

Southend Central Area Action Plan

Sustainability Appraisal Post Adoption Statement

On behalf of **Southend on Sea Borough Council**



Project Ref: 28511/2018/001i3 | Rev: B | Date: February 2018



This report has been prepared by Peter Brett Associates LLP ('PBA') on behalf of its client to whom this report is addressed ('Client') in connection with the project described in this report and takes into account the Client's particular instructions and requirements. This report was prepared in accordance with the professional services appointment under which PBA was appointed by its Client. This report is not intended for and should not be relied on by any third party (i.e. parties other than the Client). PBA accepts no duty or responsibility (including in negligence) to any party other than the Client and disclaims all liability of any nature whatsoever to any such party in respect of this report.

© Peter Brett Associates LLP 2018

Contents

1	Introduction	1
1.1	Context	1
1.2	Overview of the SCAAP	1
1.3	Overview of the SCAAP SA Process	1
1.4	Structure of this Report	2
2	How environmental considerations have been integrated into the SCAAP	4
2.1	Introduction	4
2.2	SA Framework	4
2.3	SA Reporting and Outputs	9
3	How SA reporting has been taken into account in the SCAAP	10
3.1	Overview	10
3.2	SA Assessment Matrices and Scoring	10
3.3	SA Mitigation and Enhancement Recommendations	11
4	How the opinions raised during consultation have been taken into account	20
4.1	Overview	20
4.2	Consultation Opportunities	20
4.3	Impact of SA Related Consultation Responses on the SCAAP	20
5	Reasons for choosing the Plan as adopted, in light of other alternatives dealt with	28
5.1	Overview	28
5.2	Strategic Objectives	28
5.3	Preferred Option	30
5.4	Reasonable Alternatives Considered	30
5.5	Rationale for adoption of SCAAP as prepared	31
6	Measures that are to be taken to monitor the likely significant effects of the implementation of the Plan	32
6.1	Overview	32
6.2	SCAAP Monitoring Framework	32
7	Conclusion	42

Tables

Table 2:1	Key Sustainability Issues Identified in Relation to the SCAAP	6
Table 2.2	Iterations of SCAAP SA Reports and Consultations	9
Table 3.1	Overview of SA Recommendations and Associated SCAAP Response (2010 – 2017)	12
Table 6:1	SCAAP Implementation and Monitoring Framework (2018)	33
Table A.1	SCAAP SA Framework	43

Appendices

Appendix A SCAAP SA Framework

This page is intentionally blank

1 Introduction

1.1 Context

- 1.1.1 Peter Brett Associates LLP (PBA) has been commissioned by Southend-on-Sea Borough Council (SBC) to undertake the sustainability appraisal (SA) of the Southend Central Area Action Plan (SCAAP). This report provides a SA Post Adoption Statement to explain how the SA process and wider environmental considerations have informed the development of the SCAAP, which in February 2018 was presented to SBC for formal adoption.
- 1.1.2 This report responds to the information requirements specified in Regulation 16 of the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 as amended ('the SEA Regulations') and the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 as amended ('the Development Planning Regulations'). Read together, these regulations set out the core information and assessment requirements for undertaking a SA, incorporating strategic environmental assessment (SEA) of emerging plans and programmes.

1.2 Overview of the SCAAP

- 1.2.1 The purpose of the SCAAP is to set a detailed and comprehensive planning policy framework for Southend's Central Area to guide the delivery of development within this area. The SCAAP sits in the context of the other planning documents that make up the existing local planning framework for the Borough. These include:
- The Southend Core Strategy (2007), which provides the spatial strategy for the Borough to 2021;
 - The Southend Development Management Document (DMD) (2015), which sets Borough-wide policies to be used in determining development delivery;
 - The London Southend Airport Joint Area Action Plan, which covers the airport and its environs; and,
 - The Essex and Southend Replacement Waste Local Plan (2017), which provides the framework for determining planning applications for new waste facilities and change to existing waste facilities.
- 1.2.2 Once formally adopted by SBC (expected February 2018), the SCAAP will become part of the local planning framework and statutory Development Plan for Southend. As such the SCAAP will play a key role in the determination of planning applications and other development decisions within the Central Area of Southend, as all planning applications must be determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The SCAAP will be reviewed in due course as part of the preparation of the Southend new Local Plan, which will cover the period to 2036.

1.3 Overview of the SCAAP SA Process

- 1.3.1 In line with statutory requirements, SA incorporating Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) has previously been undertaken and reported at all stages in the preparation of the SCAAP, namely:
- SA of Issues and Options – Town Centre and Seafront Area Action Plans (AAPs) (2007);

- SA of SCAAP Issues and Options (2010)¹;
 - SA of Proposed Submission SCAAP (2011);
 - SA of SCAAP Preferred Approach (2015);
 - SA of Revised Proposed Submission SCAAP (2016); and,
 - SA of Proposed Post-Examination Modifications (PM) (2017).
- 1.3.2 In each case, SA reports (or, in respect of the proposed Post Examination Modifications (PM's), an SA Addendum) were prepared by PBA to accompany the relevant iteration of the Plan. Both the SA report and the SCAAP were consulted on in tandem, with representations on both documents influencing the evolution of the SCAAP.
- 1.3.3 The SCAAP has been subject to examination by an independent Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State. The Revised Proposed Submission SCAAP was submitted to the Government for independent examination on 10th March 2017 and hearing sessions were held between the 23rd and 25th May 2017. Following the hearing, the Inspector published a schedule of proposed modifications which was considered necessary for the Plan to be 'sound'. The Council consulted on these proposed modifications to the Plan.
- 1.3.4 The Inspectors Final Report was published in December 2017 and concluded that, subject to the modifications being made, the Plan is sound, it satisfies the requirements of Section 20(5) of the 2004 Act and it provides an appropriate basis for the planning of Southend Central Area. The report states that an adequate SA and Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) has been undertaken.

1.4 Structure of this Report

- 1.4.1 Reflecting Article 9 of European Directive 2001/42/EC on the assessment of the effects of certain plans and programmes on the environment ('the SEA Directive'), Regulation 16(4) of the SEA Regulations requires responsible authorities (including SBC) to produce a statement containing the following information as soon as reasonably practical after the adoption of a relevant and qualifying plan or programme:
- How environmental considerations have been integrated into the plan or programme (**Section 2** of this Statement);
 - How the environmental report has been taken into account (**Section 3**);
 - How opinions expressed in response to:
 - i the invitation referred to in regulation 13(2)(d);
 - ii action taken by the responsible authority in accordance with regulation 13(4), have been taken into account; (**Section 4**).
 - How the results of any consultations entered into under regulation 14(4) have been taken into account;
 - The reasons for choosing the plan or programme as adopted, in the light of the other reasonable alternatives dealt with; (**Section 5** of this Statement) and

¹ This revised Issues and Options paper was published to respond to SBC's decision to combine the previously proposed Town Centre and Seafront AAPs into a single SCAAP covering all of the central area of Southend.

- The measures that are to be taken to monitor the significant environmental effects of the implementation of the plan or programme (regulation 16) (**Section 6** of this Statement).
- 1.4.2 The remainder of this report responds to these six information requirements in turn. It should be noted that this SA Post Adoption Statement addresses the requirements of the SEA Regulations rather than providing a wider “*Adoption Statement*” or “*Consultation Statement*”.

2 How environmental considerations have been integrated into the SCAAP

2.1 Introduction

2.1.1 The SA process involves assessing the performance of a plan or a programme against a series of sustainability objectives to test whether it is likely to result in significant environmental, social or economic effects. SA incorporates SEA, which as required by the SEA Regulations focuses on assessing the likely significant effects from a plan or programme on the environment.

2.2 SA Framework

2.2.1 The first stage of the SA process is to define the scope of the SA itself, resulting in the production of an SA Framework which is subsequently used to assess the performance of the emerging plan or programme.

2.2.2 The SA Framework detailed within a SA Scoping Report originally prepared to underpin the SA process for the Southend Core Strategy (adopted 2007) was initially used within this SA. However, SBC's decision in 2010 to combine the previously proposed AAPs for the Seafront and Town Centre areas of Southend prompted a need to update the evidence base which had informed the previous identification of key sustainability issues and associated SA Objectives for the SA of the Southend Core Strategy. An updated SA Framework was therefore provided within the SA Report which accompanied the SCAAP Issues and Options paper (2010). This Framework was subsequently amended throughout the SA process to ensure that it continued to address relevant sustainability issues affecting the central area of Southend.

2.2.3 The SA Framework for the SCAAP was developed by considering the following:

- The environmental topics prescribed within Annex 1 of the SEA Directive and Schedule 2 of the SEA Regulations for which any likely significant effects from the SCAAP need to be addressed;
- The objectives of other relevant plans and programmes at local, national and international scales;
- The environmental, social and economic characteristics of the central area of Southend and its sub-regional context;
- The key environmental and wider sustainability issues identified relating to the central area of Southend; and,
- Responses received from the SEA Consultation Authorities² regarding the proposed SA Framework.

2.2.4 The final SA Framework used to assess the SCAAP at various stages is provided in **Appendix A**.

Key Sustainability Issues Identified in Relation to the SCAAP

2.2.5 A summary of the key sustainability issues identified through SA Scoping which needed to be considered throughout the development of the SCAAP is provided in Table 2.1 below. To

² Natural England, the Environment Agency and Historic England (previously English Heritage).

ensure that these issues were sufficiently addressed, a dedicated SA Objective was devised within the SA Framework to assess the effects of the SCAAP upon each issue.

