+	0	0	?	0	0	?	0	0	?	0	0	?	0	-	-	0	0	?	0	0	?
RS Policy CO2	Economy	Revocation	0	0	?	+	+	+	0	0	?	0	0	?	0	0	?	0	0	?	0	-	-	0	0	?	0	0	?
RS Policy CO3	Scale and Distribution of Housing	Revocation	0	-	?	+	+	+	0	0	?	0	0	?	0	0	?	0	0	?	-	-	-	0	0	?	0	0	?
RS Policy MKAV1	Housing Distribution by District 2006-2026	Revocation	0	0	?	+	+	+	0	0	?	0	-	-	0	?	-	0	?	-	0	-	-	0	0	?	0	0	?
RS Policy MKAV2	Spatial Framework for Milton Keynes Growth Area	Revocation	0	0	?	+	+	+	0	0	?	0	-	?	0	0	?	0	0	?	0	-	-	0	0	?	0	-	?
RS Policy MKAV3	Spatial Framework for Aylesbury Growth Area	Revocation	0	0	?	0	+	+	0	0	?	0	?	-	0	?	-	0	?	-	0	?	-	0	0	0	0	0	?
RS Policy MKAV4	Effective Delivery	Revocation	0	0	-	+	+	+	0	0	-	+	+	+	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	-
GAT1, GAT2, GAT 3	Core Strategy, Economic Development and Housing Distribution	Revocation	0	0	?	+	+	+	0	0	?	0	0	?	0	0	?	0	0	?	0	-	-	0	0	?	0	0	?
RS Policy IW2	Housing Development	Revocation	0	-	-	+	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	0	0	0	0	-	-
RS Policy AOSR1	Scale and Location of Housing Development 2006-2026	Revocation	0	0	-	+	+	+	0	0	-	0	0	-	0	0	-	0	0	-	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-
RS Policy AOSR2	Scale and Location of Housing Development 2006-2026	Revocation	0	0	-	+	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	-	-
RS Policy AOSR3	The Whitehill/Bordon Opportunity	Revocation	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	+	+

RS Policy No.	RS Policy Title	Alternative	Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna			Population and Human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic Factors			Material Assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape		
			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
RS Policy AOSR4	Scale and Location of Housing Development 2006-2026	Revocation	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	0	0	0	?	?
RS Policy AOSR5	Scale and Location of Housing Development 2006-2026	Revocation	0	?	?	+	+	+	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	0	0	0	?	?
RS Policy AOSR6	Scale and Location of Housing Development 2006-2026	Revocation	0	-	-	+	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	-	-
RS Policy AOSR7	Maidstone Hub	Revocation	0	0	-	+	+	+	0	0	-	0	0	-	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	0	-	0	0	+	0	0	-
RS Policy AOSR8	Tonbridge/Tunbridge Wells Hub	Revocation	?	?	?	+	+	+	?	?	?	0	-	-	0	-	?	0	0	?	0	-	-	0	0	0	?	?	?

Score Key:	++ Significant Positive effect	+	Minor positive effect	0 No overall effect	- Minor negative effect	-- Significant negative effect	? Score uncertain
<p>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. A conclusion of uncertainty arises where there is insufficient evidence for expert judgement to conclude an effect.</p> <p>The reasons for the assessment are presented in Appendix D for each policy.</p> <p>S – short term (less than 0.75 year), M – medium term (between 0.75 and 5 years) and L – long term (> 5 years)</p>							

Likely Significant Effects

There are several policies where potentially significant negative environmental effects have been identified for the revocation of the quantified and spatially specific policies. These include Policy H1 Regional Housing Provision 2006 to 2026, Policy T9 Airports and a range of sub-regional policies including KTG4, LF3, MKAV1 and IW2. However, the effects are also identified for retention of the Regional Strategy. Neither alternative will remove the need for more houses, jobs and employment land within the region. The principal identified effect concerns the predicted substantial increase in consumer demand for water in an already water scarce region. Other identified significant effects occur for air quality and climate (Policy T9) and on material assets.

The revocation of policies H1 and TC1 and a range of sub-regional policies was also identified as having a significant positive effect on the 'population topic'. These policies support economic development, employment land provision and housing supply. One of the key planning principles set out in the NPPF is to proactively drive and support sustainable economic development to deliver the homes, business and industrial units, infrastructure and thriving local places that the country needs. This includes minimising negative impacts and providing net gains to the community where possible. Local authorities are expected to work collaboratively with neighbouring authorities and Local Enterprise Partnerships to determine the regeneration needs of their areas. The duty to co-operate is expected to play a key role in this and Local Enterprise Partnerships can also play a key role in assisting local authorities to deliver development. Initiatives such as the Community Infrastructure Levy, New Homes Bonus and the local retention of business rates will allow communities to meet their local housing needs and share the benefits and mitigate the negative effects of growth. This framework is likely to provide the significant benefits to the community reflected in the 'population topic'.

Proposed Mitigation Measures

Concerning the potentially significant effect on scarce water resources of a growing population and employment, 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 South East Plan. In addition, water companies, through the completion of the Water Resource Management Plans have a duty to assess water supply and demand in their region on a rolling 5 year basis up to 25 years hence. The water resource planning process sets out, for those water resource zones in deficit (i.e. where demand exceeds supply) the measures needed to address the short fall. In determining future demand, population projections, housing needs and occupancy rates are used along with the effects of climate change on water availability. Preferred management options for each zone are usually a mix of water demand management measures (water metering, voluntary measures), leakage control and water supply measures (borehole refurbishment, reservoirs, bulk transfers). The Southern Water Water Resource Management Plan aims to ensure security of supply in the region for the period to 2035.

The main mitigation measure to address increased demand for construction materials and energy (material assets) is to make optimum use of recycled materials.

4.3.3 Retaining all the Quantified and Spatially Specific Policies

Table 4.4 summarises the effects of retaining only those policies that are quantified or spatially specific.

Table 4.4 Summary of the Effects of Retaining all the Quantified and Spatially Specific Policies

RS Policy No.	RS Policy Title	Alternative	Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna			Population and Human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic Factors			Material Assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape		
			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
RS Policy H1	Regional Housing Provision 2006 – 2016	Retention	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	?	?	?	-	-	-
RS Policy T9	Airports	Retention	?	?	?	+	+	+	?	?	?	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	?	?	?	?	?	?
RS Policy T10	Ports and Short Sea Shipping	Retention	?	?	?	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	+	+	+	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?
RS Policy NRM3	Strategic Water Resources Development	Retention	?	?	?	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	0	0	0	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?
RS Policy NRM6	Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area	Retention	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+
RS Policy NRM14	Sub-Regional Targets for Land-based Renewable Energy	Retention	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	?	?	?
RS Policy W3:	Regional Self-Sufficiency	Retention	?	?	?	+	+	+	?	?	?	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?
RS Policy W7:	Waste Management Capacity and Requirements	Retention	?	?	?	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	+	+	+	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?
RS Policy M2	Recycled and Secondary Aggregates	Retention	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+
RS Policy M3	Primary Aggregates	Retention	-	-	?	+	+	+	-	-	?	-	-	-	?	?	?	?	?	?	0	+	+	?	?	?	-	-	?
RS Policy M4	Other Minerals	Retention	-	-	?	+	+	+	-	-	?	-	-	-	0	0	+	0	0	+	-	-	-	?	?	?	-	-	?

