



The Mendlesham Neighbourhood Development Plan (MNDP): Submission Version

Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA): Addendum – January 2021







Contents

1.	Introduction	6
1.1	Background	6
1.2	The Mendlesham Neighbourhood Development Plan (MNDP)	6
1.3	What does this Addendum cover?	6
2.	Screening the Amendments to the MNDP	8
2.1	What will the Screening process involve and cover?	8
2.2	Screening the Amendments	8
3.	Re-Assessment of MNDP Content	23
3.1	Which Sections of the SEA Environmental Report need re-assessment?	23
3.2	Policy MP1: Housing	25
3.3	Policy MP5: Historic Environment	28
3.4	Site Options identified within the MNDP area	29
3.5	The Assessment of Site Options	31
3.6	Alternative combinations of sites to meet housing need	35
3.7	The Reasons for Selecting and Rejecting Alternative Options	46
3.8	The MNDP's Policy Content and Coverage of Themes	49
3.9	'Whole Plan' Effects	50
3.10	Recommendations and Suggested Mitigation Measures	51



List of Tables

Table 1: Screening determination of the MNDP amendments 9



Glossary of Acronyms

AA	Appropriate Assessment
ALC	Agricultural Land Classification
AQMA	Air Quality Management Area
DCLG	Department for Communities and Local Government
DPD	Development Plan Document
EA	Environment Agency
EC	European Commission
ECC	Essex County Council
EU	European Union
Ha	Hectare
HE	Historic England
HRA	Habitats Regulations Assessment
LB	Listed Building
LCA	Landscape Character Assessment
LPA	Local Planning Authority
MSA	Minerals Safeguarding Area
MSDC	Mid Suffolk District Council
NE	Natural England
NHS	National Health Service
NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework
OAN	Objectively Assessed Need
PDL	Previously Developed Land
PPG	Planning Practice Guidance
PRoW	Public Right of Way
SA	Sustainability Appraisal
SAC	Special Area of Conservation
SCC	Suffolk County Council
SEA	Strategic Environmental Assessment
SHMA	Strategic Housing Market Assessment
SHLAA	Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment
SM	Scheduled Monument
SO	SEA Objective
SPA	Special Protection Area
SSSI	Site of Specific Scientific Interest
SuDS	Sustainable Drainage System
UK	United Kingdom



1. Introduction

1.1 Background

The Mendlesham Neighbourhood Development Plan Group (MNDP Group) commissioned Place Services to undertake an independent Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) for the Mendlesham Neighbourhood Development Plan (MNDP).

1.2 The Mendlesham Neighbourhood Development Plan (MNDP)

The main purpose of the MNDP is to set out and identify the best ways to direct local planning towards community needs, while protecting the natural environment and cultural assets and ensuring a more sustainable future for the community. The MNDP will set out planning policies for Mendlesham and within the confines of the MNDP boundary as defined within the MNDP.

Once formally made, a Neighbourhood Development Plan carries the same legal weight as Local Development Plans adopted up by the Local Planning Authority (LPA), in this case Mid Suffolk District Council (MSDC).

Once adopted by Mid Suffolk District Council, the MNDP will become a statutory document. It will be used alongside National Policy and Mid Suffolk's Local Plan to determine planning applications within the MNDP boundary. Once the MNDP is 'made' it will provide a framework to manage development in the area.

1.3 What does this Addendum cover?

This Addendum accompanies the SEA Environmental Report of August 2020, factoring in changes made to the MNDP since an independent 'health check' on the Plan was undertaken. The health check looked at the Plan in detail in regard to legal compliance and conformity to the adopted and emerging planning policies at the Local Planning Authority level, in this case relevant to Mid Suffolk District Council. The health check also looked at the soundness of the MNDP.

Several changes have been made to the MNDP as a result, and as such the effects highlighted within the SEA Environmental Report of August 2020 may now not accurately reflect the version of the MNDP proposed for consultation. This Addendum screens and where deemed necessary re-assesses those elements of the MNDP that have been subsequently amended, and looks at the wider implications of the changes in regard to cumulative and synergistic impacts and 'whole Plan effects'.

The amendments made to the MNDP are summarised here as:

- The re-categorisation of some previously allocated sites;
- Changes to the wording of some policies;
- The inclusion of a Capacity Assessment Table; and
- New maps to accompany the Plan's approach to green space designations.



Each amendment to the MNDP of August 2020, as the version previously assessed, has been screened to determine whether any significant effects could be forthcoming. Where it is considered that an amendment is potentially significant enough to warrant re-assessment, then this is also included within this Addendum.

Additionally, should any Plan amendment lead to the dismissal of effects raised in the SEA Environmental Report August 2020, these will also be covered in the re-assessment of the relevant parts of the MNDP. This Addendum also considers whether any Plan amendment could give rise to the need to explore any further reasonable alternative approaches, beyond those already explored in the SEA Environmental Report of August 2020.



2. Screening the Amendments to the MNDP

2.1 What will the Screening process involve and cover?

This Section sets out the screening process, which explores whether the amendments to the Plan will:

- Lead to any additional potential environmental, social or economic effects not identified in the SEA Environmental Report (August 2020);
- Dismiss any environmental, social or economic effect raised in the SEA Environmental Report (August 2020);
- Lead to any new reasonable alternatives that would need assessment at this stage; and
- Lead to any change in the information displayed within the SEA Environmental Report (August 2020), such as the cumulative, synergistic, secondary or temporal analysis, or 'whole Plan' conclusions.

The screening process involves identifying key Plan amendments, displaying them clearly, and offering commentary as to whether there will be any change to the SEA Environmental Report as identified in the bullet points above. If it is considered that a subsequent amendment to, or re-assessment of, any element of the SEA Environmental Report will be required, these are set out within this Addendum in corresponding Sections. Each of these Sections will be displayed as and effectively replace the relevant corresponding Section of the SEA Environmental Report of August 2020.

2.2 Screening the Amendments

Please note that the amendments made to the Executive Summary of the MNDP have not been screened as these are replicated in more detail in the main body of the MNDP. The screening exercise focuses on those amendments made to the Plan's policy framework and the supporting text of policy.

The Screening process and outcomes are displayed in the table below.