Table 2:1 Key Sustainability Issues Identified in Relation to the SCAAP

SA Objectives	Key Sustainability Issues
<p>SP1 Accessibility: enable all to have similar and sufficient levels of access to services.</p>	<p>There is a heavy reliance on car travel and new development may lead to an increase demand for car travel to access these new services. There are current problems with direct walking and cycling connectivity of parts of central Southend although there is the potential for greater cycling and walking connectivity.</p> <p>There is a need to improve bus services including reducing journey times on the A127 and link with a major employment hub at the airport.</p>
<p>SP2 Housing: to provide the opportunity for people to meet their housing need.</p>	<p>Identified need for affordable housing, suitable sized family houses as well as homes to meet the needs of single person households.</p>
<p>SP3 Education and Skills: to assist people in gaining the skills to fulfil their potential and increase their contribution to the community.</p>	<p>The Central Area has become the focus for higher and further education and associated development and has seen an increase in student population.</p>
<p>SP4 Health, Safety and Security: to improve overall levels of health, reduce the disparities between different groups and different areas, and reduce crime and the fear of crime.</p>	<p>Improvements to the public realm in the Central Area are needed to create a high quality residential environment that encourages people to take healthier lifestyle choices.</p>
<p>SP5 Community: to value and nurture a sense of belonging in a cohesive community, whilst respecting diversity.</p>	<p>More services for the community may be required to improve the cultural offer in Southend.</p>
<p>EP1 Biodiversity: to maintain and enhance the diversity and abundance of species, and safeguard these areas of significant nature conservation value.</p>	<p>Habitats of international significance are located within the Borough which must be protected from development that would threaten their integrity, such as increased pollution.</p> <p>Built development is limiting the natural movement of the coastal mudflats inland of which the effects will be exacerbated by climate change and sea level rise.</p> <p>Nature conservation and biodiversity resources within the built-up area are limited and development could result in further habitat fragmentation.</p>

SA Objectives	Key Sustainability Issues
<p>EP2 Landscape Character: to maintain and enhance the quality and character and cultural significance of landscape, including the settling and character of the settlement.</p>	<p>Availability and accessibility of open space of different types and standards are limited, especially in central Southend-on-Sea.</p> <p>The constrained boundaries of the Borough and the need for new housing is putting pressure on open space within the built-up area.</p>
<p>EP3 Built Environment: to maintain and enhance the quality, safety and distinctiveness of the built environment and the cultural heritage.</p>	<p>Parts of central Southend are characterised by a current low quality built environment.</p>
<p>NR1 Air: to reduce all forms of air pollution in the interests of local air quality and the integrity of the atmosphere.</p>	<p>Increasing traffic levels in the plan area is likely to have consequences on air quality. The main sources of air pollution in Southend is road transport on busy road links such as the A127, A13 and A1159. Air quality is linked to issues related to biodiversity and health.</p>
<p>NR2 Water: to maintain and improve the quantity and quality of ground, sea and river waters, and minimise the risk of flooding.</p>	<p>Southend Central Area is under quite high risk of flood, although direct tidal inundation is largely mitigated through sea flood defences. Tidal effects on the rivers in the Borough and climate change present a risk.</p> <p>In the East of England, South Essex in particular, water resources can be limited, especially at times of low rainfall, and therefore water efficient design in new developments is essential. In policy terms the protection of water resources is already covered by Policy DM2 within the Southend DMD (2015).</p>
<p>NR3 Land: to use efficiently, retaining undeveloped land and bringing contaminated land back into use.</p>	<p>There are significant areas of the Town Centre that are used for car parking, which does not represent the best use of scarce central land.</p>
<p>NR4 Soil: to maintain the resource of productive soil.</p>	<p>The constrained boundaries of the Borough and the need for new housing is putting pressure on open space within the built up area for development, as well as on the high quality agricultural land on the built up area boundary, maximising the need to make best use of urban land including in the town centre. This increases development pressure within the Central area of Southend.</p>
<p>NR5 Minerals and other Raw Materials: to maintain the stock of minerals and other raw materials.</p>	<p>New development will inevitably result in the consumption of additional raw materials.</p>

SA Objectives	Key Sustainability Issues
<p>NR6 Energy Sources: to increase the opportunities for energy generation from renewable energy sources and make the best use of the materials, energy and effort embodied in the product of previous activity.</p>	<p>New development will inevitably result in the consumption of additional natural resources, particularly energy.</p>
<p>EG1 Local Economy: to achieve a clear connection between effort and benefit, by making the most of local strengths, seeking community regeneration, and fostering economic activity.</p>	<p>High levels of out commuting to London due to relatively low house prices in Southend compared to other local authority areas around London and lack of appropriate employment opportunities in the plan area.</p> <p>The majority of tourists and visitors to the Central Area are day visitors and there is potential to encourage more overnight stays to increase expenditure and benefit the local economy.</p>
<p>EG2 Employment: to maintain and enhance employment opportunities matched to the size of the local labour force and its various skills, and to reduce the disparities arising from unequal access to jobs.</p>	<p>In 2011, Census data showed that 75.6% of residents in the central area were economically active, similar to the figure of 78% for Southend and 76.8% for England and Wales. In 2013, the Town Centre provided 33% of all the jobs in the Borough although this proportion had decreased over time. This is in the context of an overall growth in employment in the Borough since 2009 (to 2013) of around 1,500 jobs and a loss of around 2,000 jobs in the central area over the same period. However, jobs in the Central Area have increased since 2014.</p>
<p>EG3 Wealth Creation: to retain and enhance the factors which are conducive to wealth creation, including personal creativity, infrastructure, accessibility and the local strengths and qualities that are attractive to visitors and investors.</p>	<p>Relatively high levels of deprivation in some parts of the Borough, especially in the central area. Parts of Milton, Victoria and Kursaal wards have the highest levels of deprivations, with sub-ward areas being in the 10% most deprived nationally.</p>

2.3 SA Reporting and Outputs

- 2.3.1 In line with statutory requirements, SA incorporating SEA has been undertaken, reported and consulted on at each stage in the preparation of the SCAAP. **Table 2.2** below outlines the main sustainability issues reported on at each stage of the SA process.

Table 2.2 Iterations of SCAAP SA Reports and Consultations

SA Reporting	Consultation Period	Summary of Issues Considered
SA of Issues and Options – Town Centre and Seafront Area Action Plans (2007)	January 2007	This initial report assessed SBC's intention to prepare separate 'Town Centre' and 'Seafront' Area Action Plans.
SA of Issues and Options (2010)	21 st June - 9 th August 2010	This report considered the proposal to combine the previously proposed Seafront and Town Centre AAPs into a single AAP covering the whole central area of Southend (to be known as the SCAAP). The report identified a wider set of key sustainability issues relevant to the enlarged SCAAP boundary and therefore amended the SA Framework being used to assess likely significant effects.
SA of Proposed Submission SCAAP (2011)	5 th September - 17 th October 2011	This report provided the first full assessment of the draft SCAAP, including a suite of policies and site allocations. At the time it was intended that following the consultation on the Proposed Submission SCAAP and associated SA Report, both documents would be submitted to the Secretary of State to undergo a formal Examination in Public (EiP).
SA of SCAAP Preferred Approach (2015)	18 th December 2015 - 15 th February 2016	The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2012) and Southend Development Management DPD (2015) were respectively published and adopted following the publication of the Proposed Submission SCAAP (2011). It was therefore necessary to take a 'step back' in this version of the SCAAP rather than submitting the Plan for EiP as previously intended. This SA report provided an assessment of likely effects from a 'preferred approach' to the SCAAP and reasonable alternatives to this.
SA of Revised Proposal Submission SCAAP (2016)	3 rd November - 16 th December 2016	This SA addressed the revisions to the Preferred Approach as a result of comments made at consultation, as well as new sites for allocations that came forward since 2015.
SA Addendum of Proposed Post Examination Modifications (2017)	11 th August – 22 nd September 2017	The SA Addendum was undertaken to respond to post examination modifications to the Revised Proposal Submission SCAAP requested by the Planning Inspector.

3 How SA reporting has been taken into account in the SCAAP

3.1 Overview

- 3.1.1 Each stage of the SA process identified likely significant effects (beneficial or adverse) from the emerging SCAAP, as well as assessing the Plan's performance against the SA Framework more widely. These findings were detailed within an SA Report or Addendum which accompanied the SCAAP at each stage of consultation. These SA Reports and Addendum incorporated all information necessary to constitute Environmental Reports for the purposes of the SEA Regulations.
- 3.1.2 Aside from complying with the requirements of the SEA Regulations, the main purpose of SA reporting was to allow consultees, the public and decision makers (i.e. SBC and the Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State to undertake an Examination in Public of the SCAAP) to consider the likely impacts of the SCAAP on identified sustainability issues (see **Table 2.2** above). Each SA Report or Addendum also identified a suite of recommended mitigation and enhancement measures to ensure the avoidance of likely significant adverse effects from the SCAAP and enhance the Plan's sustainability performance.
- 3.1.3 At each stage of the SCAAP's preparation (see Table 2.1), a draft SA Report or Addendum was produced and the SCAAP was subsequently amended to incorporate relevant mitigation and enhancement recommendations. A final version of each SA Report or Addendum was then published in tandem with the SCAAP for public consultation.

3.2 SA Assessment Matrices and Scoring

- 3.2.1 To ensure the SA remained proportionate, a matrix based approach was adopted in all SA Reports and Addendums to report likely significant sustainability effects from the SCAAP. These matrices allowed for the consistent identification of likely effects, uncertainties, key assumptions and recommended mitigation in relation to each substantive component within the SCAAP, including its objectives and policies. Supporting text within the SCAAP was not specifically assessed, as providing that this text was consistent with relevant objectives and policies, it could not itself result in any likely significant effects. Inconsistencies between supporting text and some policies were however identified and rectified through the SA process, thereby enhancing the effectiveness of the SCAAP overall.
- 3.2.2 Detailed assessment matrices were provided in appendices to each SA Report, with the key findings reported in the main body of the Report and a Non-Technical Summary also provided. A consistent scoring system was adopted within all matrices, with each substantive component of the SCAAP being scored against each SA Objective (from the SA Framework) as follows:
- Likely to contribute to the achievement of greater sustainability according to the identified objective;
 - Likely to detract from the achievement of greater sustainability according to the identified objective;
 - Likely effect but too unpredictable to specify, or multiple impacts potentially both positive and negative; or,
 - No identifiable relationship between the topic covered in the policy and the SA Objective.
- 3.2.3 Where a sustainability effect was identified as being likely to arise from an individual component of the SCAAP, a qualitative assessment was provided within the commentary box

of each matrix to determine whether this effect would be “*significant*” in the context of the SEA Regulations. As detailed in **Section 3.3** below, mitigation and enhancement measures were then identified to address all likely significant adverse effects, enhance the level of predicted beneficial effects and allow all components of the SCAAP to contribute positively to the achievement of the SA Objectives wherever possible.

3.3 SA Mitigation and Enhancement Recommendations

- 3.3.1 **Table 3.1** below provides an overview of how the mitigation and enhancement recommendations made at each stage of the SA process were taken into account in the development of the SCAAP. For consistency, the same thematic approach used to appraise the SCAAP at each stage is adopted in the table. This analysis demonstrates that the final SCAAP being presented to SBC for adoption (February 2018) has been closely informed by the SA process and that all identified sustainability issues and concerns have now been addressed.