RS Policy No.	RS Policy Title	Alternative	Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna			Population and Human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic Factors			Material Assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape		
			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
RS Policy TC1	Strategic Network of Town Centres	Retention	?	?	?	+	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	
RS Policy SH2	Strategic Development Areas	Retention	0	-	-	+	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	?	?	0	?	?	
RS Policy SH3	Scale, Location and Type of Employment Development	Retention	0	-	-	+	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	?	?	0	?	?
RS Policy SH4	Strategy for Main Town Centres	Retention	0	?	?	+	+	+	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	?	-	0	?	?	0	?	?
RS Policy SH5	Scale and Location of Housing Development 2006-2026	Retention	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
RS Policy SH6	Affordable Housing	Retention	?	?	?	+	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	?	?	?	?	?	?	
RS Policy SCT3	Management of Existing Employment Sites and Premises	Retention	0	-	-	+	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	?	?	0	?	?
RS Policy SCT5	Housing Distribution	Retention	0	-	-	+	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	0	?	?	0	?	?
RS Policy SCT7	Implementation and Delivery	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	0	0
RS Policy EKA3	Amount and Distribution of Housing	Retention	0	-	-	+	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	-	-
RS Policy EKA4	Urban Renaissance of the Coastal Towns	Retention	0	?	?	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	-	-	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	-	-	0	+	+	0	+	+

RS Policy No.	RS Policy Title	Alternative	Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna			Population and Human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic Factors			Material Assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape		
			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
RS Policy EKA5	The Gateway Role	Retention	0	-	-	+	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	-	-
RS Policy EKA6	Employment Locations	Retention	0	-	-	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	-	-
RS Policy KTG2	Economic Growth and Employment	Retention	0	-	-	+	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	-	-
RS Policy KTG3	Employment Locations	Retention	0	-	-	+	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	-	-
RS Policy KTG4	Amount and Distribution of Housing Development	Retention	0	-	-	+	+	+	0	0	0	-	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	-	-
RS Policy KTG5	The Role of the Retail Centres	Retention	0	0	0	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	?	?
RS Policy LF3	Broad Mount and Distribution of Future Housing Development	Retention	0	-	-	+	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	0	0	?	?	?
RS Policy LF4	Affordable Housing	Retention	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	+	+	0	-	-	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	?	?
RS Policy LF5	Urban Areas and Regional Hubs	Retention	0	0	?	+	+	+	0	0	?	0	-	-	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	+	+
RS Policy LF6	Development at Former DERA Site, Chertsey	Retention	0	0	-	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	-
RS Policy WCBV1	Policy WCBV1: Core Strategy	Retention	0	-	-	+	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	0	?	?	0	?	?

RS Policy No.	RS Policy Title	Alternative	Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna			Population and Human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic Factors			Material Assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape		
			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
RS Policy WCBV3	Scale and Distribution of Housing Development	Retention	0	-	-	+	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	?	?	0	?	?
RS Policy CO1	Core Strategy	Retention	0	-	-	+	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	0	?	?	0	?	?
RS Policy CO2	Economy	Retention	0	-	-	+	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	?	?	0	?	?
RS Policy CO3	Scale and Distribution of Housing	Retention	0	-	-	+	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	0	?	?	0	?	?
RS Policy MKAV1	Housing Distribution by District 2006-2026	Retention	0	-	-	+	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	0	?	?	0	?	?
RS Policy MKAV2	Spatial Framework for Milton Keynes Growth Area	Retention	0	0	-	+	+	+	0	0	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	0	?	0	0	-
RS Policy MKAV3	Spatial Framework for Aylesbury Growth Area	Retention	0	0	-	+	+	+	0	0	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	0	+	0	0	-
RS Policy MKAV4	Effective Delivery	Retention	0	0	-	+	+	+	0	0	-	+	+	+	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	-
GAT1, GAT2, GAT 3	Core Strategy, Economic Development and Housing Distribution	Retention	0	-	-	+	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	?	?	?	?	?
RS Policy IW2	Housing Development	Retention	0	-	-	+	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	-	-

RS Policy No.	RS Policy Title	Alternative	Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna			Population and Human Health			Soil			Water			Air			Climatic Factors			Material Assets			Cultural Heritage			Landscape		
			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
RS Policy AOSR1	Scale and Location of Housing Development 2006-2026	Retention	0	-	-	+	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	-	-
RS Policy AOSR2	Scale and Location of Housing Development 2006-2026	Retention	0	-	-	+	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	-	-
RS Policy AOSR3	The Whitehill/Bordon Opportunity	Retention	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	+	+
RS Policy AOSR4	Scale and Location of Housing Development 2006-2026	Retention	0	-	-	0	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	-	-
RS Policy AOSR5	Scale and Location of Housing Development 2006-2026	Retention	0	-	-	+	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	-	-
RS Policy AOSR6	Scale and Location of Housing Development 2006-2026	Retention	0	-	-	+	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	-	-
RS Policy AOSR7	Maidstone Hub	Retention	0	-	-	+	+	+	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	?	?	0	?	?	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	-	-
RS Policy AOSR8	Tonbridge/Tunbridge Wells Hub	Retention	?	?	?	+	+	+	?	?	?	0	-	-	0	0	?	0	0	?	0	-	-	0	0	0	?	?	?

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. A conclusion of uncertainty

arises where there is insufficient evidence for expert judgement to conclude an effect.

The reasons for the assessment are presented in Appendix D for each policy.

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

Likely Significant Effects

The retention for a transitional period of policies which set the quantum for development, or which are spatially specific, were identified to have potentially significant negative environmental effects on water and/or material assets. These are for: RS Policy H1 Regional Housing Provision 2006 to 2026; and a range of sub-regional policies including RS Policy EKA3, RS Policy KTG4, RS Policy LF3, RS Policy MKAV1 and RS Policy IW2. RS Policy T9 Airports has a potentially significant negative effect on air quality and climate.

The South East is one of the most water-stressed regions in England. The increased demand for water to meet the needs of the additional employment sites and homes anticipated by the policies was identified to have significant negative effects on the water topic. The increased demand for construction materials and energy together with additional waste generation were considered likely to have significant adverse effects on material assets.

With the exception of T9 all of the policies above, together with policy TC1 Strategic Network of Town Centres, and a range of sub-regional policies were identified as having significant positive effects on the population and human health resulting from increased opportunities for employment and more homes. Policy NRM 14, Sub-Regional Targets for Land-based Renewable Energy, was assessed to have significant positive effects on climatic factors through its establishment of targets for land-based renewable energy generation. Policy NRM6, Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area, sets standards for provision of residential development in proximity to the Thames Basin Heaths SPA, and was assessed as having significant positive impacts on biodiversity and landscape. By setting targets for increased use of secondary aggregates and recycled materials policy M2 was assessed as having a significant positive impact on material assets.

The retention of these policies for a transitional period may result in some confusion with the intent of the NPPF and how it is to be applied. The NPPF must be taken into account in the preparation of local and neighbourhood plans, and is a material consideration in planning decisions. The NPPF intends to ensure that the Local Plan is at the heart of the plan-led system and promotes local authorities and communities to plan to meet objectively assessed needs for housing and other forms of development for their areas which should include collaboration with other bodies where appropriate. Since Local Plans need to be in general conformity with the Regional Strategy, and planning decisions need to be made in line with it, the retention of these policies could create confusion and potential conflict in the planning system. The retention of these policies would therefore be for a transitional period until Local Plans were revised and updated.

Proposed Mitigation Measures

Retaining just the quantitative and spatially specific policies and revoking the rest of the Regional Strategy would remove the measures which were included in the Regional Strategy to mitigate the adverse effects of the proposed development. However, as with revocation of the whole Regional Strategy, measures to protect the environment are provided through the NPPF, other national policy and legislation. For example, the duty on water companies to produce Water Resource Management Plans and Drought Management Plans will continue to address the issue of water supply in the region whether or not the Regional Strategy is revoked in full, is partially revoked or is retained.

4.3.4 Retention of Policies, the Revocation of which may lead to likely Significant Negative Environmental Effects

The assessment has found that there are no policies in the South East Plan or Regional Economic Strategy where the act of revocation will cause a significant negative effect whilst retaining the same policy will maintain a significant environmental benefit. For policy H1, H2 and sub-regional policies EKA3, KTG4, LF3, MKAV1, IW1 and IW2, there is a significant negative effect on water resources. There are also significant negative effects from policies RE1, RE3, RE6, H1 and H2 on material assets and from policy T9 on air quality and climate change. These effects are the same issue for both retention and revocation.