Table 1: Screening determination of the MNDP amendments

Signposting	Previous MNDP content (August 2020)	Amendment proposed (December 2020)	Commentary and action / subsequent revision(s) needed to the Environmental Report (August 2020)
General	Plan period was 2016-2033.	Plan period is now 2018-2037.	<p>As set out within the MNDP, the start and end dates of the Plan have been changed (now from 2018 to 2037) to keep the Plan period in line with the revised Babergh and Mid Suffolk District Councils' Joint Local Plan (when it is formally adopted).</p> <p>There are no direct identified implications of this amendment on the allocation of sites, or the Plan's housing provision figure of 161 dwellings within the Plan period. The amendment does not alter the findings of the SEA Environmental Report.</p>
Para 1.4 (Bullet 2)	Setting out Mendlesham's status as a 'key service centre' within the Babergh & Mid Suffolk District Councils' Joint Local Plan.	Setting out Mendlesham's status as a 'Core Village' within an updated iteration the Babergh and Mid Suffolk District Councils' Joint Local Plan.	Although reference to the status of Mendlesham as a 'key service centre' is included within the SEA Environmental Report, the amendment does not alter the findings of the SEA.
Section 3 (Housing)	N/A	New paragraph (3.29): It should be noted that site 3 (Chapel Road) was not originally selected within this Neighbourhood Plan for development. However it has recently been granted outline planning permission (October 2020) and is now	The amendment reflects the recent permission of the site 'Land to the North East of Chapel Road' for 20 dwellings. This site was previously assessed as an alternative site option (MNDP3c) and referenced as such within the SEA Environmental Report. Subsequent revisions to the SEA Environmental Report are



Signposting	Previous MNDP content (August 2020)	Amendment proposed (December 2020)	Commentary and action / subsequent revision(s) needed to the Environmental Report (August 2020)
		<p>included in our Capacity Assessment Table as a Commitment.</p>	<p>necessary within certain sections of that Report, as the site's planning status omits its consideration as an alternative. The sections required for revision are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 5.3 Site Options identified within the MNDP area - 5.4 The Assessment of Site Options - 5.5 Alternative combinations of sites to meet housing need - 5.6 The Reasons for Selecting and Rejecting Alternative Options
Section 3 (Housing)	<p>Every year there are instances of isolated unplanned development around the Parish. A report was produced to identify the history of these unplanned developments by year over the past 10 years. That report is attached as Supporting Document SD29, Windfall Development. The report shows that over the past 8 years, since 2011, 23 unplanned new developments were completed (an average of 2.8 per year). Accordingly we have factored in a figure of 2 dwellings per year for our calculations</p>	<p>Every year there are instances of isolated unplanned development around the Parish. A report was produced to identify the history of these unplanned developments by year over the past 10 years. That report is attached as Supporting Document SD29, Windfall Development. The report shows that over the past 8 years, since 2011, 23 unplanned new developments were completed (an average of 2.8 per year). Accordingly we have factored in a figure of 2 dwellings per year for our calculations on new</p>	<p>Although the SEA Environmental Report considers windfalls, the rate of two dwellings per annum is taken as a constant in relevant Sections, including that of various reasonable alternatives and combinations of sites. This amendment to the MNDP will not alter the findings of the SEA Environmental Report.</p>



Signposting	Previous MNDP content (August 2020)	Amendment proposed (December 2020)	Commentary and action / subsequent revision(s) needed to the Environmental Report (August 2020)
	on new developments over the years 2018 to 2036 (18 years; 36 new dwellings.)	developments over the years 2018 to 2037 (19 years; 38 new dwellings.)	
Section 3 (Housing)	<p>Phase 1 - 2017 - 2022</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land to the west of Old Station road, formerly known as the G.R. Warehousing site (now under development as Station Fields). 56 dwellings of which 6 will be affordable. Land to the North West of Mason Court, known as Old Engine Meadow. 18 dwellings. Land to the West of Mason Court and adjacent to Horsefair Close. 10 dwellings (all to be affordable) Land to the East of the Mendlesham Road at Mendlesham Green. Up to 10 affordable or rented dwellings. <p>Phase 2 - 2022 - 2036</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land to the South of the Ropers Farm estate, South of Glebe Way. 	<p>Phase 1 - 2018 - 2022</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land to the west of Old Station Road, formerly known as the G.R. Warehousing site (now completed and known Station Fields). 56 dwellings of which 6 are affordable. Land to the North West of Mason Court, known as Old Engine Meadow. 18 dwellings. Land to the West of Mason Court and adjacent to Horsefair Close. 10 dwellings (all to be affordable) <p>Phase 2 - 2022 - 2036</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land to the South of the Ropers Farm estate, South of Glebe Way. [SHELAA reference SS0065]. Up to 75 dwellings. Land to the North East of Chapel Road [SHELAA reference SS0083 - 20 dwellings. 	<p>The amendments to the MNDP reflect the phasing of development and are considered factual. In consideration of the content of the SEA Environmental Report, the phasing of the Plan's allocations remains the same, with no need to amend the SEA Environmental Report as a result.</p> <p>The amendments do however reflect the recent permission of the site 'Land to the North East of Chapel Road' for 20 dwellings. This site was previously assessed as an alternative site option (MNDP3c) and referenced as such within the SEA Environmental Report. Subsequent revisions to the SEA Environmental Report are necessary within certain sections of that Report, as the site's planning status omits its consideration as an alternative. The sections required for revision are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 5.3 Site Options identified within the MNDP area - 5.4 The Assessment of Site Options

Signposting	Previous MNDP content (August 2020)	Amendment proposed (December 2020)	Commentary and action / subsequent revision(s) needed to the Environmental Report (August 2020)
	[SHELAA reference SS0065]. Up to 75 dwellings.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land to the East of the Mendlesham Road at Mendlesham Green. Up to 10 affordable or rented dwellings. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 5.5 Alternative combinations of sites to meet housing need 5.6 The Reasons for Selecting and Rejecting Alternative Options
Section 3 (Housing)	<p>3.5.3 Within the Draft Joint Local Plan currently being consulted on Mendlesham Green has a settlement boundary and it seems possible that it will be designated as a type of small village that would be expected to support some minimal development.</p> <p>3.54. MSDC policies CS1 and CS2 direct new development to towns and Key Service Centres and to a more limited extent primary and secondary villages. Any other development, in the countryside and countryside villages (e.g. Mendlesham Green) is restricted to defined categories in accordance with other Core Strategy policies.</p>	<p>3.50. Within the Draft Joint Local Plan Mendlesham Green is defined as a Hamlet with a settlement boundary and will be expected to support some minimal development.</p> <p>3.51. MSDC draft policy SP04 directs new development mainly to the Ipswich fringe, market towns and Core Villages, and to a more limited extent Hinterland Villages and Hamlets. Any other development, in the countryside and countryside settlements will be treated as windfall.</p>	<p>The revised content of the Draft Joint Local Plan, as set out, has no direct bearing on the SEA Environmental Report, in so far as no land is identified for development purposes in the Hamlet of Mendlesham Green within the Draft Joint Local Plan.</p> <p>Previously however, a site was allocated within the MNDP, and assessed as an allocation within the SEA Environmental Report. This site, 'Land to the East of the Mendlesham Road at Mendlesham Green' (MNDP12), allocated for up to 10 affordable or rented dwellings, is now proposed to be treated as an 'exception site' and does not have the status of an allocation within the amended MNDP. Subsequent revisions to the SEA Environmental Report are necessary within certain sections of that Report, as the site, promoted by the Parish Council as landowners, is now removed from consideration. The sections required for revision are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4.3.3 Policy MP1(A): Housing (Allocations)