Table 3.1 Overview of SA Recommendations and Associated SCAAP Response (2010 – 2017)

Sustainability Theme	SA Recommendations	SCAAP Response
Transport and Movement (SA Objectives SP1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At the SCAAP Issues and Options stage (2010), the SA identified the need for the SCAAP to set out a suite of policies, proposals and implementation plans to address multi-modal transport needs within the central area of Southend. This included measures to enhance access to public transport, increase road safety, improve provision for cyclists and pedestrians, and implement a new parking strategy. The subsequent SA Report for the Proposed Submission SCAAP (2011) recommended that transport related policies within the SCAAP should be consolidated to remove duplication, with greater details provided regarding infrastructure and design requirements that development proposals should address. These recommendations were reinforced within the SA Report for the SCAAP Preferred Approach (2015), which also recommended that further details should be included regarding potential road upgrades to reduce public transport journey times. The SA Report for the Revised Proposed Submission SCAAP (2016) recognised that significant changes had been made to the SCAAP to implement previous SA recommendations, such that limited further recommendations were identified. At this stage the SA recommended providing additional policy details regarding the design of new pedestrian/cycle linkages and consolidating proposals for Queensway into a single policy or plan, in order to clarify the implementation of these components of the SCAAP. 	<p>The transport proposals and policies within the SCAAP have evolved in response to SA recommendations, in particular by providing more explicit policy support for non-car travel, responding to the identified need to implement a new car parking strategy and setting out greater detail regarding infrastructure requirements.</p> <p>Policy DS5 Transport, Access and Public Realm now sets out clear criteria to encourage a shift to sustainable transport modes, including through supporting the improvement of pedestrian and cycle routes and signage in and around the town centre. Policy DS5 then identifies the principles of the Council’s town centre car parking strategy, taking account of visitor and local car parking needs.</p>

Sustainability Theme	SA Recommendations	SCAAP Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> One of the key issues addressed through the EiP of the Revised Proposed Submission SCAAP was the transport, access and public realm policy (Policy DS5) and related car parking strategy. This included provisions to ensure no net loss of key visitor car parking in the south of the Central Area. The SA Addendum (2017) concluded that policy clarifications introduced through the EiP in relation to key visitor car parks would prevent significant adverse effects arising and no further recommendations were identified. 	
Residential Development and Communities (SA Objectives SP2 and SP5)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At Issues and Options Stage (2010), the SA identified the need for the SCAAP to include a more detailed housing strategy including the types of housing which would be supported in particular locations, the principles for affordable housing delivery and how enhanced social infrastructure would be provided to meet the needs of new and existing residents. Greater detail regarding social infrastructure provision was also recommended within the SA Report for the Proposed Submission SCAAP (2011). Subsequent SA Reports in respect of the Preferred Approach SCAAP (2015) and Revised Proposed Submission SCAAP (2016) recognised that a previously identified gap in policy coverage regarding the delivery of housing to meet identified needs had partially been filled by the NPPF (2012) and the Southend Development Management Document (2015). This allowed the SCAAP to focus on setting out individual spatial and design requirements to deliver housing on proposed site allocations. At these stages the SA recommendations were therefore focused on policy measures to ensure that potential adverse effects from housing growth (e.g. 	<p>The Proposed Submission SCAAP (2011) responded to earlier SA recommendations by providing an appendix setting out indicative housing numbers on each of the housing development sites, although limited information regarding social infrastructure provision was provided at that point. Subsequent iterations of the SCAAP included clearer policy requirements regarding affordable housing provision and to assess impacts from housing proposals on amenity and social infrastructure. Greater clarity is also now provided regarding the types of housing developments which will be supported on specific sites and the likely contribution of proposed housing allocations to meeting identified housing needs up to 2021.</p> <p>The final version of the SCAAP addresses these issues in a number of Policy Areas including Policy PA4: Queensway Policy Area Development Principles which provides more detail regarding how and where housing growth can sustainably be accommodated in the central area of Southend to contribute to the delivery of at least net additional 2,474 homes up to 2021, as set by the Southend Core Strategy (2007).</p>

Sustainability Theme	SA Recommendations	SCAAP Response
	<p>increased pressure on community facilities) could be managed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The SA Addendum (2017) concluded that policy clarifications introduced through the EiP would provide a partial safeguard against potential displacement of existing residents by redevelopment proposals, resulting in a beneficial effect on housing provision to meet identified needs. By this stage in the SA process, no significant adverse effects or further recommendations were identified. 	<p>To address concerns regarding the ability of existing social infrastructure to accommodate housing growth, Policy Areas now set out relevant criteria to protect and enhance community facilities in the central area.</p>
<p>Built Environment, Design and Heritage (SA Objectives EP2 and EP3)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> One recommendation made consistently throughout the SA process was that the SCAAP should contain (more) specific design guidance and policy requirements. This was recommended to ensure that the SCAAP creates a unified sense of place within the central area of Southend, whilst promoting local distinctiveness within identified policy areas. In order to implement this, the SA Reports for the Preferred Approach SCAAP (2015) and Revised Proposed Submission SCAAP (2016) both recommended that consideration be given to the restriction of permitted development rights within the central area and the use of site specific masterplans or development briefs to ensure high design quality in all development proposals. The SA Addendum (2017) recognised that the identification of potential locations for landmark buildings would strengthen previously identified beneficial effects from the SCAAP on urban design quality but would not result in any new or different significant effects. Other proposed post-examination modifications were also considered to strengthen the protection afforded to Conservation Areas and the setting of heritage assets. 	<p>In response to the recommendation made throughout the SA for the SCAAP to include more detailed design guidance and a stronger policy position, the Plan was continually expanded to include more specific design requirements. The SCAAP now includes a policy to guide the development and location of landmark buildings within the central area (Policy DS3), detailed design requirements for some site allocations and a comprehensive suite of Policy Areas to assess development proposals affecting the historic environment.</p>

Sustainability Theme	SA Recommendations	SCAAP Response
	<p>By this stage in the SA process, no significant adverse effects or further recommendations were identified.</p>	
<p>Education and Culture (SA Objectives SP3 and SP5)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Another recommendation made consistently throughout the SA process was that the SCAAP should provide opportunities to increase educational and cultural development within the central area of Southend, not least due to its high accessibility and the need to meet the needs of a growing local population. Greater clarity regarding support for educational and cultural development on appropriate sites was sought through the SA Reports for the Preferred Approach SCAAP (2015) and the Revised Proposed Submission SCAAP (2016). • Educational and cultural development was not identified as a key issue during the EiP of the SCAAP and no relevant proposed modifications or further recommendations were considered in the SA Addendum (2017). 	<p>From the outset it was considered that the SCAAP should include specific proposals to focus educational and cultural development on specific, highly accessible sites. Policy Areas such as PA2: Elmer Square Policy Area Development Principles provides a policy framework to support the provision of education and leisure facilities; Policy Area PA3: London Road supporting the provisions of educational and supporting uses such as commercial studios and workspace; and Policy CS1: Central Seafront Policy Area supporting the provision of arts, culture, entertainment, tourism, leisure and recreational facilities.</p>
<p>Employment and Retail (SA Objectives EG1, EG2 and EG3)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SA Reports for the SCAAP Issues and Options document (2010) and Proposed Submission SCAAP identified a need for the Plan to respond to the Southend Employment Land Review, including by directing employment uses away from sites deemed to be surplus to employment requirements and by encouraging retail growth in the town centre. • Related to previous recommendations, the SA Reports for the Preferred Approach SCAAP (2015) and Revised Proposed Submission SCAAP (2016) both called for greater safeguards to be included in the Plan in respect of high quality office provision and existing class A1 retail uses within the town centre. The SA Report for the 	<p>The employment and retail proposals and policies within the SCAAP have evolved in response to SA recommendations, in particular by providing enhanced safeguards for office and A1 retail uses and by directing main town centre uses to the town centre. In this regard, Policy DS1 seeks to to maintain a high level of retail use within the town centre and active shopping frontages, whilst Policy Areas, such as Policy PA8: Victoria Gateway and Opportunity Site PA8.1: Victoria Avenue Office Area, seek to maximise employment opportunities by supporting comprehensive or incremental development that includes a mix of uses including small scale office accommodation.</p> <p>From the outset the importance of the visitor economy and associated employment was identified as a key</p>

Sustainability Theme	SA Recommendations	SCAAP Response
	<p>Revised Proposed Submission SCAAP also set out proposals to meet identified car parking needs whilst advocating a strategy of managing car parking to release land for development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The SA Addendum (2017) concluded that the inclusion of a new SCAAP objective which supports town centre viability and vitality, as well as, revised criteria in Policy DS1.1 which provides support for the town centre as the first preference for all forms of retail development, would result in significant beneficial effects on SA objectives EG1, EG2 and EG3. Reflecting the focus given to supporting the visitor economy at the EiP and in subsequent post-examination modifications the SA Addendum (2017) also concluded that the proposed implementation of a managed car parking strategy would result in potential socio-economic benefits through protecting key visitor parking whilst facilitating development and new economic activities on suitable sites. These modifications were considered to enhance previously predicted beneficial effects on objectives SP1 and EG1. By this stage in the SA process, no significant adverse effects or further recommendations were identified. 	<p>sustainability issue, including the need to retain adequate key visitor parking within the SCAAP area. In response, the SCAAP sets out policy criteria to strengthen and enhance the visitor and local economy. Policy CS1 supports the improvement of the Central Seafront as an important leisure and recreation asset for local residents and visitors, whilst Policy DS5 requires any development proposals that come forward on key visitor car parking areas in the south the Central Area to ensure there is no loss of key visitor car parking.</p>
<p>Leisure and Recreation (SA Objectives SP5)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The SA Report for the Proposed Submission SCAAP (2011) recommended that more detailed proposals should be included in the Plan regarding visitor accommodation. From 2011 onwards, a consistent SA recommendation was the need to include additional measures (e.g. policy criteria) to manage potential conflicts between waterfront tourism development opportunities, other users and the nature conservation interests of nationally and 	<p>As noted above, the importance of the visitor economy and associated employment was identified as a key sustainability issue, including the need to retain adequate key visitor parking within the SCAAP area. In response, the SCAAP sets out policy criteria to strengthen and enhance the visitor and local economy. Policy CS1 supports the improvement of the Central Seafront as an important leisure and recreation asset for local residents</p>