The effects on water resources are discussed above, and require concerted action by all responsible parties to resolve, although the water companies statutory responsibilities and approach to water resource management planning is key.

The effects on material assets arise from the increase in demand for construction material and aggregates, which are in some cases finite resources. Addressing these effects remains complex and involves increasing use of sustainable design and construction practices, increasing product availability and greater material recovery and reuse. For housing, adoption of the Government's Code for Sustainable Homes, national voluntary standard for the sustainable design and construction of new homes will lessen adverse effects. Developments in the South East will also benefit from the lessons learnt from the joint Environment Agency and WRAP European Pathways to Zero Waste (EPOW) programme which is focussed on the South East. The overall objective of Government policy on waste is to use less waste and by using it as a resource wherever possible, whilst also protecting human health and the environment. This is reflected in both PPS 10 and the National Waste Strategy 2007 (which will be replaced by the National Waste Management Plan by late 2013). In the Government Review of Waste Policy in England (June 2011), the Government stated a commitment to develop a comprehensive Waste Prevention Programme by the end of 2013. Minerals and Waste Local Plans adopted in the region commit each responsible authority to slow or reduce the rate of growth in controlled waste over the period and to encourage waste reduction in all development strategies.

Policy T9 relates to airport development and was assessed as having a significant effect on the climate change topic. Revocation of the South East Regional Strategy will not remove the demands for airport

development, and the national policy will remain as set out in the 2003 Aviation White Paper until superseded. Similarly, revocation of the Regional Strategy will not affect the national policy ambition to move towards a low carbon economy and the national measures put in place to realise this ambition.

4.4 Secondary, Cumulative and Synergistic Effects

In determining the significance of effects of a plan or programme, the SEA Directive requires that consideration is given to the secondary, cumulative, synergistic nature of the effects. As a consequence, the potential for the plan for the revocation of the South East Regional Strategy to have cumulative effects on the region and in conjunction with other regional plans has been considered as part of each assessment and a summary of those effects identified is presented in **Table 4.5** against each of the SEA topics. This assessment is relative to the legislative and policy framework that remains in place once the regional strategies are revoked.

Table 4.5 Cumulative Effects of the Plan to Revoke the South East Regional Strategy

Assessment Topic	Score	Summary
Biodiversity and Nature Conservation (which includes flora and fauna, and the functioning of ecosystems)	++/?	<p>Key indicators for biodiversity are the number and extent of protected areas and their condition. In particular, the Natural Environment White Paper states that 90% of priority wildlife habitats should be in recovering or favourable condition by 2020. According to the baseline figures, the 2020 target has already been achieved in the South East (97.6% in favourable or recovering condition).</p> <p>The South East Regional Strategy includes a number of policies that provided protection and enhancement of biodiversity and nature conservation features. Revocation of the South East Regional Strategy does not affect the legal requirement set out in the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 that a local planning authority must assess the implications of any plan or project likely to have an adverse effect on the integrity of a European site in accordance with the Habitats Directive. The Directive prevents the adoption of any such plan or project unless it must be adopted for imperative reasons of overriding public interest and there are no alternative solutions. Given the continued application of the legal and policy protection given to European and Ramsar sites and to SSSIs and further application of agri-environment schemes it is expected that revocation of the Regional Strategy would not change the positive trend in recovering or favourable condition of conservation sites.</p> <p>Specific policies were introduced under the South East Plan to avoid effects on identified European designated conservation sites, such as the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (SPA). For the Thames Basins Heaths SPA this will be continued through the mitigation strategy contained in Thames Basin Heaths SPA Area Delivery Framework and implemented by the Thames Basin Heaths Partnership. Ongoing implementation will however require continued co-operation between members in the Partnership.</p> <p>Achievement of legally binding targets for water and air quality will also be significant contributory factors in improving the quality of areas important for wildlife, while enhanced provisions on aspects such as the delivery and protection of green infrastructure will play an important role in increasing the overall area with significant biodiversity value. Statutory and policy protection for AONBs and National Parks will continue to protect the biodiversity value with these areas, at least in so far as the planning system is concerned.</p> <p>There will, however, be some development anticipated on greenfield sites, and where this occurs this will lead to some local loss of biodiversity (either directly through land take or indirectly through effects associated with disruption and disturbance of habitats adjacent to the developed sites arising from construction, traffic and recreational activity). The local effects will, however, depend on decisions taken by local authorities in consultation with their communities, and by businesses and other partners, on the future scale, nature and location of housing and other development in order to meet identified need.</p>

Assessment Topic	Score	Summary
Population (including socio-economic effects and accessibility)	++/?	<p>The South East Regional Strategy contains a variety of policies concerning economic development, from employment land provision to housing targets. Objectives from the South East Regional Economic Strategy include achieving global competitiveness; smart growth and ensuring that competitiveness is consistent with the principles of sustainable development.</p> <p>There is a range of significant direct and secondary positive benefits anticipated to accrue to communities from the provision of employment and housing land, improvements in local facilities and enhancement from local environmental quality. Revocation is unlikely to affect this. One of the key planning principles set out in the NPPF is to proactively drive and support sustainable economic development to deliver the homes, business and industrial units, infrastructure and thriving local places that the country needs. However, this should be in accordance with other policies in the NPPF which seek to minimise environmental effects. This includes minimising impacts on biodiversity and providing net gains where possible (paragraph 109), having access to high quality public transport facilities (paragraph 35) and aiming for a balance of land uses within their area so that people can be encouraged to minimise journey lengths for employment, shopping, leisure, education and other activities (paragraph 37).</p> <p>There are seven Local Enterprise Partnerships in the South East England region, covering Kent, East Sussex, West Sussex, Hampshire, Isle of Wight, Surrey, Oxfordshire, Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Bedfordshire, established within the last two years with the objective of enabling strategic business growth in the region. Each continues the emphasis on competitive advantage, the provision of strategic locations for employment (such as the Enterprise Zones in the South East LEP), the focus on key clusters (such as low carbon technologies in the Thames Gateway, advanced manufacturing in Southern Hampshire) and the provision of infrastructure to support such growth.</p> <p>Local authorities are expected to work collaboratively with neighbouring authorities and Local Enterprise Partnerships to determine the regeneration needs of their areas. The duty to co-operate is expected to play a key role in this and Local Enterprise Partnerships can also play a key role in assisting local authorities to deliver.</p> <p>This is likely to provide similar significant benefits as retention of the Regional Strategy.</p>
Human Health	+	<p>National health related policies/strategies and programmes are primarily related to improving the health of populations and reducing health disparities. The disparities referred to are primarily geographic, ethnic and economic. The South East Regional Strategy established sub-regional policies to address specific sub-regional issues associated with employment and regeneration which would have indirect health benefits through creating local employment opportunities, improving housing quality, improving local environmental quality, and seeking to afford greater access to green infrastructure.</p> <p>Revocation will not affect the delivery of these benefits; as noted above, local authorities are required to work collaboratively with neighbouring authorities and Local Enterprise Partnerships to determine the regeneration needs of their areas. Similarly, revocation will not remove the need for more houses within the region. Indeed it is Government policy to boost significantly the supply of housing, for example through initiatives such as the Community Infrastructure Levy, New Homes Bonus and the local retention of business rates are intended to encourage a more positive attitude to growth and allow communities to share the benefits and mitigate the negative effects of growth. New homes are to be in locations accessible by sustainable means of transport, walking and cycling in particular are healthy activities and the NPPF is complementary to national initiatives such as the cycle to work scheme.</p> <p>Paragraph 114 of the NPPF provides for a policy (similar to that within the South East Regional Strategy) to the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of green infrastructure. Indeed, paragraph 117 goes further. 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.</p>
Soil and Geology (including land use, important geological sites, and the contamination of soils)	?	<p>The main adverse impacts on soil are a result of development, and land cover under arable and horticulture has decreased by 9.1% between 1998 and 2007 across the UK. As a region, the South East has the largest area of previously developed land (PDL) suitable for housing and in 2008, 78% of new dwellings were constructed on previously developed land (PDL). Following revocation, given the scale of likely future development to meet population growth needs, it is likely that some greenfield land will be affected.</p> <p>The majority of land in the South East is ALC Grade 3, with pockets of 1 and 2. Policies in the</p>