Signposting	Previous MNDP content (August 2020)	Amendment proposed (December 2020)	Commentary and action / subsequent revision(s) needed to the Environmental Report (August 2020)
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 5.3 Site Options identified within the MNDP area - 5.4 The Assessment of Site Options - 5.5 Alternative combinations of sites to meet housing need - 5.6 The Reasons for Selecting and Rejecting Alternative Options - 6.2 The MNDP's Policy Content and Coverage of Themes - 7.1.1 'Whole Plan' Effects - 7.1.2 Recommendations and Suggested Mitigation Measures
Section 3 (Housing)	Overall Capacity Assessment (table) - GRAND TOTAL: 197 dwellings	Overall Capacity Assessment (table) – GRAND TOTAL: 229 dwellings	<p>The Overall Capacity Assessment table amalgamates a dwelling total from completions since the base date of the Plan, commitments, and allocations, whilst also factoring in the windfall allowance of two dwellings per annum. The MNDP has been amended to reflect an update in regard to recent completions and commitments, which shows an uplift of 32 dwellings.</p> <p>The SEA Environmental Report, in assessing the effects of the Plan's allocations and alternatives, including cumulatively and regarding alternative site combinations, takes into account the housing provision figure of 161</p>



Signposting	Previous MNDP content (August 2020)	Amendment proposed (December 2020)	Commentary and action / subsequent revision(s) needed to the Environmental Report (August 2020)
			<p>dwelling over the Plan period as a minimum figure. The implications of the assessment of site combinations in the SEA Environmental Report will not be altered by this change in position regarding overall capacity.</p>
<p>Polict MP1 / MP1A</p>	<p>The previous Plan included separate Policies MP1, and MP1A, the latter of which included the following site allocations and corresponding 'site criteria':</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Land to the west of Old Station Road, formerly known as the G.R. Warehousing site (under development as Station Fields). 56 dwellings, 6 of which are affordable. - Land to the North West of Mason Court, known as Old Engine Meadow. 18 dwellings. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o This site will be supported for housing development provided combined with the site below (land to the West of Mason Court). 	<p>The Plan is amended to merge the two previous policies MP1 and MP1A, into a new MP1. The site allocations listed, with 'site criteria' are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Land to the North West of Mason Court, known as Old Engine Meadow. 18 dwellings. [Site 11] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o This site will be supported for housing development provided it is combined with the site below (land to the West of Mason Court). o As an edge of village settlement and gateway site from the Cotton Road, development will require a high degree of landscaping and screening along its boundaries. Retention of existing mature trees and hedging. o Hedging along the Western/Northern and Eastern boundaries should be substantial and enhanced in order to 	<p>The merging of the policies related to the removal of previously allocated sites, and also amendments to site criteria, will lead to numerous changes being required to the SEA Environmental Report. The removal of sites relates to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Land to the west of Old Station Road, formerly known as the G.R. Warehousing site; and - Land to the East of the Mendlesham Road at Mendlesham Green. <p>These sites are required to be removed from SEA considerations. Changes are therefore required in the following sections of the SEA Environmental Report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 4.3.3 Policy MP1(A): Housing (Allocations) - 5.3 Site Options identified within the MNDP area - 5.4 The Assessment of Site Options - 5.5 Alternative combinations of sites to meet housing need



Signposting	Previous MNDP content (August 2020)	Amendment proposed (December 2020)	Commentary and action / subsequent revision(s) needed to the Environmental Report (August 2020)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ As an edge of village settlement and gateway site from the Cotton Road, development will require a high degree of landscaping and screening along its boundaries. Retention of existing mature trees and hedging. ○ Hedging along the western/northern and eastern boundaries should be substantial and enhanced in order to protect the rural approach and view to the village from Chapel Road. ○ Vehicle access to this site from Ducksen Road will not be allowed. ○ A pathway and cycle track via Ducksen Road will be supported. ○ Criteria to be included that ensure that the 	<p>protect the rural approach and view to the village from Chapel Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Vehicle access to this site from Ducksen Road will not be allowed because of insufficient space and pedestrian risk. ○ A pathway and cycle track via Ducksen Road will be supported. ○ Criteria to be included that ensure that the recommendations of the SFRA Part 2 should be factored into any forthcoming reserved matters application. <p>- Land to the West of Mason Court and adjacent to Horsefair Close. 10 dwellings (all to be affordable). [Site 11]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ This site will be supported for development provided it is combined with the Old Engine Meadow site as above. This site already benefits from mature trees and hedging on its western boundary, these should be protected and enhanced. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 5.6 The Reasons for Selecting and Rejecting Alternative Options - 6.2 The MNDP's Policy Content and Coverage of Themes - 7.1.1 'Whole Plan' Effects - 7.1.2 Recommendations and Suggested Mitigation Measures <p>Additionally, the 'site criteria' of 'Land to the West of Mason Court and adjacent to Horsefair Close' now includes consideration of the SFRA Part 2 recommendations. This will not require further re-assessment of the above mentioned sections of the SEA Environmental Report, as this was factored into the SEA Environmental Report; its omission from the Policy in August 2020 was deemed erroneous.</p> <p>The 'site criteria' of the allocation 'Land to the South of the Ropers Farm estate, South of Glebe Way' have been amended to include additional text surrounding access. Additional text reads, 'All new dwellings on this site must have direct access to both Old Station Road and Church Road.' This will also require coverage within the above mentioned sections of the SEA Environmental Report.</p>