Sustainability Theme	SA Recommendations	SCAAP Response
	<p>internationally designated sites along the foreshore. This issue was considered during the EIP and resulted in several key proposed post-examination modifications, as reported within the SA Addendum (2017) and detailed below under the Natural Environment theme. Taking this into account, the SA Addendum (2017) did not identify any likely significant adverse effects or further recommendations.</p>	<p>and visitors. The SCAAP also recognises the potential of the Central Area to enhance the experience for visitors, residents and workers, extending the economy throughout the day and into the evening in areas such as the High Street, London Road and Central Seafront Policy Areas.</p> <p>Whilst the SCAAP does not include a specific policy regarding new hotels and conference facilities in the Central Area, this policy matter is now addressed by a general policy within the Southend Development Management Document (2015).</p>
<p>Sustainable Construction and Flooding (NR2, NR5 and NR6)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The SA Reports for the SCAAP Issues and Options paper (2010) and the Proposed Submission SCAAP (2011) recommended that greater consideration be afforded to opportunities to deploy low carbon and renewable energy generation technologies in appropriate areas, including potential district heating networks in relation to proposed site allocations. Reflecting subsequent changes to legislation and national planning policy, later SA Reports for the Preferred Approach SCAAP (2015) and the Revised Proposed Submission SCAAP (2016) focused more on ensuring that the Plan promotes the efficient use of energy and natural resources. The SA Report for the Proposed Submission SCAAP (2011) called for greater consistency in the way flood issues are managed between individual proposed site allocations. Subsequently, the SA Reports for the Preferred Approach SCAAP (2015) and Revised Proposed Submission SCAAP (2016) noted that Policy DS4 addressed flood risk matters more directly, in 	<p>The energy, natural resources and flood risk policies within the SCAAP have evolved in response to SA recommendations. In particular, Policy DS4 now provides a more rigorous policy framework to manage flood risks and sustainable drainage. The SCAAP has also been prepared with consideration to the Council's Low Carbon Energy and Sustainability Strategy 2015-2020.</p>

Sustainability Theme	SA Recommendations	SCAAP Response
	<p>accordance with requirements introduced by the NPPF (2012) and associated UK Government guidance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustainable construction and flooding were not identified as key issues during the EiP of the SCAAP and no relevant proposed modifications or further recommendations were considered in the SA Addendum (2017). 	
<p>Natural Environment (EP1 and EP2)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SA Report for the SCAAP Issues and Options paper (2010) first identified the need to undertake a Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) to ensure the avoidance of likely significant adverse effects (LSE) on European Sites, principally those along the foreshore in the Seafront area. All subsequent stages of the SA process took account of the conclusions of the HRA and identified the need for greater clarity within SCAAP policies to protect ecological interests, including the national and international foreshore designations. • The SA Report for the SCAAP Issues and Options paper (2010) also recommended that the SCAAP should include policies to deliver landscaping, new parks and new planting. Subsequently the SA Report for the Proposed Submission SCAAP (2011) concluded that the town centre has poor provision of public open space, with the exception of the seafront, and recommended that this should be addressed by adding open space requirements to individual site allocations. The SA Report for the Preferred Approach SCAAP (2015) and Revised Proposed Submission SCAAP (2016) later recognised that new policies and proposals had been developed to deliver open space and urban greening improvements within the central area of Southend. 	<p>The natural environment policies and proposals within the SCAAP have evolved in response to SA recommendations to enhance the protection afforded to biodiversity issues. Policy CS2 in particular now sets out criteria to protect biodiversity interests including designated sites in accordance with the NPPF (2012). Individual Policy Areas also seek to address biodiversity considerations, including by providing clear support for landscape design improvements, urban greening and tree planting.</p>

Sustainability Theme	SA Recommendations	SCAAP Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The level of protection afforded to national and international foreshore designations was a key issue during the EiP following a consultation response received from Natural England, as was the need to manage potential land use conflicts in the Seafront area. Proposed main modifications 15 – 17 were amended following the preparation of the draft SA Addendum (2017) to ensure the avoidance of significant adverse effects on biodiversity interests and to align Policy CS2 with paragraph 118 of the NPPF (2012). Taking this into account, the SA Addendum (2017) did not identify any likely significant adverse effects or further recommendations. 	

4 How the opinions raised during consultation have been taken into account

4.1 Overview

4.1.1 The SEA Regulations require the opinions expressed by consultees and the public regarding a SA to be taken into account during the preparation of the plan before its adoption. Each stage of the SCAAP was subject to public consultation, with an SA Report or Addendum published and consulted on in tandem.

4.2 Consultation Opportunities

4.2.1 In total six stages of consultation took place for the SA of the SCAAP:

- **SA of Issues and Options** (Town Centre and Seafront Area Action Plans 2007): January 2007;
- **SA of SCAAP Issues and Options** (2010): 21st June-9th August 2010;
- **SA of Proposed Submission SCAAP** (2011): 5th September -17th October 2011;
- **SA of SCAAP Preferred Approach** (2015):18th December 2015-15th February 2016;
- **SA of Revised Proposal Submission SCAAP** (2016): 3rd November-16th December 2016; and
- **SA Addendum of Proposed Post Examination Modifications** (2017): 11th August – 22nd September 2017.

4.2.2 The first formal consultation on the SCAAP was the Issues and Options paper (2010), as prior to that date separate AAPs had been proposed by SBC for the Seafront and Town Centre areas. **Section 4.3** below identifies how consultation responses of relevance to the SA have informed the development of the SCAAP since 2010.

4.3 Impact of SA Related Consultation Responses on the SCAAP

SA of Issues and Options 2010

4.3.1 The consultation was open for an 8-week period between 21st June 2010 and 9th August 2010. A total of 484 representations were received from 27 respondents during the consultation. Issues raised in the representations of relevance to the SA, and key changes made in response (in the superseded Proposed Submission version of the plan (2011)), are summarised below.

Development Management

- While a Development Management DPD should be brought forward that contains detailed development management policies for all development in the Borough, the SCAAP should provide locally specific policies which address individual site constraints and opportunities in the Central area of Southend.

Change: The SCAAP addresses specific themes and issues which provide more detail, over and above that provided within the Southend DMD (2015). These relate to: certain types of land use, public realm and environmental quality, the historic environment,

transport and access, and infrastructure provision and flood risk. The SCAAP must be read in conjunction with the DM DPD.

Green Space and Biodiversity

- The town centre is under provided for in terms of open space and the SCAAP should support the creation of new public areas where possible. This could link to the green space and green grid strategy.

Change: The need to provide interlinked, functional green space to relieve the pressure on the biodiversity interests of the foreshore, provide for a pleasant central area environment, help to mitigate the impacts of climate change, and improve walking and cycling within the central area were promoted within the SCAAP.

The Historic Environment

- The need to preserve and enhance the quality of the Historic Environment within the central area, in particular the Conservation Areas and Listed and Locally Listed Buildings.
- The unique Victorian and Edwardian streetscapes and vistas within the central area need to be carefully preserved, both short and long views.
- The High Street contains, or connects, a number of historic landmarks and spaces and its vitality should not be threatened by proposals to form alternative quarters or circuits.

Change: In response to this issue the Proposed Submission SCAAP (2011) included a detailed policy framework to protect heritage interests. However, this was subsequently removed to avoid duplication with the Southend DMD (2015) which provides a detailed suite of policies to protect and enhance the historic environment across the Borough, including within the Central area of Southend. The SCAAP supplements this by setting out clear supporting text, guidance and links to relevant higher-level policies.

Public Realm

- The SCAAP should include a framework for Public Realm and Environmental Improvements / Enhancements within the Central Area.
- The rear of the Odeon building currently does little to support the attractiveness or vibrancy of the Victoria Gateway Area, and actions could be taken to improve this.

Change: The SCAAP includes clearer area specific proposals to improve public realm, protect important views and promote visually attractive frontages. A detailed policy framework regarding design and environmental improvements is instead set out within the Southend DMD (2015).

Transport and Access

- Rather than depending on LTP3, the SCAAP should include some markers to maximise travel choice and encourage sustainable travel to work patterns.
- Parking is a major issue, it has to be provided off road for all new build and future conversions. The paid for town centre car parks and on street parking should be for visitors and shoppers, workers' car parking should be provided within a short walk and permits for residents to park on street should be phased out in central town centre areas.

Change: A Transport and Access Strategy was included within this iteration of the SCAAP, centred around a car parking strategy and access proposals for specific

development sites Vehicle Parking Standards for the Borough, including the central area, have since been taken forward in the Southend DMD (2015).

The Seafront

- A planning framework should be produced for the seafront, including the need to integrate the Quarters to provide a comprehensive strategy for development in the area. The St Johns, Central Seafront and Eastern Esplanade area Quarters do not form, nor are planned to be, a coherent Central Quarter and this issue must be addressed by the SCAAP.
- The regeneration of the Golden Mile should be achieved with minimal intervention. The continuity of the Golden Mile is a key component of its vitality, vibrancy and attraction and should be retained.
- The determination of the boundaries of each of the Quarters-will be difficult to interpret on the ground; this issue needs to be addressed within the SCAAP.

Change: The seafront is treated as a coherent planning entity within which specific areas have a different role, whilst at the same time reflecting the common relationship they have with the seafront. Areas originally identified as 'Quarters' have been reviewed and Policy Areas (and associated Opportunity Sites) identified.

Town Centre and Retail

- With Southend town centre remaining the first preference for all forms of retail development and for other town centre uses, Town centre and prime retail frontages should be clearly defined on a proposals map.
- The extension of the retail area of the central area to both the east and west is unlikely to resolve the issues affecting the central area, particularly when it is questionable whether any additional retail space is required.

Change: The Proposals Map was amended to include the boundary of the defined town centre and Primary and secondary retail frontages. The Retail Study (2011) concluded that there is merit in broadening the High Street offer both spatially and in terms of types of shopping. As demand for additional retail is based on targeting bigger units and the regeneration of the town centre and seafront as a visitor destination, this approach has therefore been taken forward within the SCAAP.

Land Uses

- The SCAAP should be specific in terms of land uses that could be brought forward through the proposals sites.
- The Primary School Sites in the Central Area are all on tight sites with well below the minimum site area for the number of pupils. Additional land would relieve this pressure if available.

Change: The SCAAP provides a policy framework that clearly defines where and how different land uses should be accommodated within the town. Reference was made to the current managed shortage of primary school sites and the need for additional primary school places for planned population growth. Which has been provided through the planned expansion of existing primary schools.

Tall Buildings

- The location and siting of tall buildings within the central area, and the potential negative impact this could have on views of the estuary, the potential impacts this could have on the quality of the built form, with particular reference to impacts on the setting of conservation areas and listed/locally listed buildings.

Change: The SCAAP includes area specific proposals to encourage the development of landmark buildings and to ensure that development responds to its local context. A detailed policy framework regarding the siting and design of tall buildings is instead set out within the Southend DMD (2015).