Assessment Topic	Score	Summary
		<p>NPPF seek to protect best and most versatile land (i.e. ALC Grades 1-3a). The NPPF also has policies relating to green infrastructure (see discussion on human health above) which will reduce such effects and there remains the overall commitment given 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>At this stage the cumulative effects remain uncertain although are likely to be negative. However, given the target in the Natural Environment White Paper (NEWP) that by 2030 all of England's soils will be managed sustainably and degradation threats tackled successfully along with further research, there remains the potential for this to be addressed in the long term.</p>
Water Quality and Resources (including as inland surface freshwater and groundwater resources, and inland surface freshwater, groundwater, estuarine, coastal and marine water quality)	-/-	<p>Water resources are one of the main issues of concern for this region, which is the driest and most densely populated in the UK. There is a risk that water resources will not meet future demand. A high level policy (NRM1) in the Regional Strategy, sought to mitigate the effects of development by providing a policy context aimed at improving supply, and reducing demand. However, revocation is not considered to affect the benefits for human health as the objectives will be delivered by other policies and legislation by a range of organisations.</p> <p>The NPPF requires under paragraph 94 that local planning authorities should adopt proactive strategies to mitigate and adapt to climate change, taking full account of flood risk, coastal change and water supply and demand considerations. Paragraph 143 also sets out that local planning authorities will need to establish environmental criteria to ensure that permitted operations do not have unacceptable adverse impacts on the natural and historic environment or human health, including fromimpacts on the flow and quantity of surface and groundwater and migration of contamination from the site; and take into account the cumulative effects of multiple impacts from individual sites and/or a number of sites in a locality.</p> <p>Water companies, through the completion of the Water Resource Management Plans, have a duty to assess water supply and demand in their region on a rolling 5 year basis up to 25 years hence. The water resource planning process sets out, for those water resource zones in deficit (i.e. where demand exceeds supply) the measures needed to address the short fall. In determining future demand, population projections, housing needs and occupancy rates are used along with the effects of climate change on water availability. Preferred management options for each zone are usually a mix of water demand management measures (water metering, voluntary measures), leakage control and with supply measures (borehole refurbishment, reservoirs, bulk transfers). The Southern Water Resource Management Plan aims to ensure security of supply for the period to 2035. In making provision for future growth in the demand for water resources, water companies need to consider the role of large scale infrastructure such as reservoirs (e.g. as Havant Thicket, Hampshire or the Upper Thames reservoir, Oxfordshire). These options will be considered by water companies in the 2014 water resource management planning process; however, if such an option is identified as the preferred one and subsequently adopted, there will be substantial local effects (such as land take, soil loss, material use, resource sterilisation and landscape change).</p> <p>Statutory requirements under the Water Framework Directive will continue to apply and be implemented principally in accordance with River Basin Management Plans, supported by national planning policy. Local authorities should work co-operatively with other authorities, the Environment Agency and water companies to ensure the spatial planning aspects of River Basin Management Plans are applied and the distribution and scale of growth have regard to the capacity of waste water treatment works and WFD requirements</p> <p>Joint and partnership working between the Environment Agency, water industry bodies, local authorities and others must continue in line with the new duty to co-operate in order to deliver water efficiency, management and infrastructure benefits.</p> <p>However, given that the Climate Change Risk Assessment concluded that the South East region is particularly vulnerable to flooding, affecting both business and individual households, additional effects on water resource remain a residual concern and are scored negatively accordingly.</p>
Air Quality	0/-	<p>Within the South East, there are 44 Air Quality Management Areas and the main risk to air quality is from traffic. Policy NRM9 in the South East Plan made specific reference to air quality, and implementation of measures to sustain the downward trend in air pollution in the region. Air quality was also a component of those policies concerning transport.</p> <p>Revocation of the Regional Strategy will not affect the current trend in air quality or the localised effects noted. National planning policies, including those on air quality, sustainable development and transport, will continue to apply and inform Local Plan policies. More sustainable transport provision and infrastructure and sustainable locations for development should be supported locally through land use and transport planning. Furthermore, in areas of poor air quality</p>

Assessment Topic	Score	Summary
		- including those within, or adjacent to, an Air Quality Management Area - local authorities will continue to work closely with relevant partners to ensure that development has taken proper account of relevant air quality matters.
Climate Change (including greenhouse gas emissions, predicted effects of climate change and the ability to adapt)	+	<p>The South East could be substantially affected by the effects of climate change. The UK Climate Change Risk Assessment notes an increased risk of surface water flooding, particularly in urban areas (South Hampshire, Thames Gateway), and significant pressure on flood defences from rising sea levels and storms. Flooding is likely to affect key transport interchanges, and 25% of properties in the region are at risk of flooding. The South East Plan contains a specific policy (CC2) relating to climate change which sets targets for reducing carbon dioxide emissions and a range of measures for achieving this including through development planning and resource efficiency. Policy NRM14 sets sub-regional targets for land-based renewable energy provision.</p> <p>Revocation will not affect the move towards a low carbon economy. 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). Similarly, 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>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. From October 2012, the Green Deal will also improve the energy efficiency of the existing housing stock and supporting the drive to lower carbon emissions from households.</p> <p>There is a legally-binding target to ensure 15% of energy comes from renewable sources by 2020 and the UK Renewable Energy Strategy 2009 set out the path to meet it.</p> <p>One policy in the South East Plan (T9) related to airport development and was assessed as having a significant effect on the climate change topic. Revocation of the South East Regional Strategy will not remove the demands for airport development, and the national policy will remain as set out in the 2003 Aviation White Paper until superseded. Similarly, revocation of the Regional Strategy will not affect the national policy ambition to move towards a low carbon economy and the national measures put in place to realise this ambition.</p> <p>Following revocation of regional strategies, local authorities will be expected to continue to work together across administrative boundaries and with the Environment Agency to plan development that properly minimises the effects of climate change, particularly from flooding and coastal change. For flooding matters, local authorities already have a duty to co-operate under the Floods and Water Management Act 2010. This contains provisions that cover regional working and co-operation such as the establishment of Regional Flood and Coastal Committees and the bringing together of lead local flood authorities (unitary and county councils), who will have a duty to co-operate, to develop local strategies for managing local flood risk. In addition, the Flood Risk Regulations 2009 imposes a duty on the Environment Agency and lead local flood authorities to determine whether a significant flood risk exists in an area and if so to prepare flood hazard maps, flood risk maps and flood risk management plans.</p>
Waste Management and Minerals	+/-	<p>The South East Regional Strategy policies reinforces aspects of national policy that will need to apply across the region if waste generation is to be successfully decoupled from economic growth. It respects the European and national policy context and, in seeking to achieve the required shift towards more sustainable waste management, builds on principles set out in the Waste Strategy for England and PPS10.</p> <p>However, revocation of the South East Regional Strategy will not affect waste management in the region or the provision of future waste infrastructure to meet regional needs. The combination of European Directives (notably the Waste Framework Directive and Landfill Directive), Government policy (the 2007 Government Waste Management Strategy and the review of waste policy) and waste planning policy (PPS10) will ensure that waste management is undertaken in a manner consistent with the waste management hierarchy, increasing resource efficiency and reducing waste requiring disposal in landfill.</p> <p>If the current levels of waste going to landfill persist then the existing available capacity is</p>