Signposting	Previous MNDP content (August 2020)	Amendment proposed (December 2020)	Commentary and action / subsequent revision(s) needed to the Environmental Report (August 2020)
	<p>recommendations of the SFRA Part 2 are factored into any forthcoming reserved matters application.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Land to the West of Mason Court and adjacent to Horsefair Close. 10 dwellings (all to be affordable). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o This site will be supported for development provided it is combined with the Old Engine Meadow site as above . This site already benefits from mature trees and hedging on its western boundary , these should be protected and enhanced. - Land to the East of the Mendlesham Road at Mendlesham Green. Up to 10 affordable or rented dwellings. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o This site will be supported for development as affordable housing, dwellings will be set back from the road and the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Criteria to be included that ensure that the recommendations of the SFRA Part 2 should be factored into any forthcoming reserved matters application. - Land to the South of the Ropers Farm estate, South of Glebe Way. [SHELAA reference SS0065]. Approximately 75 dwellings (including an agreed percentage of affordable). [Site 2/13] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o This site will be supported for phased development commencing earliest 2022. o Sufficient green space and screening will be provided to protect the setting of Elms Farm (grade 2*) to the West of the site. o The River Dove along the East of the site will be provided with a protective buffer zone, which will be planted to provide an effective screen and green space along the whole stretch of the river on site, in order to enhance and 	



Signposting	Previous MNDP content (August 2020)	Amendment proposed (December 2020)	Commentary and action / subsequent revision(s) needed to the Environmental Report (August 2020)
	<p>existing front hedge will be retained.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Arrangements to deal with any issues of noise or odour from the adjacent farm should be specified. <p>- Land to the South of the Ropers Farm estate, South of Glebe Way. [SHELAA reference SS0065]. Up to 75 dwellings with up to 35% affordable.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ This site will be supported for phased development commencing earliest 2022. ○ Sufficient green space and screening will be provided to protect the setting of Elms Farm (grade 2*) to the west of the site. ○ The River Dove along the east of the site will be provided with a protective buffer zone, which will be planted to provide an 	<p>protect the rural environment and view from Oak Farm Lane.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The existing rural footpath along the North of the site will be retained and a wide buffer zone will be maintained to protect the rural amenity of the residents of Glebe Way. ○ The affordable housing on site will be mixed within the development and not in one block. ○ This whole site (Site 4 - Fig. 2.2) is the only one possessing the unique ability to protect the historic heart of Mendlesham Village by diverting a significant amount of existing and future local traffic away from the Conservation Area. Most of the support of this site is because of its dual access to Old Station Road and Church Road which provide an opportunity for local traffic to avoid the village conservation area. All new dwellings on this site must have direct access to both Old Station Road and Church Road. 	



Signposting	Previous MNDP content (August 2020)	Amendment proposed (December 2020)	Commentary and action / subsequent revision(s) needed to the Environmental Report (August 2020)
	<p>effective screen and green space along the whole stretch of the river on site, in order to enhance and protect the rural environment and view from Oak Farm Lane.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The existing rural footpath along the north of the site will be retained and a wide buffer zone will be maintained to protect the rural amenity of the residents of Glebe Way. ○ The affordable housing on site will be mixed within the development and not in one block. ○ This whole site (MNDP2a and MNDP2b) is the only one possessing the unique ability to protect the historic heart of Mendlesham Village by diverting a significant amount of existing and future local 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Landscaping will be installed on the Eastern edge of the site to ensure the site blends in with the surrounding landscape. ○ A Heritage Impact Assessment should be provided. ○ Criteria to be included that ensure that the recommendations of the SFRA Part 2 should be factored into any forthcoming reserved matters application. 	



Signposting	Previous MNDP content (August 2020)	Amendment proposed (December 2020)	Commentary and action / subsequent revision(s) needed to the Environmental Report (August 2020)
	<p>traffic away from the Conservation Area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Landscaping will be installed on the eastern edge of the site to ensure the site blends in with the surrounding landscape. ○ A Heritage Impact Assessment should be provided. ○ Criteria to be included that ensure that the recommendations of the SFRA Part 2 are factored into any forthcoming reserved matters application. 		
Policy MP5 (Historic Environment)	A detailed proposal should be put forward for all new developments requiring planning permission identifying any potential increases in traffic flows and what mitigating measures will be put in place to minimise the effects.	A detailed proposal should be put forward for all new developments requiring planning permission identifying any potential increases in traffic levels and what mitigating measures will be put in place to minimise the effects.	The amendment proposed to Policy MP5 sees the replacement of the wording 'traffic flows' with 'traffic levels.' This amendment requires the re-assessment of Policy MP5 as included within the SEA Environmental Report.



Signposting	Previous MNDP content (August 2020)	Amendment proposed (December 2020)	Commentary and action / subsequent revision(s) needed to the Environmental Report (August 2020)
Policy MP5 (Historic Environment)	Any proposal for development requiring planning permission which would generate Heavy Goods Vehicle traffic needing to access the Conservation area must provide a transport statement showing that the proposal will not have an unacceptable traffic impact on the Conservation area.	Any proposal for development requiring planning permission which would generate additional traffic needing to access the Conservation area must provide a transport assessment and necessary mitigation measures giving expected traffic volumes emanating from the proposed development.	This further amendment proposed to Policy MP5 seeks transport assessments to be submitted for any development that would increase traffic levels in the Conservation Area, rather than the focus on HGVs as included in the previous Policy wording. This amendment requires the re-assessment of Policy MP5 as included within the SEA Environmental Report.
Policy MP5 (Historic Environment)	All new development should demonstrate a clear understanding of the rural context of Mendlesham and provide appropriate levels of landscaping, boundary and screening planting; in accordance with the “Landscape and visual assessment of Mendlesham” supporting document (SD19) which forms part of this policy. Policy SD19 is to be considered with and read in conjunction with, this policy.	All new development should demonstrate a clear understanding of the rural position of Mendlesham and the importance of maintaining its village environment. Developments will provide appropriate levels of landscaping, boundary and screening planting to ensure that they blend in with the existing environment. Supporting Document SD19 (“Landscape and visual assessment of Mendlesham” provides examples of the important features of the village that need to be maintained.	This amendment proposed for Policy MP5 offers further information on the requirements of new development and a consistent approach with other Plan policies. The amendments are not considered to result in a distinctly different change in approach to that of the previous Policy wording, or wider Plan, and no amendments to the appraisal of the Policy within the SEA Environmental Report are considered necessary.
Policy MP9 (Local green space)	Development on any of these smaller spaces will only be permitted in very special circumstances **.	Development on designated Local Green Space will only be permitted in exceptional circumstances **.	The amendment increases the number of designated Local Green Spaces within the Plan area. These are considered a reinforcement of Plan objectives, and will