Housing

- Housing density is not necessarily the problem, it is the quality that needs to be improved.
- Given the SHLAA and CAM identify theoretical capacities that exceed the targets set in the Core Strategy, it would not appear necessary to be prescriptive about density, which should be a function of the dwelling types for which there is a market or need.

Change: The SCAAP provides a policy approach which specifies overall housing numbers for the central area, the delivery on specific sites will come forward through development briefs. The Southend DMD (2015) provides more detail on tenure mix.

Gateway Neighbourhoods

- The focus on protecting existing employment areas from loss in Gateway Neighbourhoods may only be necessary in part. Not all employment areas are in suitable location and cause inconvenience to residents and hold back residential improvement of streets/areas.
- The character of each of the main Gateway Neighbourhoods identified are very different and each face different local issues and challenges. Each should therefore be separately assessed and have a separate policy approach.

Change: New development opportunities are expected to address employment regeneration needs, such as providing small scale move-on space for entrepreneurs. The approach taken in the SCAAP recognises the changing nature and function of parts of these neighbourhoods. Development Briefs will be used where appropriate to determine the types and function of development. The SCAAP sets out a policy framework for each of the Gateway Neighbourhoods, to enable the enhancement of gateway environments to the town, to complement its role as a business and visitor centre, providing for future opportunities to meet affordable and more specialised housing needs, new recreational and community uses.

The Quarters³

- The SCAAP will need to address the issue of an oversupply of outdated and poor quality office space.
- Reference is made to the provision of a new library; it is not clear where this is to be or why the existing library needs replacing.
- Promoting town centre living for families could be difficult on a number of levels including the noise, lack of parking, potential absence of homes with adequate private amenity space.

³ The SCAAP now defines Policy Areas and associated Opportunity Sites, rather than Quarters.

- Given the constrained nature of the High Street the identification of the former B&Q site for a large foodstore is in accordance with an identified need, and will provide a second anchor at the northern end of the High Street. This approach should be taken forward.
- The Development Brief for Warrior Square will need to make provision for suitable replacement of existing car parking provision as part of the proposed development of Warrior Square, or elsewhere within the town centre.
- It is not clear how parking requirements for the Clifftown Quarter will be met and also how the network of lanes/mews will support deliveries to business premises.
- The removal of all units, except for quality buildings, in the St Johns, Central Seafront and Eastern Esplanade quarter is unlikely to be viable in the current market and a more selective approach may be more deliverable. Some flexibility will be needed however to ensure deliverability and the SCAAP should avoid being too prescriptive on this issue.
- There is uncertainty over Sainsbury's finding an alternative site, there is no mention that if they do find an alternative site they will retain a town centre presence within the London Road area, nor is there any mention of the redevelopment proposals for Roots Hall football ground. Given that there is a resolution to grant planning consent for the redevelopment of Roots Hall, the SCAAP should address this.

Change: The SCAAP (2011) took forward the approach that supports a large format foodstore on the former B&Q site, subject to an assessment of the impact of the proposal on the town centre, a transport assessment, and agreement on the detailed design. The SCAAP (2011) set out a mixed use approach to the Warrior Square site, including office and residential uses and car parking, to be complimented by an enhanced public realm. Development principles for the Clifftown Quarter, which seek to create an area with a strong cultural identity and compliment the historic grain of the area, have been brought forward within the SCAAP (2011). The London Road site and Roots Hall have been included as proposals sites within the SCAAP (2011).

Implementation and Monitoring

- There is a need for an implementation and monitoring strategy.
- The success of the 'City by the Sea' option will be dependent on the strength and effectiveness of, and continued commitment to, the implementation and delivery mechanisms which should be further elaborated on in the final document.

Change: Implementation and monitoring proposals have been included within the SCAAP to address delivery issues.

SA of Proposed Submission SCAAP (2011)

- 4.3.2 The consultation was open between 5th September and 17th October 2011. A total of 126 representations were received from 13 respondents during the consultation. Issues raised in the representations of relevance to the SA, and key changes made in response, are summarised below.

Flood Risk and Water

- Flood risk should be mentioned in section 3.2 as a constraint to the development within the SCAAP and include the need for Flood Risk Assessments in flood zones 2 and 3
- Policy should reflect that infrastructure, particularly waste water collection and treatment facilities, must be provided ahead of development where needed.

Change: Provision will be made within the policy to ensure that flood risk is considered when development takes place. The wording of policy for infrastructure provision has been revised and the above will be taken on board.

Nature Conservation and Biodiversity

- New lighting should be arranged to avoid direct illumination of the foreshore or excessive glare.

Change: This would be addressed as part of the development lighting scheme and therefore no change was proposed to the Preferred Approach (2015).

SA of SCAAP Preferred Approach (2015)

- 4.3.3 The consultation was open for an 8-week period from the 18th December 2015 to 15th February 2016. In total 543 representations were received from 33 respondents during the consultation. The issues raised by the representations and key changes made by the council are summarised below.

Leisure, Tourism and Recreation

- Concern regarding lack of emphasis in Plan on importance of tourism to Southend

Change: the words 'and resort' was proposed to be added in the vision after 'regional centre'. The vision would then read: 'Our vision for Southend Central Area, which includes the Town Centre and Central Seafront Area, is for it to be a City by the Sea. As a prosperous and thriving regional centre and resort, it will be an area...' Strategic Objective 10 (page 18) would be amended and split to address these issues, and placed further up the ordering and amend the last sentence of paragraph 76 (page 39) to read: 'This will build on the town's role as a major resort and contribute to a stronger, more vibrant centre.'

The Historic Environment

- Concern over little importance given to the areas of historic past

Change: To emphasise the importance of the historic environment it is proposed to add a new sentence after paragraph 79 to read: 'Heritage assets will be promoted and enhanced as part of the future development of the town'.

Design

- Concern that too much emphasis is placed on landmark buildings rather than ensuring consistent best quality urban design overall.

Change: Whilst Policy DS3 sets out criteria relating to landmark buildings, the SCAAP also refers to SBC's Design and Townscape Guide SPD (adopted 2009) and Streetscape Manual SPD (revised 2015). These documents provide design guidance to inform all development proposals and guidance to ensure a coordinated, high quality streetscape is sustainably achieved within the Borough, including within the Central area of Southend. Furthermore, Strategic Objective 2 of the SCAAP promotes design excellence and good quality development proposals and public realm improvements to reinforce a distinctive sense of place. This is carried through within the Policy Areas and Opportunity Sites, which promote design quality within development.

Flood Risk

- Concerns raised regarding surface water disposal

Change: It was proposed to add the following text to Policy DS4 point 2 as follows:
'...Under no circumstances will surface water be permitted to discharge into a separate foul sewer or sewerage system. Surface runoff that cannot be discharged into the ground, a surface water body or a surface water sewer or local highway drain, must be discharged to a public, combined sewer system.'

Transport and Movement

- Concern that additional residential development should make adequate provision for resident's car parking.
- Problems of accessibility to centre and limited car parking provision preventing further investment in tourism facilities and results in shoppers/visitors not returning to town.
- Need for additional car parking provision in central seafront tourist areas.
- Should be like for like car parking provision on Opportunity Sites which are currently used for car parking with additional provision for development proposed on site.
- Concern whether 'mixed mode' transport provision is safe and road safety/connectivity improvements needed through improved road crossing facilities

Changes: The Council commissioned an independent car parking Study which will investigate and present findings on the capacity of the car parks that service the town centre and central seafront area. This will be included in the submission version of the SCAAP and a number of changes were implemented, including the introduction of no net loss of key visitor parking to the south of the central area.

Nature Conservation and Biodiversity

- Policy wording not considered adequate

Change: amended wording of Policy CS2 point 1 to read: Ensure that all development proposals within the Central Seafront Area are accompanied by a Habitats Regulations Assessment and associated documentation to ensure there will be no adverse effect on the European and International foreshore designations (SPA and Ramsar) either alone or in combination with other plans or projects.'

SA of Revised Proposal Submission SCAAP (2016)

- 4.3.4 The consultation was open between the 3rd November and 16th December 2016. A total of 410 representations were received during the consultation. The issues raised by the representations and key changes made by the council are summarised below.

Flood Risk

- Needs to ensure consistency with national policy regarding flood risk management.

Change: Policy wording amended to reflect the provisions of the NPPF (2012) regarding flood risk management.

Transport and Movement

- Problems of accessibility to centre and limited car parking provision preventing further investment in tourism facilities.
- Plan does not distinguish between leisure/retail parking needs and tourism parking needs – most people with families visiting the tourism areas travel by car.

- Consider parking surveys to be flawed – incorrect information used/survey dates not representative of peak usage.
- No net loss of car parking provision in the south of the Plan area; does not make provision for growth in the tourism economy as sought in the Plan.

Change: Policy DS5 and related Policy Areas include proposals to improve accessibility. These policies will sit alongside the Local Transport Plan, which aims to address issues of congestion, circulation and accessibility to Southend to assist economic growth. SBC commissioned an independent car parking study which investigated and presented findings on the capacity of the car parks that service the town centre and central seafront area. This study found an over-capacity of car parking to the south of the Central area, with spare parking capacity to the north. To address this imbalance, SBC proposed modifications to the SCAAP to implement a car parking strategy which protects key visitor parking whilst releasing other land for development. These modifications were subsequently considered through a formal EiP.

SA Addendum of Proposed Post Examination Modifications

- 4.3.5 As noted in **Table 3.1** above, through the EiP of the Revised Proposed Submission SCAAP (2016) a suite of proposed modifications was devised to provide an appropriate level of protection to the international and national designations along the foreshore in the central area of Southend. This involved discussions between SBC and Natural England to produce appropriate wording. Subsequently, the wording of post-examination modifications 15 – 17 regarding Policy CS2 was subject to detailed scrutiny through the preparation of the SA Addendum (2017) and was found to require further amendment to accord with the mitigation requirements set out within the NPPF (2012) at paragraph 118. This revised wording of Policy CS2 was endorsed within the Inspector’s Report of Examination of the SCAAP (December 2018).

5 Reasons for choosing the Plan as adopted, in light of other alternatives dealt with

5.1 Overview

5.1.1 In accordance with the SEA Regulations, the SA undertaken in respect of the SCAAP considered the likely effects from both the preferred approach and all reasonable alternatives which could be identified at each stage of the SCAAP's development. This section provides an overview of the preferred approach and the reasonable alternatives that were considered. However, it should be noted that three distinct strategy options were put forward for consideration.