Assessment Topic	Score	Summary
		<p>estimated to be sufficient for a further 7 years. However, the South East does have over 2.8 million tonnes (per annum) of residual waste treatment capacity either 'operating' or 'under construction'. In addition, planning consent has been granted to over 1.3 million tonnes of new incineration, gasification and Waste Incineration Directive (WID) compliant biomass capacity. Whilst these may help address infrastructure needs in the short and medium term, a growing population, a current higher than average proportion of waste requiring residual treatment and a reduction in the quantities of waste going to landfill will require the provision of further waste management infrastructure in the long term.</p> <p>Ensuring the timely provision of appropriate waste management facilities will have significant benefits on human health while reducing the amount of waste imported into the region should reduce traffic levels and have benefits for air quality. The reduction in the amount of waste disposed of to landfill will reduce the risk of water contamination and emission of green house gases (i.e. methane).</p> <p>Viewing waste as a resource will have significant benefits to material assets for example by replacing primary aggregate with recycled construction waste and making effective use of recovered energy.</p> <p>The furtherance of mineral extraction, whilst avoiding any environmental sensitive areas, remains a position that allows for further use of a non-renewable resource (and is reflected in the negative score against this topic).</p>
Cultural Heritage (including architectural and archaeological heritage)	++/-	<p>The South East region has a number of significant and historic cities combined with a rich maritime history and archaeological/defence heritage. The South East Plan policy BE6 concerned the protection, conservation and enhancement of the historic environment.</p> <p>Revocation will not affect the intent behind the policy as existing legislation protecting listed buildings, scheduled monuments, conservation areas and registered parks and gardens remain in place.</p> <p>Paragraphs 126 - 141 of the NPPF set out strong national policy on conserving and enhancing the historic environment. It 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.</p> <p>When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be.</p> <p>The most important cultural heritage sites are subject to statutory protection. This is supported by national planning policy for the protection and conservation of the historic environment. Following revocation of regional strategies, local authorities would still need to continue to work together on conservation, restoration and enhancement of the heritage and historic environment.</p> <p>In planning for the historic environment, local authorities should continue to draw on available information, including data from partners, to address cross boundary issues; they should also continue to liaise with English Heritage to identify and evaluate areas, sites and buildings of local cultural and historic importance.</p>
Landscape and Townscape	-	<p>The South East is home to several landscapes of national importance. Policies to provide protection to Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (C3), together with protection and enhancement of landscapes outside designated areas (C4), were included in the South East England Plan (C4).</p> <p>Revocation will not affect the intent behind these policies as existing legislation and policy remain including protections for valued landscapes and nationally designated areas (which are also subject to statutory protection). Paragraph 115 of the NPPF maintains the policy basis for the legislation. The NPPF also maintains the policy previously contained in PPS7 that local planning authorities should set criteria based policies against which proposals for any development on or affecting protected landscape areas will be judged (paragraph 113), while landscape character assessments should be prepared where appropriate (paragraph 170).</p>
Score Key:	Significant Positive ++	Positive +
	No significant effects 0	Negative -
	Significant negative --	Uncertain?
	No relationship n/a	
<p><i>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. A conclusion of</i></p>		

Assessment Topic	Score	Summary
<i>uncertainty arises where there is insufficient evidence for expert judgement to conclude an effect.</i>		

The plan to revoke the Regional Strategies is however national in scope as well as applying to the eight regions. In consequence the wider implications and effects of the plan have also been considered.

A key principle of regional planning was to seek to provide consistency and efficiency in the provision of housing, employment and associated infrastructure, along with the protection and enhancement of environmental resources. Notwithstanding counter arguments as to the effectiveness with which a Regional Strategy might be implemented, their revocation raises issues as to the cumulative impacts and unintended consequences of their replacement through a localised approach.

In respect of setting local housing targets, over the medium and longer term, reliance on locally-generated housing figures could yield an increasing difference between authority areas within regions. Tensions may arise, where the duty to co-operate and housing market assessments require an agreed strategy to accommodate growth that is not viewed as equitable by the co-operating authorities. This could create disparities which are difficult to reconcile without significant interventions. However, under revocation there is also the opportunity for adjacent authorities in previously different regions to explore joint working which may help address some of the potential issues that could arise.

At a broader scale, there could be an increasing diversification of regional circumstances across the country, accentuating issues such as the north-south divide with wider socio-economic consequences and reliance on other policy instruments for their resolution. Macro-scale trends such as the decentralisation of population from urban areas are arguably more difficult to address through local initiatives, as is regeneration which might be more efficiently tackled through regional-scale policy. National transport policies such as HS2 and other measures to improve the effectiveness of national transport networks and the ease of accessibility between regions will become increasingly important to counter such potential effects.

If an effect of abolition is regional differences then environmental effects could be exacerbated in some areas. For particular regions, this could be critical for resources such as water which, whilst addressed through mechanisms such as Water Resource Management Plans and the Environment Agency River Basin Management Plans, could be affected by absence of the strategic overview of regional planning which would seek to balance regional environmental capacity and the need for growth.

For the protection and enhancement of environmental resources more generally, the cumulative effects of the absence of regional policy frameworks and associated resources is harder to determine over the longer term. Whether regional strategies specifically relating to biodiversity and landscape resources, for example, can adequately realise their potential in the absence of a unifying policy framework is uncertain. Here, the cumulative impacts could be associated with increasingly lost opportunities to plan strategically for these interests.

The provision of renewable energy has been an issue which regional planning arguably seemed to be particularly fitted to help guide. Development of strategic renewable energy-generating capacity, whilst to some extent modified through co-operation, could over the longer term lead to sub-optimal provision as localised interests perhaps come to the fore, and issues over the equity of provision and national interests are increasingly difficult to reconcile. As with the enhancement of natural resources, this could present a lost opportunity, only recognised over the longer term.

4.5 In summary

The assessment of the revocation of the South East Regional Strategy has shown that there will be significant positive effects, although these will be largely similar to those that would arise were the Regional Strategy to be retained.

For many policies, it is difficult to identify specific differentiation between the effects of retention and revocation, given the strategic nature of the Regional Strategy policies and the degree to which they have already devolved responsibility to local authorities. The provisions of the NPPF means that a basic framework for the delivery of sustainable development is in place which is compatible with the principles employed in the Regional Strategy. Local Plans can therefore readily deliver the aspirations and proposals of the Regional Strategy, using additional mechanisms such as the duty to co-operate.

Where it occurs, differentiation is most clear in respect of housing and employment allocations. New housing and employment development is likely to have significant positive effects on the population topic and negative effects on biodiversity, air, water and material assets. Under revocation in the absence of a regional context it will be the responsibility of local authorities, through preparing, updating and implementing Local Plans and working together under the duty to co-operate and with other organisations such as the Local Enterprise Partnerships, to best meet the needs of their areas (and other local authority areas where appropriate) having regard to the NPPF and other policy and legislation (e.g. the Government's planning policy for traveller sites published in March 2012).

Under revocation, the regional objectives established for economic development concerning global competitiveness and smart growth will be replaced by the commitments of the Local Economic Partnerships and the key policies in the NPPF to proactively drive and support sustainable economic development (as reflected in post NPPF adopted Local Plans). The seven Local Enterprise Partnerships in the South East England region will continue the emphasis on competitive advantage, the provision of strategic locations for employment (such as the Enterprise Zones in the South East LEP), the focus on key clusters (such as low carbon technologies in the Thames Gateway, advanced manufacturing in Southern Hampshire) and the provision of infrastructure to support such growth.

Under revocation, the positive effects (and any negative effects) of development may be delayed where there are uncertainties over the quantum of development in the absence of the Regional Strategy. The application of the NPPFs presumption in favour of sustainable development and its policies to boost the supply of housing will help support development which accords with the NPPF where Local Plans or policies are absent, silent or out of date.

Under revocation, a number of policies that contain regional targets (such as those for brownfield land and renewable energy) will be lost. In the case of brownfield land, the NPPF does require preferential use of brownfield land and local planning authorities can still set local targets; however, the removal of the specific target could reduce the amount of brownfield land reused for development and lead to an increase in development on greenfield sites. In the case of renewable energy, 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. Specifically, local planning authorities are expected to identify opportunities where development can draw its energy supply from decentralised, renewable or low carbon energy supplies. Local effects however, will depend on decisions taken by local authorities in consultation with their communities, and by businesses and other partners, on the future scale, nature and location of housing and other development in order to meet identified need.