Signposting	Previous MNDP content (August 2020)	Amendment proposed (December 2020)	Commentary and action / subsequent revision(s) needed to the Environmental Report (August 2020)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Playing fields at Mendlesham village - Childrens play area at Mendlesham village, - Church graveyards at St. Mary's, Mendlesham, - The Mendlesham Millennium Wood, - Allotments at Mendlesham Green**, - Baptist Chapel (ex) cemetery at Mendlesham Green, - Childrens play area at Mendlesham Green. <p>** Very special circumstances - It is proposed to use some of the Allotment land (directly adjacent to Cedars and currently used only for grazing) for a 10 dwelling social housing development led by the Mendlesham CLT.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Playing fields at Mendlesham village, - Childrens play area at Mendlesham village, - Church graveyards at St. Mary's, Mendlesham, - The Mendlesham Millennium Wood, - Allotments at Mendlesham Green**, - Baptist Chapel (ex) cemetery at Mendlesham Green , - Childrens play area at Mendlesham Green, - Green area at Mayfield Way, - Green area at Horsefair Close, - Green area at Glebe Way. <p>** Exceptional circumstances - It is proposed to use some of the Allotment land (directly adjacent to Cedars, Mendlesham Green and currently used only for grazing) for a 10 dwelling social housing development led by the Mendlesham CLT. The development would be dealt with as an exception site (See fig. 2.3).</p>	<p>not alter the findings of the assessment of the Policy as contained within the SEA Environmental Report.</p> <p>The new designation of the site 'Allotments at Mendlesham Green' as Local Green Space reflects the wider Plan position of this area of land being, in part, identified as an Exception Site, rather than a Plan allocation for affordable housing. The implications of part of the site being identified as an Exception Site rather than a housing allocation, will require the re-assessment of various elements of the SEA Environmental Report. These elements are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 4.3.3 Policy MP1(A): Housing (Allocations) - 5.3 Site Options identified within the MNDP area - 5.4 The Assessment of Site Options - 5.5 Alternative combinations of sites to meet housing need - 5.6 The Reasons for Selecting and Rejecting Alternative Options - 6.2 The MNDP's Policy Content and Coverage of Themes - 7.1.1 'Whole Plan' Effects



Signposting	Previous MNDP content (August 2020)	Amendment proposed (December 2020)	Commentary and action / subsequent revision(s) needed to the Environmental Report (August 2020)
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 7.1.2 Recommendations and Suggested Mitigation Measures



3. Re-Assessment of MNDP Content

3.1 Which Sections of the SEA Environmental Report need re-assessment?

This section outlines the re-assessment of various elements of the MNDP that have been amended since the finalisation of the SEA Environmental Report in August 2020. Sections of the SEA Environmental Report that require re-assessment are identified within the table above, and the following sub-sections of this Addendum contain these re-assessments.

The elements of the SEA Environmental Report that require re-assessment are identified as:

Section in SEA Environmental Report	In regard to...
Section 4.3.3.2 and 4.3.3.4 - Policy MP1(A): Housing (Allocations)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The removal of MNDP12 (Land to the East of the Mendlesham Road at Mendlesham Green – 10 affordable units) - The removal of MNDP10 (Land to the west of Old Station Road, formerly known as the G.R. Warehousing site – 56 dwellings) - An amended site criterion regarding access at MNDP2b (Land to the South of the Ropers Farm estate, South of Glebe Way – 75 dwellings)
Section 4.5.1 - Policy MP5: Historic Environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Amendments to policy criteria for Policy MP5: Historic Environment
Section 5.3 Site Options identified within the MNDP area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The removal of MNDP3c (Chapel Road – 20 dwellings) - The removal of MNDP12 (Land to the East of the Mendlesham Road at Mendlesham Green – 10 affordable units) - The removal of MNDP10 (Land to the west of Old Station Road, formerly known as the G.R. Warehousing site – 56 dwellings)
Section 5.4 The Assessment of Site Options	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The removal of MNDP3c (Chapel Road – 20 dwellings) - The removal of MNDP12 (Land to the East of the Mendlesham Road at Mendlesham Green – 10 affordable units)

Section in SEA Environmental Report	In regard to...
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The removal of MNDP10 (Land to the west of Old Station Road, formerly known as the G.R. Warehousing site – 56 dwellings)
Section 5.5 Alternative combinations of sites to meet housing need	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The removal of MNDP3c (Chapel Road – 20 dwellings) - The removal of MNDP12 (Land to the East of the Mendlesham Road at Mendlesham Green – 10 affordable units)
Section 5.6 The Reasons for Selecting and Rejecting Alternative Options	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The removal of MNDP3c (Chapel Road – 20 dwellings) - The removal of MNDP12 (Land to the East of the Mendlesham Road at Mendlesham Green – 10 affordable units) - The removal of MNDP10 (Land to the west of Old Station Road, formerly known as the G.R. Warehousing site – 56 dwellings)
Section 6.2 The MNDP's Policy Content and Coverage of Themes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The removal of MNDP12 (Land to the East of the Mendlesham Road at Mendlesham Green – 10 affordable units) - The removal of MNDP10 (Land to the west of Old Station Road, formerly known as the G.R. Warehousing site – 56 dwellings) - An amended site criterion regarding access at MNDP2b (Land to the South of the Ropers Farm estate, South of Glebe Way – 75 dwellings) - Amendments to policy criteria for Policy MP5: Historic Environment
Section 7.1.1 'Whole Plan' Effects	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The removal of MNDP12 (Land to the East of the Mendlesham Road at Mendlesham Green – 10 affordable units) - The removal of MNDP10 (Land to the west of Old Station Road, formerly known as the G.R. Warehousing site – 56 dwellings) - An amended site criterion regarding access at MNDP2b (Land to the South of the Ropers Farm estate, South of Glebe Way – 75 dwellings)

Section in SEA Environmental Report	In regard to...
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - An amended site criterion regarding access at MNDP2b (Land to the South of the Ropers Farm estate, South of Glebe Way – 75 dwellings)
Section 7.1.2 Recommendations and Suggested Mitigation Measures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The removal of MNDP12 (Land to the East of the Mendlesham Road at Mendlesham Green – 10 affordable units) - The removal of MNDP10 (Land to the west of Old Station Road, formerly known as the G.R. Warehousing site – 56 dwellings)

3.2 Policy MP1: Housing

Please note that the SEA Environmental Report separates the site allocation elements of the MNDP's Policy MP1 from other thematic elements, to ensure a focussed appraisal of each site's site criteria that is detached from the more strategic content of the Policy. This approach is considered to remain valid within the SEA Environmental Report, although it is acknowledged that the previous policies MP1 and MP1(A) have been merged within the amended Plan. The following assessment of Sections 4.3.3.2 and 4.3.3.4 replace the corresponding sections within the SEA Environmental Report (August 2020).