5.2 Strategic Objectives

5.2.1 The SCAAP Issues and Options paper (2010) presented three strategic options for managing the development of central Southend, each with an increasing level of intervention and change. Following evaluation by SBC and informed by the SA findings, the preferred approach was selected from the three presented.

5.2.2 The three spatial options were:

- Option 1: Strengthening the status quo;
- Option 2: Reinforcing the urban circuits; and
- Option 3: City by the Sea (the preferred option).

Option 1: Strengthening the status quo

5.2.3 This would see the High Street remain the focus for all retail development in the centre, although some improvements will also take place in nearby areas. This is commensurate with a 'do-nothing' approach as it is what would occur without the SCAAP, relying on Core Strategy policy only.

- This option would focus on the High Street and this focus of resources may help in better securing improvements in this area. However, this option does not take advantages of wider environmental improvements that could help raise the overall image of Southend to potential investors (local and national), with wider benefits for the town. The option therefore may be too limited to successfully attract new inward investment.
- This option would also miss opportunities for more mixed use regeneration of the town centre, including additional education and cultural facilities and new housing.
- The overall scale of development may reduce impacts on natural resource use and on the natural environment.
- Lack of enhancement to public transport and improved movement routes is unlikely to encourage people to choose more sustainable modes. This option is unlikely to help promote Southend as a retail destination, with people choosing to make longer trips elsewhere for their shopping needs. However, fewer attractions in the town centre may reduce overall traffic volumes and avoid additional congestion.
- This option is unlikely to have any great benefit for the economic sustainability of the town, nor will help in meeting social sustainability objectives.

Option 2: Enhance urban circuits

- 5.2.4 This option would widen the central Southend regeneration and improvement to a larger area than Option 1. Chichester Road, London Road, Clifftown and Farringdon neighbourhoods would all be the focus for specific regeneration proposals. This option also includes Seaway car park as a new linking feature at the south east end of the High Street, although not a destination in itself.
- This option would help create a High Street of a quality to attract national retailers, and improving links to adjacent streets could help increase the attractiveness of the town centre for shopping and support retail businesses of the existing main route.
 - This option does not include a residential element therefore not meeting objectives of delivering new homes or supporting a more mixed use and vibrant town centre.
 - This option allows for growth of the education role of the town centre, supporting skills training, higher education and the related benefits this can bring to the town centre.
 - This option may risk not being bold enough in seeking regeneration potential, therefore missing opportunities to create a high quality town centre, which is successful in improving the image of Southend as a place to live, visit or do business.

Option 3: City by the Sea

- 5.2.5 This is the most far reaching option seeking the greatest amount of regeneration of the town centre, surrounding area and mix of uses. It is taken forward as the preferred option for the SCAAP.
- This option would see the largest amount of redevelopment and therefore require the greatest use of natural resources. However, if new buildings use water and energy more efficiently than older ones it could have net benefits in the medium or longer term.
 - This option is for comprehensive redevelopment of the town centre over a wide area, although with specific uses for different zones. It has the potential to have a positive benefit for Southend as a whole, improving its image as a place to live, visit and do business.
 - This option may be the most risky to implement, particularly in a recession. However, having a joined up approach for the Central Area that sets out all development potential is likely to be beneficial in the long-term in ensuring a coherent redevelopment of the area. Implementation and funding schemes will need to be fully developed to ensure full delivery.
 - Given the large amount of change this option may bring about, there is a need to ensure it is delivered in conjunction with other plans and strategies for the area to avoid adverse impacts. This could include travel and parking management, South Essex Rapid Transit (SERT) improvements and tourism strategies. This option does recognise the need for transport and movement improvements in the town centre, especially making walking a more attractive option.
 - This option is for a large-scale redevelopment of areas of the town centre, for a range of uses including employment. There is a risk that this will have an impact on regeneration and growth options for other parts of the Borough. Therefore, the plan makers should ensure the objective for growth in central Southend does not adversely impact on the objectives for growth in other locations.

5.3 Preferred Option

5.3.1 The third option was investigated in further detail in the SAs.

5.3.2 SBC justify their choice of the 'City by the Sea' option as:

"Based on a thorough understanding of opportunities and constraints and consultation feedback to date, the preferred overarching rationale for the Southend Central Area Plan is the creation of a 'City by the Sea' – a change in the function and transformation in the quality of the town centre and seafront and renewal to the remaining parts of the Town Centre." (Paragraph 5.17 SCAAP Issue and Options 2010)

5.4 Reasonable Alternatives Considered

Retail Options

5.4.1 The Preferred Approach SCAAP (2015) included clear options for the proportion of the Primary Shopping Frontage that should be retained for retail. The options were:

- Option A: 70% protection of A1 use on the primary frontage;
- Option B: Protection of retail use so that there are never more than two consecutive non-A1 uses and never below 50% of the total (other uses only A2 or A3); or
- Option C: Protection of retail use so that there are never more than two consecutive non-A1 uses (other uses only A2 to A5).

5.4.2 The SA Report for the Preferred Approach SCAAP (2015) found that although Southend does experience a vacancy rate in retail units above the national average; this could be due to existing policies that restrict the use of retail units in this area to a retail use, meaning other A Uses, such as restaurants, financial services etc. are not permitted under usual circumstances. Therefore, allowing additional non-A1 uses could reduce this vacancy under Options B and C. However, these options could also undermine the Primary Retail Centre. Other uses such as restaurants, cafés, bars, banks, estate agents etc. can change the character and footfall of an area. There is also the risk that diluting the retail offer in these parts of centre may have a knock on effect in undermining the retail role, causing possible further decline in its function.

5.4.3 The preferred approach taken forward into the Revised Proposed Submission SCAAP (2016) was to reduce the area of Primary Shopping Frontage to a more robust defensible area, as referred to as part of the recommendations of the SA. Within this space the decision was made to pursue a mid-point between 'Option A' and 'Option B', with 60% retention of A1 'retail' uses. This option was identified as most likely to protect a sustainable town centre as it should help prevent the character of these areas and the 'core' retail area from dilution, by allowing protection of its primary use, but allowing some diversification. The aim is for this approach to allow for a higher quality type of commercial uses in these areas (including restaurants) rather than simply relying on retail.

Quarters, Policy Areas and Opportunity Site Proposals

5.4.4 The SCAAP area was initially divided into a number of Quarters, which were subsequently redefined as discrete Policy Areas. Individual Opportunity Sites have been identified within these Policy Areas and the SCAAP provides detailed guidance to steer their development.

5.4.5 All sites that were identified as feasible for development and able to contribute to the enhancement of the Central Area were assessed in the SA during its preparation. No alternative sites have been excluded from allocation for all major housing sites where there is

evidence to demonstrate that they are capable of being delivered by 2021 (the end of the plan period) are allocated. This does not include any sites that are already committed for development (i.e. have an extant planning permission).

- 5.4.6 The reorganisation of some of the Policy Areas (previously known as Quarters and Gateway Neighbourhoods) sought to create more coherent parcels of land with a shared aim and spatial identity. For example, the Queensway Policy Area is now more contiguous with the Better Queensway regeneration area and the High Street now includes both of the shopping centres, emphasising the role of the retail core of the town. This should help in delivering more sustainable outcomes by enabling policy to clearly iterate the aims for each area.

5.5 Rationale for adoption of SCAAP as prepared

- 5.5.1 The Examination Report prepared by the Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State to undertake the EIP of the SCAAP tested the soundness of the SCAAP against the following questions:
- Has the plan been positively prepared i.e. based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed requirements?
 - Is the plan justified?
 - Is it based on robust and credible evidence?
 - Is it the most appropriate strategy when considered against the alternatives?
 - Is the document effective?
 - Is it deliverable?
 - Is it flexible?
 - Will it be able to be monitored?
 - Is it consistent with national policy?
- 5.5.2 The Examination Report found that the SCAAP largely reflects the vision and objectives of the Core Strategy whilst responding to evidence from technical reports with justified rationale for retail, tourism, employment, transport, car parking and housing requirements. It concluded that, with the implementation of main modifications (as amended slightly by the Examination Inspector), the SCAAP is sound and legally compliant and provides an appropriate basis for the planning of the Central Area of the Borough over the plan period to 2021.
- 5.5.3 Specifically, with respect to the SA process, the Examination Report concluded that the SA was well balanced in its emphasis on the main strands of sustainability and included appropriate consideration of visitor economy issues.

6 Measures that are to be taken to monitor the likely significant effects of the implementation of the Plan

6.1 Overview

- 6.1.1 The SEA Regulations require details to be provided regarding a mechanism(s) to monitor the likely significant effects on the environment of a plan or programme. Monitoring is required to ensure that the approach set out in the SCAAP continues to be relevant and effective.
- 6.1.2 Regular monitoring will include analysis of data and trends and reviews of the evidence base and provides the basis to trigger a review of actions, strategies and policies to reflect changing circumstances.

6.2 SCAAP Monitoring Framework

- 6.2.1 A series of suggested indicators and, where appropriate, targets, to monitor the implementation of the SCAPP's policies and proposals were set out in the Revised Proposed Submission SCAAP (2016). Some modifications were made to this monitoring and implementation framework after the EiP in order to take account of monitoring recommendations from previous SA reports and align the framework more clearly with each policy and proposal within the final SCAAP (2018).
- 6.2.2 The final framework for the SCAAP, which will be used to monitor its implementation through annual monitoring reports, is detailed in Table 6.1 below.

Table 6:1 SCAAP Implementation and Monitoring Framework (2018)

Key Responsibilities	Implementation	Monitoring Indicators and Targets ⁴	Risks
Policy DS1: A Prosperous Retail Centre			
SBC, public and private developers	Through the continual submission and determination of planning applications. Annual monitoring of retail floor space and refreshes of the retail study.	DS1.1 Proportion of frontage within Town Centre Primary Shopping Frontage that are in A1 Retail use – ensure compliance with policy target. DS1.2 Proportion of units within Town Centre Primary and Secondary Frontage that are vacant – reduce. As Core Strategy Policy CP2 As Indicator DM13.2	Reliance on private sector funding and developer interest. Lack of Developer interest in retail sites. Out of centre developments reducing the capacity to support town centre retail. Growth of neighbouring and sub-regional town centre retail offer. Changes to Central Government policy on Town Centre First. Further changes to Prior Approval or permitted development rights in town centres.
Other Relevant Policies	Core Strategy DPD: KP2, CP2 Development Management DPD: DM1, DM5, DM13		
Policy DS2: Key Views			
SBC, public and private developers	Through the continual submission and determination of planning applications. Implementation of public realm improvements as set out by Policy Area Development Principles.	DS2.1 number of schemes that enhance visually important views – sight lines, access, open space and views improved to identified areas.	
Other Relevant Policies	Core Strategy DPD: KP2, CP4 Development Management DPD: DM1, DM4, DM5, DM6		
Policy DS3: Landmarks and Landmark Buildings			

⁴ Where feasible, the monitoring indicators as outlined in Southend Core Strategy (2007) will also be presented for the SCAAP area.