Where it is a policy that provides a strategic direction and whose requirements extend beyond the boundaries of a single authority, such as in the sub regions, there may again be differences between retention and revocation. Under revocation the positive effects (and any negative effects) may be delayed where there are uncertainties over the timing of development in the absence of the Regional Strategy. Again however, the application of the NPPFs presumption in favour of sustainable development and its policies to boost the supply of housing will help support development which accords with the NPPF where plans or policies are absent, silent or out of date.

A number of issues are arguably more efficiently and effectively addressed across wider areas than individual local authorities such as major infrastructure provision, biodiversity planning, climate change mitigation and adaptation, and renewable energy. Whilst the duty to co-operate in principle and practice could well address a wide range of strategic issues, it is AMEC's opinion that there is some uncertainty as to how this might work in the short term, both by topic and geographically. However, there are examples in the South East, such as the Thames Basin Heaths Partnership, where this has already worked successfully. If however, wider arrangements are ineffectual or lack support, for some issues, such as renewable energy, biodiversity enhancement or landscape conservation, their potential will not be realised.

More widely, and over the longer term, it is AMEC's view that inter- and intra-regional differences could be magnified as a result of the sum of local decisions which reflect strongly varying circumstances such as housing demand.

Mitigation of the effects of revocation is likely to be diverse and perhaps sub-regionally specific. For example, in planning for water provision as part of new development, there is likely to be greater reliance on Water Resource Management Plans and co-operation between interested parties.

5. Conclusions and Key Findings

5.1 What are the Environmental Effects of Revocation of the South East Regional Strategy?

The assessment has identified that the revocation of the South East Regional Strategy will be likely to result in a range of environmental effects across all of the topics identified in the SEA Directive.

The overall vision of the South East Regional Strategy is a combination of the visions set out in the South East Plan and the Regional Economic Strategy (RES). The South East Plan's vision is of *"a socially and economically strong and just South East that respects the limits of the global environment"*. The RES vision is that *"by 2016 the south east will be world class region achieving sustainable prosperity"*. These visions are intentionally complementary as they both seek to ensure that the South East region effectively addresses sustainability having regard to economic progress, quality of life and the environment, amongst other factors. The RESs headline targets and related objectives for Gross Value Added, productivity and the region's ecological footprint sit effectively alongside the South East South East Plan's objectives which include providing new housing and adequate infrastructure, and achieve a closer alignment between jobs and homes growth. Following through their respective visions and objectives, the policies in the South East Plan and RES are together designed to achieve a more sustainable future.

The assessment of the revocation of the Regional Strategy has shown that there will be significant positive effects across most SEA topic areas; these effects will be largely similar to those arising if the strategy were to be retained. This reflects the fact that in some policy areas (such as the provision for future employment and housing needs) the intent will be continued through other government policy, notably the NPPF. For example, the application of the NPPFs presumption in favour of sustainable development will provide a strong basis for securing a more sustainable future in the South East and has resulted in the assessment identifying significant positive effects for many SEA topic areas, both for retention and revocation

The revocation of the South East Regional Strategy removes a number of quantitative based policies such as those for housing where specific dwelling allocations are made to individual local authorities. In the absence of this regional context it will be the responsibility of local authorities, through preparing, updating and implementing Local Plans to work together under the duty to co-operate to best meet the needs of their areas in the most appropriate way having regards to the NPPF and where appropriate other policy and legislation (for example, the Government's planning policy for traveller sites published in March 2012). The duty to co-operate will require new ways of working for local authorities and this may lead to some delay in putting in place local plans and other planning policy or in establishing what the development needs are of their area having regard to the needs of other areas as well, such as in their housing market area which is likely to include a number of local authorities. It is AMEC's view that the net effect of this may be a short-medium term slowing down of development as the new approaches are

implemented - this in turn may lead to a reduction in the positive and negative environmental effects over this short term. The application of the NPPF's presumption in favour of sustainable development and its policies to boost the supply of housing will help where plans or policies are absent, silent or out of date.

One area where revocation of the Regional Strategy would lead to significant negative effects is in relation to water and in particular on water supply. As the South East is one of the driest and most densely populated region in the UK, new development could create significant shortfall in terms of water supply and demand, and population increases coupled with climate change may place further pressure on water resources. Under both revocation and retention there will be more housing and employment development in the region in the future. Although per capita water use is likely to decrease, total water use in the region is likely to increase as the water infrastructure deficit increases. Areas likely to be significantly affected include South Hampshire, London Fringe, Western Corridor and Blackwater Valley, and Milton Keynes and Aylesbury Vale. However the effects are likely to be minimised as far as possible through the operation of the region's water companies and through the application of policies in the NPPF and elsewhere which are designed to secure efficient water usage.

Other significant negative effects are identified in relation to material assets arising from additional housing and economic development including airport developments – in the latter case together with significant negative effects for climate change. These effects are common for both revocation and retention.

The assessment identifies similar significant negative effects on water and material assets for retention and revocation although the effects under revocation may be delayed where there are uncertainties over the timing of developments in the absence of the Regional Strategy

The assessment has considered the reasonable alternative of retaining the South East Regional Strategy. This has resulted in the identification of similar environmental effects to revocation although there may be differences in the timing of effects as indicated above. Other reasonable alternatives assessed were partial revocation of the South East Regional Strategy by

- Revoking all the quantified and spatially specific policies and retaining for a transitional period the non spatial policies, ambitions and priorities; or
- Retaining for a transitional period all the spatially specific policies where a quantum of development or land for development is allocated to a particular location in the region and revoking the non spatial policies, ambitions and priorities; or
- Retention for a transitional period of policies, ambitions and/or priorities, the revocation of which may lead to likely significant negative environmental effects.

The effects of revoking all the quantified and spatially specific policies were identified to be very similar to retaining the Regional Strategy as neither alternative will remove the need for more houses, jobs and employment land within the region. Similarly, the retention of the spatially specific policies will also result in the negative effects on water and material assets but there could be some confusion initially with the intent of the NPPF and how the policies are to be applied.

The assessment found that there are no policies in the South East Plan or Regional Economic Strategy where the act of revocation will cause a significant negative environmental effect whilst retaining the same policy will maintain a significant environmental benefit.

5.2 Proposals for Monitoring

It is a requirement of the SEA Directive to establish how the significant effects of revoking the Regional Strategy will be monitored. Article 10(2) of the SEA Directive specifically states that, where appropriate, existing monitoring arrangements may be used to assess the success of the appropriate plan in achieving its objectives. It does not require that targets be developed for the SEA itself.

CLG's Business Plan²⁸ under section 5 'Put Communities in charge of planning' includes specific monitoring actions for the department regarding the Local Plan making progress by authorities and on compliance with the duty to co-operate. The results of this monitoring will provide clarity over the extent of any delay in adoption of revised Local Plans. When reviewing the effects of the final decision on revocation, it is proposed that CLG will make periodic reference to the following metrics and sources of information contained in **Table 5.1**. The proposed indicators reflect those identified in the course of the gathering the evidence for this assessment, namely the review of plans, strategies and programmes and collation of baseline information. They are proposed in part to minimise any additional burdens associated with collection and analysis of monitoring data.

Any resulting analysis of long term trends in the indicators will be used to consider whether any further mitigation or intervention is needed for the two categories identified in the SEA Directive, namely:

- The significant effects identified in the assessment that may give rise to irreversible damage, where appropriate, relevant mitigating measures can be taken; and
- Uncertain effects where monitoring would enable preventative or mitigating measures to be undertaken.

Based on the findings of this assessment, the effects that should therefore be monitored include:

- Significant effects on water (RS Policy RE1, RE3, RE6, H1, H2, EKA1, KTG1, KTG4, LF1, LF3, MKAV1 and IW1-2).
- Significant effects air (RS Policy T9).
- Significant effects on climate change RS Policy T9).
- Significant effects on material assets (RS Policy RE1, RE3, RE6, H1 and H2).