3.2.1 Reassessment of 4.3.3.2 Significant, Secondary and Temporal Effects

Land to the North West of Mason Court, known as Old Engine Meadow & Land to the West of Mason Court and adjacent to Horsefair Close (site reference in this SEA: MNDP11)																	
Temporal Effects	SEA Objectives																
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	
Short Term	0	+	0	0	0	?	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Medium Term	0	+	0	0	0	?	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Long Term	0	+	0	0	0	?	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Commentary	<p>This site has planning permission, yet site specific criteria exist within the Policy to reflect its 'outline' status. To this effect, the MNDP may have some material weight and may influence any reserved matters application that may be forthcoming, although the principle and quantum of development has already been established through the outline application.</p> <p>The key issues to overcome identified within the assessment of the site in Appendix 2 are summarised as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Parts of the site would be distanced from a convenience shop, the school, and a bus stop. 																



- Loss of hedgerows.
- The site is within an area with high visual sensitivity.
- A large proportion of the site is within Flood Risk Zones 3 and 2.
- Associated with fluvial flood risk concerns, the potential for negative effects on water quality.

The Policy will have positive outcomes related to housing. The Policy can be seen to successfully ensure that no scheme would be permitted that did not attempt to mitigate as far as is possible the landscape impact of the site, associated with a key entrance gateway to the village. To this extent there would be no negative impact that can be expected from any subsequent development and neutral to positive impacts are highlighted. Regarding access to services, the assessment of the site explored viable routes through the village that were accessible by walking and cycling and found that north-western parts of the site would not be suitably accessible for all. The Policy responds to this by ensuring that a pathway and cycle track via Ducksen Road would be supported which would ensure that these services would be more accessible and being diverted via Chapel Road; however there are question marks as to the preferred access point to the site, ensuring a general uncertainty surrounding SEA Objective 6. Despite this, the site has planning permission indicating that access issues are not perceived as insurmountable.

In an early iteration of this SEA Report, which was shared with the MNDP Group, uncertain impacts were highlighted regarding SEA Objective 15, in response to the absence of any policy criterion that seeks to ensure that there would be no risk from fluvial, surface or groundwater water flooding. Uncertain impacts were also highlighted regarding the absence of any associated water quality assessment needed. Recommendations were made in that early iteration of the SEA due to a large proportion of the site being within Flood Risk Zones 3 and 2 associated with a tributary of the River Dove to the north, and these have been taken onboard and factored into the Policy, with the inclusion of a criterion that 'the recommendations of the SFRA Part 2 should be factored into any forthcoming reserved matters application.' The site has been granted outline planning permission, which indicates that negative effects can be ruled out regarding flood risk and water quality, in accordance with the principle and quantum of development adhering to District level planning policies. This SEA considers that there would be 'no impact' on SEA Objectives 15 and 16 as a result.

Land to the South of the Ropers Farm estate, South of Glebe Way (site reference in this SEA: MNDP2b)																
Temporal Effects	SEA Objectives															
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Short Term	0	++	+	?	0	?	0	?	0	0	0	?	0	0	?/0	0
Medium Term	0	++	+	?	0	?	0	?	0	0	0	?	0	0	?/0	0
Long Term	0	++	+	?	0	?	0	?	0	0	0	?	0	0	?/0	0
Commentary	<p>The key issues to overcome identified within the assessment of the site in Appendix 2 are summarised as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Southern parts of the site would be distanced from the GP Surgery, a convenience shop, and a bus stop. - Access to the site does not currently exist. 															



- A Public Right of Way borders the site to the north.
- The site is in close proximity to the Grade II* Elms Farmhouse to the west and its setting.
- A large proportion of the site (over 20%) is within Flood Risk Zones 3 and 2.
- Associated with fluvial flood risk concerns, the potential for negative effects on water quality

The Policy will have significant positive outcomes related to housing delivery, and affordable housing, due to the level of growth proposed. Positive design effects can be confidently highlighted in accordance with the Policy's requirement that the affordable housing on site will be mixed within the development and not in one block. The Policy can be seen to aspire to ensure that no scheme would be permitted that did not attempt to mitigate impacts on the Grade II* Listed Elms Farmhouse adjacent to the site. A previous iteration of the SEA Report recommended that the Policy include the requirement for a Heritage Impact Assessment to accompany any planning application, and this recommendation has been included, leading to generally uncertain effects at this stage, with the possibility of negative implications reduced.

Regarding the PRoW, the Policy seeks to ensure a wide buffer zone to protect the rural amenity of the residents of Glebe Way, which will ensure that the PRoW is also retained with no diversion. This ensures no effect is highlighted in this assessment.

The Policy states that 'the whole site... is the only one possessing the unique ability to protect the historic heart of Mendlesham Village by diverting a significant amount of existing and future local traffic away from the Conservation Area. Most of the support of this site is because of its dual access to Old Station Road and Church Road which provide an opportunity for local traffic to avoid the village conservation area. All new dwellings on this site must have direct access to both Old Station Road and Church Road.' Investigation into access to the site can be found within the AECOM site assessment report; this document considers access from Glebe Way, but that this only has the potential to support a smaller quantum of houses. AECOM's assessment also highlights the potential of using Oak Farm Lane for access as the land adjacent to the site is under the same ownership. This may require the access road to cross the water course that runs parallel to the eastern boundary of the site, or alternatively require a different access point onto Glebe Way that is not part of the existing planning permission for this part of the site. Feasibly, access / egress would have to be from two points in order to meet the requirements of the above quoted policy criterion (likely from Old Station Road and also Church Road / Glebe Way) and thus uncertain effects are highlighted for SEA Objectives 4 and 8, regarding infrastructure and minimising traffic through the Conservation Area at this stage as a result.

A previous iteration of the SEA Report highlighted the possibility of negative impacts regarding SEA Objective 15 (flood risk). This was due to a large proportion of the site (over 20%) being within Flood Risk Zones 3 and 2 associated with a tributary of the River Dove to the north. At that stage it was recommended that the Policy could include a criterion to ensure that the recommendations for the site as included within the SFRA Part 2 are taken onboard. This has been factored into the Policy at this stage and there can be expected to be uncertain to neutral implications as a result.