Key Responsibilities	Implementation	Monitoring Indicators and Targets ⁴	Risks
SBC, public and private developers	Through the continual submission and determination of planning applications. Implementation of public realm improvements as set out by Policy Area Development Principles.	DS3.1 number of appropriately located new landmark buildings – delivery of land mark buildings.	The new landmark building is not of a high quality design, and is poorly located in the townscape to the detriment of the local environment.
Other Relevant Policies	Core Strategy DPD: KP2, CP4 Development Management DPD: DM1, DM4, DM5, DM6		
Policy DS4: Flood Risk Management and Sustainable Drainage			
SBC, Environment Agency Anglian Water, Public and private developers	Through the continual submission and determination of planning application. Site based flood risk assessments.	DS4.1 Number of developments incorporating sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) - For all new development, new impermeable areas will be drained by SuDS. As Core Strategy Policy CP4.	A risk of low quality flood risk assessments. Poorly designed SuDS.
Other Relevant Policies	Core Strategy DPD: KP1, KP2, KP3, CP4 Development Management DPD: DM6		
Policy DS5 – Transport, Access and Public Realm			
SBC, Local Transport Operators. Public and private developers and owners.	Through the continual submission and determination of planning applications. Joint working with local transport operators. Joint working with private operators of car parks. Local Transport Plan and other funding mechanisms – £7m secured from first round of Local Growth Fund (LGF) to deliver transport and public realm improvements in the SCAAP area.	DS5.1 Providing the level of publically available car parking provision to support the vitality and viability of the central area: – Keep car parking capacity, demand and traffic management provisions under review to ensure that this capacity remains at a level to support the vitality and viability of Southend Central Area.	Lack of funding for transport projects. Changes to rail or bus network, quality of service, number of services provided. Level of co-operation between operators and the local authority.

Key Responsibilities	Implementation	Monitoring Indicators and Targets ⁴	Risks
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Monitor the success in achieving no net loss of key visitor car parking (Table 5, 2,562 spaces) to the south of the Central Area (Map 4). - Monitor any net change in overall paid-for public parking within Central Area South (3,142) spaces as outlined in Appendix 9. <p>As Core Strategy Policy CP3. As Development Management Policy DM15.</p>	
Other Relevant Policies	Core Strategy DPD: KP2, KP3, CP3, CP4 Development Management DPD: DM15		
Policy PA1: High Street Policy Area Development Principles			
SBC, Public and private developers. Landowners, Business Improvement District, Historic England	Through the continual submission and determination of planning applications. Implementation of public realm improvements. LGF Funding. Stub end roads pedestrianisation. Event space. Public realm improvements (greening). Town centre/ seafront connection (multi-level).	<p>As Core Strategy Policies CP1, CP2, CP4, CP8</p> <p>PA1.1 Total number of dwellings built, by size and tenure within Policy Area – 2,474 net additional dwellings by 2021 within SCAAP area.</p>	<p>Lack of interest in retail in the Town Centre.</p> <p>Growth of neighbouring and sub-regional town centre retail offer.</p> <p>Changes to Central Government policy on Town Centre First</p> <p>Further changes to Prior Approval or permitted development rights in town centres.</p> <p>Lack of inward investment opportunities.</p> <p>Effect of any out of town retail development.</p>
Other Relevant	Core Strategy DPD: KP1, KP2, KP3, CP1, CP2, CP4 Development Management DPD: DM1, DM2, DM5, DM15		

Key Responsibilities	Implementation	Monitoring Indicators and Targets ⁴	Risks
Policies			
Policy PA2: London Road Policy Area Development Principles			
SBC, public and private developers, Street Market Operators, University of Essex, South Essex College	'Victoria Gateway initiative' Phase 2. Local Transport Plan 3. LGF Funding. Through the continual submission and determination of planning applications. Mixed-mode pedestrian and cycle priority route (LGF funding application). Tree planting. landscaping/public art/integrated signage. Pedestrianisation/relocation of taxi rank.	As Core Strategy Policies CP1, CP2, CP3, CP4, CP8	Lack of funding for transport and public realm improvements. Lack of inward investment opportunities. Higher and further education establishments Lack of inward investment establishments to not want to develop further in the town centre.
Other Relevant Policies	Core Strategy DPD: KP1, KP2, KP3, CP1, CP2, CP4 Development Management DPD: DM1, DM2, DM15		
Policy PA3: Elmer Square Policy Area Development Principles Opportunity Site Elmer Square Phase 2 (PA3.1)			
SBC, University of Essex South Essex College Public and private developers	Elmer Square Phase 2 project to complement the recently completed Forum public and academic library - Exploration of use of £6m notional allocation of LGF funding. Through the continual submission and determination of planning applications. Local Transport Plan 3. Mixed mode pedestrian and cycle priority route.	As Core Strategy Policies CP1, CP4, CP6	Lack of funding for transport and public realm improvements Lack of inward investment opportunities. Higher and further education establishments to not want to develop further in the town centre. Lack of funding for large scale projects.
Other Relevant Policies	Core Strategy DPD: Development Management DPD:		
Policy PA4: Queensway Policy Area Development Principles Opportunity Site 'Better Queensway' Project (PA4.1)			
SBC, Public and private developers Registered	Better Queensway Project. Through the continual submission and determination of planning applications.	As Core Strategy Policies CP1, CP2, CP3, CP4, CP6, CP7, CP8	Lack of funding for transport and public realm improvements. Lack of inward investment opportunities.

Key Responsibilities	Implementation	Monitoring Indicators and Targets ⁴	Risks
Housing Providers	Local Transport Plan 3. New community infrastructure. New public open space - Queensway Urban Park. Public realm improvements. Pedestrian and cycle crossing. Create mixed mode pedestrian and cycle priority route and shared priority route. Chichester Road improvements. Improvement to Southchurch Road retail area. Application made for Local Growth Funding specific to Better Queensway Project.		Additional cost of transport realignment, particularly in relation to the Queensway Dual Carriageway. Lack of interest from developers. Change to political focus and priority for a large scale project of this size. Lack of support from local residents and wider community.
Other Relevant Policies	Core Strategy DPD: KP1, KP2, KP3, CP1, CP4, CP6, CP8 Development Management DPD: DM1, DM2, DM3, DM7, DM8, DM15		
Policy PA5: Warrior Square Policy Area Development Principles			
SBC, Public and private developers	Through the continual submission and determination of planning applications. Linked to Better Queensway Project. Public realm improvements. New pedestrian and cycle priority route and shared priority route. LGF Funding. Environmental improvements to Queensway and Chichester Road. Children's play facility at Warrior Square Gardens - £150,000 cost identified by IDP.	As Core Strategy Policies CP1, CP4, CP6, CP8	Lack of funding for transport and public realm improvements. Lack of inward investment opportunities. Lack of interest in office development. Lack of funding for children's play facility.
Other Relevant Policies	Core Strategy DPD: KP1, KP2, KP3, CP1, CP3, CP4, CP6, CP7, CP 8 Development Management DPD: DM1, DM2, DM3, DM4, DM5, DM7, DM8, DM10, DM15		
Policy PA6: Clifftown Policy Area Development Principles			
SBC,	Through the continual submission and determination of	As Core Strategy Policies CP1,	Lack of funding for transport

Key Responsibilities	Implementation	Monitoring Indicators and Targets ⁴	Risks
Public and private developers Landowners Transport Operators English Heritage	planning applications. Tree Planting Programme. LGF Funding. Local Transport Plan 3. Public realm improvements. Regenerate the forecourt at Southend Central Station. Redevelop Central House for retail, residential, offices. Regenerate site of Empire Theatre for cultural uses. Provision of information boards/digital technology to interpret historic assets.	CP2, CP4, CP8	and public realm improvements. Lack of inward investment opportunities. Lack of support from local community in relation to proximity to conservation area and noise. Level of co-operation between rail operators and local authority to initiate public realm improvements
Other Relevant Policies	Core Strategy DPD: KP1, KP2, KP3, CP2, CP4, CP7 Development Management DPD: DM1, DM2, DM4, DM5, DM6, DM14		
Policy PA7: Tylers Policy Area Development Principles Opportunity Site Tylers Avenue (PA7.1)			
SBC, Public and private developers Travel Operators	Through the continual submission and determination of planning applications. Need for a masterplan. LGF funding. Local Transport Plan 3. Creation of a new public open space. Mixed mode pedestrian and cycle priority route. Home Zone. Improved walking and cycling linkages. Junction improvements at Queensway.	As Core Strategy Policies CP1, CP2, CP3, CP4, CP8	Lack of interest in retail or commercial space. Cost of parking re-provision and new travel interchange. Lack of funding for transport and public realm improvements Lack of inward investment opportunities. Lack of support from local community for home zone.
Other Relevant Policies	Core Strategy DPD: KP1, KP2, KP3, CP2, CP3, CP4, CP8 Development Management DPD: DM1, DM2, DM3, DM4, DM7, DM8, DM10, DM15		
Policy CS1: Central Seafront Policy Area Development Principles Opportunity Sites: Southend Pier (CS1.1); Seaways (CS1.2); Marine Plaza (CS1.3); New Southend Museum (CS1.4)			
SBC, Public and	Through the continual submission and determination of	As Core Strategy	Lack of funding for transport and