²⁸ CLG May 2012, Business Plan 2012-2015

Monitoring measures have also been proposed where there have been uncertain effects identified and these include:

- Uncertain effects on biodiversity (RS Policy CC7, CC9, T1, T9-10, T12-14, NRM3, W1-7, W9, W16-17, M3-4, BE2-3, TC1-3, TRS2-7, S4-5, SH2-6, SCT1-2, SCT4-6, EKA2-4, EKA8, KTG1-5, LF1, LF5, LF8, LF10, WCBV1-4, CO1-4, MKAV1-3, GAT1-3, IW4-5, AOSR4-5, AOSR8).
- Uncertain effects on population and human health (RS Policy W3, W10, W13, BE2-3, TC3, TRS6, CO4, AOSR4).
- Uncertain effects on soil (RS Policy SP3, CC7, CC9, H3, T1, T9-10, NRM3, W1-7, W9-10, W17, M3-4, BE2-3, TC1, TC3, TRS2-7, S4-5, SH2, SH4-6, SCT1-2, SCT4-6, EKA2-3, EKA8, KTG1-5, LF4, LF5, LF8, LF10, WCBV1-4, CO1-4, MKAV1-3, GAT1-3, IW4-5, AOSR4-5, AOSR8).
- Uncertain effects on water (RS Policy CC7, CC9, RE2, T1, T10, W6-7, W9-10, W16-17, M3-4, BE2-3, TC1, TRS3-7, S4-5, SH2, SH4-6, SCT1-2, SCT4-6, EKA2-4, KTG2-4, LF4, WCBV1-4, CO1-4, MKAV2, GAT1-3, IW5, AOSR4-5).
- Uncertain effects on air (RS Policy CC7, CC9, RE3, RE6, H3, T1, T14, W3, W9-10, W17, M3-4, BE2, TC1-3, TRS2-7, S4, S6, SH2, SH4-6, SCT1-2, SCT4-6, EKA2-4, EKA7-8, KTG1-2, LF1, LF4-5, WCBV1-4, CO1-4, MKAV1-3, GAT1-3, IW4-5, AOSR4-5, AOSR7-8).
- Uncertain effects on climatic factors (RS Policy CC7, CC9, RE3, RE6, H3, T1, NRM3, W3, W9-10, W17, M3-4, BE2, TC1-3, TRS2-7, S4, S6, SH2, SH4-6, SCT1-2, SCT4-6, EKA2-4, EKA7-8, KTG1-4, LF1, LF4-5, WCBV1-4, CO1-4, MKAV1-3, GAT1-3, IW4-5, AOSR4-5, AOSR7-8).
- Uncertain effects on material assets (RS Policy CC7, CC9, H1, T1, T10, NRM3, W11, BE2, TC1, TC3, TRS4-7, S4-5, SH4-6, SCT4, SCT6, EKA4, KTG1, KTG3-4, LF1, MKAV3, IW43, AOSR4-5).
- Uncertain effects on cultural heritage (RS Policy SP3, CC7, CC9, H2-3, T1, T9-10, T14, NRM3, NRM13-14, W1-7, W10, W12-13, W16-17, M3-4, TC1, TC3, TRS2-7, S4-6, SH1-2, SH4-6, SCT1-2, SCT4-6, EKA4, KTG1, LF1, LF4, WCBV1-4, CO1-4, MKAV1-2, GAT1-3).
- Uncertain effects on landscape (RS Policy CC7, H3, T1, T9-10, NRM3, NRM13-14, W1-7, W9-10, W16-17, M3-4, C3, BE2-3, TC1, TC3, TRS1-7, S4-5, SH1-6, SCT1-6, EKA2-4, EKA8, KTG1-5, LF1, LF2-4, LF8, LF10, WCBV1-4, CO1-4, MKAV1-3, GAT1-3, IW4-5, AOSR4-5, AOSR8).

Taking this into account, of the 12 topics considered in this SEA, it is proposed that monitoring should focus on the following indicators and sources of information, as set out in **Table 5.1**.

Table 5.1 Potential Environmental Monitoring Indicators

SEA Topics	Proposed Monitoring Indicators	Source(s) of Information
Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna	<p>Annual (where information allows) trends in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Condition of designated sites • Threatened habitats and species • Populations of countryside birds • Surface water biological indicators 	<p>Joint Nature Conservancy Committee (JNCC) report under Article 17 of the Habitats Directive (completed every 6 years) on the conservation status of protected habitats</p> <p>JNCC</p> <p>http://www.jncc.gov.uk/page-4241</p> <p>http://jncc.defra.gov.uk/page-4239</p> <p>http://jncc.defra.gov.uk/page-4238</p> <p>http://jncc.defra.gov.uk/page-4235</p> <p>http://www.sssi.naturalengland.org.uk/Special/sssi/report.cfm?category=R,RF</p> <p>Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra)</p> <p>http://www.defra.gov.uk/statistics/environment/inland-water/</p> <p>The Environment Agency (EA) are responsible for monitoring water quality under the Water Framework Directive</p>
Population	<p>Annual (where information allows) trends in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employment Information • Population • Housing and additional net dwellings 	<p>Office of National Statistics (ONS) reports, specifically Regional Trends and Regional Gross Value Added</p> <p>Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) statistics: Annual net additional dwellings, Housebuilding: permanent dwellings completed by tenure and region</p>
Human Health	<p>Annual (where information allows) trends in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Statistics – Long term illness, etc. • Crime • Deprivation • Access to and quality of the local environment 	<p>ONS on health</p> <p>Home Office, Crime Survey for England and Wales</p> <p>DCLG: Indices of Deprivation</p> <p>ONS (proposed measures of wellbeing)</p>
Soil and Geology	<p>Annual (where information allows) trends in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land use 	DCLG statistics
Water	<p>Annual (where information allows) trends in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • % of catchments with good 	EA and Defra

SEA Topics	Proposed Monitoring Indicators	Source(s) of Information
	ecological status <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Water resource availability Per capita water consumption 	http://www.defra.gov.uk/statistics/environment/inland-water/ Southern Water, Thames Water, South East Water, Portsmouth Water, Veolia Water South East, Sutton and East Surrey Water
Air	Annual (where information allows) trends in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of AQMAs Number of AQMAs were exceedances occurred. 	Defra Defra
Climatic factors	Annual (where information allows) trends in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Emission of greenhouse gases Number of properties at risk of flooding 	Department for Energy and Climate Change (DECC) Statistical Release: Local and regional CO2 emissions EA
Material Assets	Annual (where information allows) trends in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Volume of construction waste and proportions recycled Volume of hazardous waste Volume of controlled wastes and proportions recycled Volume of minerals extracted 	EA EA EA South East Mineral Planning Authorities'
Cultural heritage, including architectural and archaeological heritage	Annual (where information allows) trends in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> % of heritage assets of different types that are at risk 	English Heritage 'Heritage at risk report'
Landscape and Townscape	Annual (where information allows) trends in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Change in AONBs (area, threats and quality) Changes in Conservation 	National Association of AONBs English Heritage (if 2003 survey repeated)

SEA Topics	Proposed Monitoring Indicators	Source(s) of Information
	<p>Areas</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percentage who are very or fairly satisfied with local area Trend in number of vacant dwellings 	<p>ONS (proposed measures of wellbeing)</p> <p>DCLG http://www.communities.gov.uk/documents/housing/xls/1815794.xls</p>

5.3 Quality Assurance

The Government's Guidance on SEA contains a quality assurance checklist to help ensure that the requirements of the SEA Directive are met. Those relevant to this stage have been highlighted below.