3.2.2 Reassessment of 4.3.3.4 Proposed Mitigation Measures / Recommendations

In some cases and for some of the allocated sites, an early iteration of the SEA Report that was shared with the MNDP Group highlighted areas where the Policy could be improved to ensure that mitigation of some

environmental effects could be ensured through any forthcoming planning applications. Prior to that, the SEA Report suggested that further evidence be commissioned and undertaken to aid site selection, notably a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (Part 2) and a site level assessment that explored possible heritage effects. Relevant to the Policy itself, and its criteria based approach regarding site allocations, recommendations made throughout the process included:

Land to the North West of Mason Court, known as Old Engine Meadow & Land to the West of Mason Court and adjacent to Horsefair Close

- Due to there being a large proportion of the site (over 20%) within Flood Risk Zones 3 and 2 associated with a tributary of the River Dove to the north, a SFRA Part 2 was undertaken to assist in the selection of sites, and a previous iteration of the SEA recommended that the Policy include the SFRA's recommendations for the site. This has been factored into the Policy, and as such no recommendations are made at this stage.

Land to the South of the Ropers Farm estate, South of Glebe Way

- A previous iteration of the SEA Report shared with the MNDP Group recommended that the Plan ensure that the risks to the heritage asset from the principle of development on the site are understood and evidenced and that any forthcoming planning application is accompanied by a Heritage Impact Assessment. This has been factored into the Policy at this stage.
- The previous iteration of the SEA Report also recommended that the Policy could include such criteria to ensure that the recommendations for the site as included within the SFRA Part 2 are taken onboard, in response to a large proportion of the site (over 20%) being within Flood Risk Zones 3 and 2 associated with a tributary of the River Dove to the north. This recommendation has also been factored into the Policy at this stage.

3.3 Policy MP5: Historic Environment

The following assessment of Section 4.5.1.2 replaces the corresponding section within the SEA Environmental Report (August 2020).

3.3.1 Reassessment of 4.5.1.2 Significant, Secondary and Temporal Effects

Temporal Effects	SEA Objectives															
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Short Term	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	+	++	0	0	0	0
Medium Term	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	+	++	0	0	0	0
Long Term	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	+	++	0	0	0	0
Commentary	The Policy will have significant positive impacts on protecting and enhancing the historic environment (SEA Objective 12), as well as minor effects on SEA Objective 8. This is through the Policy seeking to ensure that increased traffic levels are fully understood through the															



submission of a Transport Assessment giving expected traffic volumes emanating from the proposed development, as well as necessary mitigation measures. This allows decision making to be fully informed of traffic levels and may ensure that developments increasing traffic movements and flows through the Conservation Area are minimised (SEA Objective 8). The Policy is considered to be in line with national requirements, as well as district-level Policy and adds further information regarding local characteristics relevant to the Plan area. Minor indirect effects are also likely to be forthcoming regarding SEA Objectives related to design and landscape where such factors are intrinsically linked to the historic environment and as a result of any successful development scheme; both through the principle of development in the first instance or mitigation as required by the Policy.

3.4 Site Options identified within the MNDP area

The following assessment of Section 5.3 replaces the corresponding section within the SEA Environmental Report (August 2020).

3.4.1 Amendments to Section 5.3 Site Options identified within the MNDP area

The sites in the following table have been identified as 'reasonable' options / alternatives for exploration and potential allocation within the MNDP.

Table 18: Sites identified for assessment within this SEA

Site Ref in SHELAA (SS) / Reference in NP	Address	Potential / submitted site yield (as per SHELAA, or as per assumption included)	SEA Reference
Proposed for Housing			
SS0063	Land north of Mill Road and south of Chapel Road, Mendlesham	Residential development - proposed phased approach Phase 1 approx. 3.5ha 85-90 residential units, Phase 2 approx. 2ha 50-55 residential units. Estimated dwelling yield 70.	MNDP1
SS0065 / Site 4 (identified by MNDP Group)	Land south of Glebe Way, Mendlesham / Land to the south of Ropers Farm estate, South of Glebe Way	Site representing the outline planning permission - application DC/18/03147: 2.254ha - erection of up to 28 dwellings (including 9 affordable homes).	MNDP2a (28 dwellings) MNDP2b (75 dwellings)

Site Ref in SHELAA (SS) / Reference in NP	Address	Potential / submitted site yield (as per SHELAA, or as per assumption included)	SEA Reference
		Site allocated for residential development in the Neighbourhood Development Plan: approx. 5.3ha with an estimated 3-4ha available – estimated dwelling yield up to 75.	
SS0083	Land to the north east of Chapel Road, Mendlesham	Residential development. 4.6ha – estimated dwelling yield 50 (as submitted in the MSDC Local Plan call-for-sites process) Site allocated for residential development in MSDC Local Plan: 2.3ha – estimated dwelling yield 50 (reflecting a smaller portion of the site as submitted but with the same dwelling yield as above).	MNDP3a (50 dwellings) MNDP3b (50 dwellings)
SS1015	Land between Mill Road and Old Station Road, Mendlesham	Residential development. 6.44ha - no proposed dwelling yield was submitted through the call-for-sites process. An assumption has therefore been made regarding the yield for the purposes of this SEA on the basis of 25 dwellings per ha. The proposal has therefore been assessed at up to 160 dwellings.	MNDP4
SS0555	Land east of Old Station Road	Residential development. 0.57ha - estimated dwelling yield 5.	MNDP5
SS0579	Land to the east of Oak Farm Lane, Mendlesham	Residential development. 0.51ha - no proposed dwelling yield was submitted through the call-for-sites process. An assumption has therefore been made regarding the yield for the purposes of this SEA on the basis of 25 dwellings per ha. The proposal has therefore been assessed at up to 15 dwellings.	MNDP6
SS0035	Land north of Brockford Road	Residential development. 1.8 ha - no proposed dwelling yield was submitted through the call-for-sites process. An assumption has therefore been made regarding the yield for the purposes of this SEA on the basis of 25 dwellings per ha. The proposal has therefore been assessed at up to 45 dwellings.	MNDP7
SS0784	Land north of Brockford Road, Mendlesham	Residential development. 15.83ha - no proposed dwelling yield was submitted through the call-for-sites process. An assumption has therefore been made regarding the yield for the purposes of this SEA on the basis of 25 dwellings per ha. The proposal has therefore been assessed at up to 395 dwellings.	MNDP8
SS1063	Land west of A140, Mendlesham	A new settlement of approx. 1,750 dwellings (based on 35dph).	MNDP9