Key Responsibilities	Implementation	Monitoring Indicators and Targets ⁴	Risks
private developers Environment Agency	<p>planning applications. Completion of committed sites at Marine Plaza and New Museum. Application made for LGF specific to museum. Continual maintenance and investment in the Pier, including the installation of new digital technologies. Expansion of City Beach. Completion of committed new lagoon. Flood risk and mitigation measures. Improving connectivity from Town Centre and Central Seafront. Rationalise signage, street furniture, green grid. Upgrade the Cliffs Pavilion outdoor space. Improve traffic management, parking, walking and cycling. New frontage on the southern side of the Royals Shopping Centre. LGF funding.</p>	<p>Policies CP1, CP2, CP3, CP4, CP7, CP8. As Development Management Policy DM12.</p>	<p>public realm improvements. Lack of inward investment opportunities. Outcome of screening under Habitats Regulations. Lack of developer interest. Development of out of town retail and leisure attractions.</p>
Other Relevant Policies	Core Strategy DPD: KP1, KP2, KP3, CP3, CP4, CP7, CP8 Development Management DPD: DM1, DM2, DM3, DM4, DM5, DM6, DM7, DM8, DM9, DM10, DM12, DM14, DM15		
Policy CS2: Nature Conservation and Biodiversity			
SBC, Natural England	<p>Through the determination of planning applications. Project-level Habitats Regulation Assessment where necessary. Development of visitor facility close to foreshore. Provision of public open space at Pier Hill, Seaways, Eastern Esplanade.</p>	<p>As Core Strategy Policies CP4, CP7</p>	<p>Outcome of screening under Habitats Regulations.</p>
Other Relevant Policies	Core Strategy DPD: KP1, KP2, KP3, CP4, CP7 Development Management DPD: DM6		
Policy CS3: The Waterfront			

Key Responsibilities	Implementation	Monitoring Indicators and Targets ⁴	Risks
SBC	Through the determination of planning applications. Completion of committed new lagoon (Coastal Communities Fund). Public realm improvement. Provision of information boards/digital technology to interpret biodiversity of area.	As Core Strategy Policies CP4, CP7	Lack of funding
Other Relevant Policies	Core Strategy DPD: KP1, KP2, KP3, CP4, CP7 Development Management DPD: DM6		
Policy PA8: Victoria Gateway Neighbourhood Policy Area Development Principles Opportunity Sites: Victoria Avenue (PA8.1); Baxter Avenue (PA8.2)			
SBC. Public and private developers Land owners Registered Housing Provider	Through the continual submission and determination of planning applications. Completion of committed sites at Victoria Avenue and Carnarvon Road. Local Transport Plan 3. Recent completion of the Hive Southend Business Hub (Southend City Deal and £0.7m LGF match funding). Additional education facilities. Junction improvements at Victoria Avenue/ Fairfax Drive. Junction improvements at Victoria Avenue/ East Street/West Street (LGF funding). Junction improvements at Victoria Avenue/ Carnarvon Road (LGF funding). Junction improvements at Victoria Avenue/ Great Eastern Avenue (LGF funding). Enhancements to North Road including civic space at junction with Chelmsford Avenue. Enhancement of the Civic space on east side of Victoria Avenue/urban greening. Create mixed mode pedestrian and cycle priority route (LGF funding).	As Core Strategy Policies CP1, CP2, CP3, CP4, CP6, CP7, CP8.	Lack of funding for transport and public realm improvements Lack of inward investment opportunities. Lack of inward investment Further changes to Prior Approval or permitted development rights. Lack of interest for new office accommodation. Fragmented approach. Multiple site ownership.
Other Relevant Policies	Core Strategy DPD: KP1, KP2, KP3, CP1, CP3, CP4, CP6, CP7, CP8 Development Management DPD: DM1, DM2, DM3, DM4, DM5, DM7, DM8, DM9, DM10, DM13, DM15		

Key Responsibilities	Implementation	Monitoring Indicators and Targets ⁴	Risks
Policy PA9: Sutton Gateway Neighbourhood Policy Area Development Principles Opportunity Sites: Sutton Road (PA9.1); Guildford Road (PA9.2)			
SBC, Public and private developers	Through the continual submission and determination of planning applications. Completion of committed sites at Sutton Road. Enhancements to Sutton Road – streetscape and landscape. LGF funding	As Core Strategy Policies CP1, CP2, CP3, CP4, CP6, CP8.	Lack of funding for transport and public realm improvements. Lack of inward investment opportunities. Multiple site ownership.
Other Relevant Policies	Core Strategy DPD: KP1, KP2, KP3, CP1, CP3, CP4, CP6, CP7, CP8 Development Management DPD: DM1, DM2, DM3, DM4, DM7, DM8, DM9, DM10, DM11, DM13, DM14, DM15		

7 Conclusion

7.1.1 This Post Adoption Statement for the SCAAP has reported on the following details:

- How environmental considerations have been integrated into the plan or programme (**Section 2** of this Statement);
- How the environmental report has been taken into account (**Section 3**);
- How opinions expressed in response to:
 - i the invitation referred to in regulation 13(2)(d);
 - ii action taken by the responsible authority in accordance with regulation 13(4), have been taken into account; (**Section 4**).
- How the results of any consultations entered into under regulation 14(4) have been taken into account;
- The reasons for choosing the plan or programme as adopted, in the light of the other reasonable alternatives dealt with; (**Section 5** of this Statement) and
- The measures that are to be taken to monitor the significant environmental effects of the implementation of the plan or programme (regulation 16) (**Section 6** of this Statement).

7.1.2 **Section 3.3** of this report in particular has demonstrated that the final SCAAP being presented to SBC for adoption (February 2018) has been closely informed by the SA process and that all identified sustainability issues and concerns have now been addressed. In particular, the post-examination modifications to the SCAAP have enhanced previously predicted beneficial effects and now result in no significant adverse effects being likely to result from the final SCAAP.

Appendix A SCAAP SA Framework

A.1.1 Table A.1 below sets out the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Framework which has underpinned the SA of the SCAAP.

Table A.1 SCAAP SA Framework

Reference Number	Sustainability Objective	Explanation and desirable direction of change	Sub-Objectives
Social progress which recognises the needs of everyone			
SP1	Accessibility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> enable all to have similar and sufficient levels of access to services, facilities and opportunities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> maintain Southend Central Area as the centre for all services, as the most accessible location improve accessibility to the town centre improvement in public transport accessibility along the entire length of the seafront
SP2	Housing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> to provide the opportunity for people to meet their housing need 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ensure a sufficient number of dwellings encourage a suitable mix of dwellings, including tenure and size
SP3	Education & Skills	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> to assist people in gaining the skills to fulfil their potential and increase their contribution to the community 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> improve accessibility to employment and education facilities support continued development of the University campus in the town centre
SP4	Health, safety and security	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> to improve overall levels of health, reduce the disparities between different groups and different areas, and reduce crime and the fear of crime 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> improvements to reduce fear of crime in the town centre, especially at night improve pedestrian routes through the town centre and seafront to help design out crime

Reference Number	Sustainability Objective	Explanation and desirable direction of change	Sub-Objectives
SP5	Community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> to value and nurture a sense of belonging in a cohesive community, whilst respecting diversity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> improve the viability and distinctive character of Southend town centre provide public art and improvements to the design of seafront tourist buildings, such as beach huts and kiosks to provide a recognisable unified approach for Southend provide new community open spaces in the town centre and seafront
Effective protection of the environment			
EP1	Biodiversity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> to maintain and enhance the diversity and abundance of species, and safeguard these areas of significant nature conservation value 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> protect undeveloped parts of the coastline protect key habitats directly or indirectly from developments which may harm them ensure new development brings enhancements to the built environment where appropriate ensure 'appropriate assessment' of all development is carried out where appropriate
EP2	Landscape character	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> to maintain and enhance the quality and character and cultural significance of the landscape, including the setting and character of the settlement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> protect undeveloped parts of the coastline retain notable features and areas of open space along the coast line protect views of the estuary

Reference Number	Sustainability Objective	Explanation and desirable direction of change	Sub-Objectives
EP3	Built environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> to maintain and enhance the quality, safety and distinctiveness of the built environment and the cultural heritage 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> enhance and protect land mark and listed buildings on the sea front enhance and protect listed buildings and those of interest in the town centre improve urban design quality through policy protect existing and create new open and green space
Prudent use of natural resources			
NR1	Air	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> to reduce all forms of air pollution in the interests of local air quality and the integrity of the atmosphere 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> reduce traffic congestion in the town centre encourage freight modal shift and encourage a reduction in emissions of new buildings
NR2	Water	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> to maintain and improve the quantity and quality of ground, sea and river waters, and minimise the risk of flooding 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ensure no increased risk of coastal flooding acknowledge the risk to water quality from on-shore developments
NR3	Land	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> to use land efficiently, retaining undeveloped land and bringing contaminated land back into use 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> protect undeveloped coastline in the Borough encourage development on previously developed land encourage high density residential development and mixed use development in the town centre
NR4	Soil	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> to maintain the resource of productive soil 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> protect productive soil where applicable (little overall impact likely)
NR5	Minerals and other raw materials	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> to maintain the stock of minerals and other raw materials 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> minimise use of aggregates for new development (relevance to sea defences)

Reference Number	Sustainability Objective	Explanation and desirable direction of change	Sub-Objectives
NR6	Energy sources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> to increase the opportunities for energy generation from renewable energy sources, maintain the stock of non-renewable energy sources and make the best use of the materials, energy and effort embodied in the product of previous activity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> encourage efficient use of energy use of more energy from low carbon sources encourage decentralised energy supply, including through renewable energy or CHP.
Maintenance of high and stable levels of economic growth and employment			
EG1	Local economy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> to achieve a clear connection between effort and benefit, by making the most of local strengths, seeking community regeneration, and fostering economic activity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> improve the viability and vitality of the town centre as economic hub for the Borough improve the viability and vitality of the seafront as a major and flexible tourist destination identify sites for local business start-ups in accessible locations
EG2	Employment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> to maintain and enhance employment opportunities matched to the size of the local labour force and its various skills, and to reduce the disparities arising from unequal access to jobs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> work to create new jobs in a range of sectors within the Borough work to make the coast a major destination for conferences support a diverse range of businesses premises to meet different needs, as well as supporting existing business clusters
EG3	Wealth creation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> to retain and enhance the factors which are conducive to wealth creation, including personal creativity, infrastructure, accessibility and the local strengths and qualities that are attractive to visitors and investors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> contribute to creating attractive environment for business to flourish improve access for all residents to a range of jobs

Peter Brett Associates LLP is a leading development and infrastructure consultancy. As an independent consulting practice of planners, economists, engineers and scientists, we provide trusted advice to create value from land and buildings owned or operated by our clients.

All of our work, from the engineering of landmark buildings and critical infrastructure to the spatial planning and economic evidence in support of development, is evidence based and informed by a deep understanding of what it takes to deliver construction.



UK

Ashford
Birmingham
Bristol
Cambridge
Edinburgh
Glasgow
Leeds
London
Manchester
Newcastle
Northampton
Oxford
Plymouth
Reading
Southampton
Taunton

International

Czech Republic
Germany
Slovakia

Services

Transport Planning
Energy and Buildings
Civil Engineering
Water, Environment and
Geotechnical
Planning, Development
and Economics