Table 5.2 Quality Assurance

Objectives and Context	
The plan's purpose and objectives are made clear.	Presented in Section 2 .
Environmental issues, including international and EC objectives, are considered in developing objectives and targets.	International and European objectives and targets are identified in Appendix E .
SEA objectives are clearly set out and linked to indicators and targets where appropriate.	Section 3.1 presents the SEA Topics and Table 5.1 links these to indicators.
Links to other related plans, programmes and policies are identified and explained.	Appendix E identifies relevant plans, programmes and policies.
Scoping	
The environmental consultation bodies are consulted in appropriate ways and at appropriate times on the content and scope of the Scoping Report.	<p>The Consultation Bodies in England²⁹ were consulted on the scope and level of detail of the environmental reports on 6 May 2011, and were given 5 weeks as required by regulations to respond. The equivalent bodies in the Devolved Administrations were also consulted.</p> <p>Their comments were used as the basis for deciding the scope and level of detail of the material included in the environmental reports. Consideration was also given to more detailed textual comments provided by the consultation bodies.</p> <p>Section 1.5.2 presents information on scoping consultation.</p>
The SEA focuses on significant issues.	Section 3.2 sets out the scope of the assessment. These issues reflect the views of the scoping consultees as detailed in Section 1.5.2 . The significant issues are

²⁹ The Environment Agency, English Heritage and Natural England

Objectives and Context	
	identified in Appendix E for each of the 12 SEA topics.
Technical, procedural and other difficulties encountered are discussed; assumptions and uncertainties are made explicit.	Section 3.5 identifies the technical difficulties encountered in completing this report.
Reasons are given for eliminating issues from further consideration.	No issues were eliminated from further consideration.
Alternatives	
Realistic alternatives are considered for key issues, and the reasons for choosing them are documented.	Alternatives were identified in Section 2.4 .
Alternatives include 'do minimum' and/or 'business as usual' scenarios wherever relevant.	Alternatives were identified in Section 2.4 .
The environmental effects (both adverse and beneficial) of each alternative are identified and compared.	Refer to Section 4, 5 and Appendix D and E .
Inconsistencies between the alternatives and other relevant plans, programmes or policies are identified and explained.	Refer to Section 2.4 .
Reasons are given for selection or elimination of alternatives.	These are presented in Sections 2.4 and 5 .
Baseline Information	
Relevant aspects of the current state of the environment and their likely evolution without the plan are described.	Refer to Appendix E where baseline information is provided for each SEA topic considered.
Characteristics of areas likely to be significantly affected are described, including areas wider than the physical boundary of the plan area where it is likely to be affected by the plan where practical.	Refer to Appendix C, D and E
Difficulties such as deficiencies in information or methods are explained.	These are stated throughout the report where appropriate.
Prediction and Evaluation of Significant Environmental Effects	
Effects identified include the types listed in the Directive (biodiversity, population, human health, fauna, flora, soil, water, air, climatic factors, material assets, cultural heritage and landscape) as relevant; other likely environmental effects are also covered as appropriate.	These are set out in Appendix D and E and summarised in Section 4 and 5 .
Both positive and negative effects are considered, and the duration of effects (short, medium, or long term) is addressed.	These are set out in Appendix D and E and summarised in Section 4 and 5 .
Likely secondary, cumulative and synergistic effects are identified where practicable.	These are set out in Appendix D and E and summarised in Section 4 .
Inter-relationships between effects are considered where practicable.	These are set out in Appendix D and E and summarised in Section 4 and 5 .
The prediction and evaluation of effects makes use of relevant accepted standards, regulations and thresholds.	Refer to individual topic chapters in Appendix E and Section 3.4.2 .
Methods used to evaluate the effects are described.	These are described in Section 3.4 .

Objectives and Context	
Mitigation Measures	
Measures envisaged to prevent, reduce and offset any significant adverse effects of implementing the plan or programme are indicated.	These are set out in Appendix D and E and summarised in Section 4 and 5 .
Issues to be taken into account in project consents are identified.	If relevant, these are set out in Appendix D and E and summarised in Section 4 and 5 .
Environmental Report	
Is clear and concise in its layout and presentation.	The layout of the Environmental Report is set out in Section 1.6 . The structure was subject to early consultation and review as part of scoping.
Uses simple, clear language and avoids or explains technical terms.	The Environmental Report has been written in plain English as far as the technical nature of the report allows.
Uses maps and other illustrations where appropriate.	Figures and tables have been used throughout the SEA Report and in Appendix E where appropriate.
Explains the methodology used.	This is presented in Section 3 .
Explains who was consulted and what methods of consultation were used.	This is covered in Section 1.5 .
Identifies sources of information, including expert judgement and matters of opinion.	References to information sources are provided throughout the report and Appendix E where appropriate.
Contains a non-technical summary covering the overall approach to the SEA, the objectives of the plan, the main options considered, and any changes to the plan resulting from the SEA.	An NTS is provided as a stand alone document.
Consultation	
The SEA is consulted on as an integral part of the plan-making process.	<p>The completed previous Environmental Reports were sent to the Consultation Bodies in England and the equivalent bodies in the devolved administrations and simultaneously published for public consultation on 20 October 2011. The consultation period ended on 20 January 2012. As the Environmental Reports dealt with the effects of the revocation and not the adoption of plans, there were no draft plans to consult on.</p> <p>This Environmental Report will be published for consultation in summer 2012.</p>
Consultation Bodies and the public likely to be affected by, or having an interest in, the plan or programme are consulted in ways and at times which give them an early and effective opportunity within appropriate timeframes to express their opinions on the draft plan and Environmental Report.	<p>The completed Environmental Reports were sent to the Consultation Bodies in England and the equivalent bodies in the devolved administrations and simultaneously published for public consultation on 20 October 2011.</p> <p>This Environmental Report will be published for consultation in summer 2012.</p>
Decision-making and Information on the Decision	
The Environmental Report and the opinions of those consulted are taken into account in finalising and adopting the plan or programme.	This will be included in the Post Adoption Statement (to be issued following consultation).

Objectives and Context	
An explanation is given of how they have been taken into account.	This will be included in the Post Adoption Statement (to be issued following consultation).
Reasons are given for choosing the plan or programme as adopted, in the light of other reasonable alternatives considered.	This will be included in the Post Adoption Statement (to be issued following consultation).
Monitoring Measures	
Measures proposed for monitoring are clear, practicable and linked to the indicators and objectives used in the SEA.	These are presented in Section 5.2 .
Monitoring is used, where appropriate, during implementation of the plan or programme to make good deficiencies in baseline information in the SEA.	Details of this are provided in Section 5.2 .
Monitoring enables unforeseen adverse effects to be identified at an early stage (these effects may include predictions which prove to be incorrect).	Details of this are provided in Section 5.2 .
Proposals are made for action in response to significant adverse effects.	This will be set out in the Post Adoption Statement (to be published following consultation).

5.4 Next Steps

This Environmental Report is presented for consultation until Thursday 6 December 2012. Feedback received from consultees in relation to the SEA will be documented and considered in reviewing the proposals to revoke the regional strategies. A Post Adoption Statement will summarise how the SEA and the consultation responses have been taken into account and how environmental considerations have been integrated into the final decisions regarding the proposals to revoke the regional strategies.

Third-Party Disclaimer

Any disclosure of this report to a third party is subject to this disclaimer. The report was prepared by AMEC at the instruction of, and for use by, our client Department for Communities and Local Government. It does not in any way constitute advice to any third party who is able to access it by any means. AMEC excludes to the fullest extent lawfully permitted all liability whatsoever for any loss or damage howsoever arising from reliance on the contents of this report. We do not however exclude our liability (if any) for personal injury or death resulting from our negligence, for fraud or any other matter in relation to which we cannot legally exclude liability.

AMEC Environment & Infrastructure UK Limited

Gables House, Kenilworth Road, Leamington Spa, Warwickshire CV32 6JX, United Kingdom
Tel +44 (0) 1926 439 000 Fax +44 (0) 1926 439 010

© Queen's Printer and Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 2012

You may re-use this information (not including logos) free of charge in any format or medium, under the terms of the Open Government Licence. To view this licence, visit <http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/> or write to the Information Policy Team, The National Archives, Kew, London TW9 4DU, or e-mail: psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk.

This document/publication is also available on our website at www.communities.gov.uk

Any enquiries regarding this document/publication should be sent to us at:

Department for Communities and Local Government
Eland House
Bressenden Place
London
SW1E 5DU
Telephone: 030 3444 0000