Site Ref in SHELAA (SS) / Reference in NP	Address	Potential / submitted site yield (as per SHELAA, or as per assumption included)	SEA Reference
Site 2 (identified by MNDP Group)	Land to the north west of Mason Court known as Old Engine meadow, combined with the site known as Land to the West of Mason Court and adjacent to Horsefair Close.	Site proposed for 28 dwellings (10 affordable) as per outline planning permission. 1.5ha.	MNDP11

Of these above sites, the following are preferred within the Plan and allocated:

- MNDP11: Land to the north west of Mason Court known as Old Engine meadow, combined with the site known as Land to the West of Mason Court and adjacent to Horsefair Close.
- MNDP2b: Land to the south of Ropers Farm estate, South of Glebe Way

3.5 The Assessment of Site Options

The following assessment of Section 5.4 replaces the corresponding section within the SEA Environmental Report (August 2020).

3.5.1 Reassessment of Section 5.4 The Assessment of Site Options

Table 19: Comparative site assessment

SEA Obj.		Site Reference (*indicates allocated site in MNDP)											
		MNDP1	MNDP2a	MNDP2b*	MNDP3a	MNDP3b	MNDP4	MNDP5	MNDP6	MNDP7	MNDP8	MNDP9	MNDP11
1.	1.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	1.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2.	2.1	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?
	2.2	++	++	++	++	++	++	+	++	++	++	++	++

SEA Obj.		Site Reference (*indicates allocated site in MNDP)												
		MNDP1	MNDP2a	MNDP2b*	MNDP3a	MNDP3b	MNDP4	MNDP5	MNDP6	MNDP7	MNDP8	MNDP9	MNDP11	
12.	12.1	?	?/-	-	0	0	-	-	-	--	--	-	0	
13.	13.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	0
	13.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?/+	+	0
	13.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?/+	+	0
14.	14.1	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	-	0	
15.	15.1	0	0/?	-	--	0	0	0	?/-	?	0	0	-	
	15.2	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?	0	
	15.3	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	
16.	16.1	-	-	-	-	0	0	0	-	-	0	-	-	

3.5.2 Amendments to Section 5.4.1 Comparison of Effects for Selected Allocated and Alternative Options

Table 20: Significant effects highlighted within the site assessments

Site	Significant Effects highlighted in this report
ALLOCATED SITES	
MNDP2b	No significant effects highlighted
MNDP11	No significant effects highlighted

Site	Significant Effects highlighted in this report
ALTERNATIVE SITES	
MNDP1	Landscape impacts
MNDP2a	No significant effects highlighted
MNDP3a	Fluvial flood risk
MNDP3b	No significant effects highlighted
MNDP4	Landscape impacts
MNDP5	No significant effects highlighted
MNDP6	Impact related to settlement pattern
MNDP7	Landscape impacts & Impacts on the Historic Environment
MNDP8	Landscape impacts & Impacts on the Historic Environment
MNDP9	No significant effects highlighted

Excluding the above sites with effects assessed as significantly negative, there remain a number of alternative sites that perform relatively well against the sustainability objectives on the whole, and also in comparison to the allocated sites. Some discussion needs to be made regarding comparisons between the two allocated sites, and those remaining alternatives that do not have planning permission. These sites correspond to allocation MNDP2b, and alternatives MNDP3b, MNDP5 and MNDP9 (alternative MNDP2a has outline planning permission).

The following table acts as a guide to identify the further assessed effects of these remaining sites, in order to stimulate discussion of their sustainability merits and demerits against each other. Please note that the table acts as a guide only, and the separately identified effects cannot be quantified to reach an overall 'sustainability score.'

Table 21: Effects for comparison of the remaining sites

Site	Number of instances of different ranging effects						
	Significantly positive	Positive	No impact	Uncertain	Uncertain (positive leaning)	Uncertain (negative leaning)	Negative
MNDP2b (Allocated)	1	1	11	4	0	3	6

Site	Number of instances of different ranging effects						
	Significantly positive	Positive	No impact	Uncertain	Uncertain (positive leaning)	Uncertain (negative leaning)	Negative
MNDP3b (Alternative)	1	4	13	6	0	1	1
MNDP5 (Alternative)	0	4	16	4	0	0	2
MNDP9 (Alternative)	1	3	5	7	0	1	9

The comparison of the effects of the allocated and alternative sites in the above table indicates that allocated site MNDP2b will have comparatively more negative effects than all of the alternatives with the exception of MNDP9. The submission of site option MNDP9 is a proposal for a new standalone village that has been rejected by both the MNDP Group and MSDC as not needed within either the MNDP or the emerging Joint Local Plan. MNDP9 has been assessed as having a large number of uncertain effects within this SEA Report, that predominantly arise from a lack of information and the need to rely on assumptions in its appraisal, such as the level of infrastructure that a new settlement would require to be sustainable. In short, it is difficult to assess such a proposal against the other site options using the site assessment framework. The site can be dismissed from further comparison discussion due to the scale of the proposal being far greater than the housing quantum figure supplied to the MNDP Group by MSDC as required and proportionate. Similarly, the proposal can be considered removed from the scope and remit of the MNDP in ensuring community benefits through planning within the village of Mendlesham and Mendlesham Green.

Any direct comparison of site MNDP2b and MNDP5 is difficult, due to the significant differences in land area and dwelling quanta proposed, at up to 75 dwellings and five dwellings respectively. The small scale of site MNDP5 is also reflected in the assessment of effects, with a high number of instances of 'no effect' against the sustainability criteria. It could be considered that at five dwellings, there is no need to allocate the site as it would not contribute significantly to meeting housing needs within the Plan period.

Comparisons can be made regarding allocated site MNDP2b and MNDP3b at up to 75 dwellings and 50 dwellings respectively; both would make a significant contribution to meeting housing needs in the Plan area and over the Plan period. Alternative MNDP3b is considered to represent the main alternative to the emerging MNDP's allocation of site MNDP2b for assessment within this SEA. Site option MNDP3b, for 50 dwellings, is at the time of writing an allocated site within the emerging MSDC Joint Local Plan whereas the full extent of site MNDP2b is not. The assessment of the sites within Appendix 2 of this Report indicate that site MNDP3b has more positive effects and fewer negative effects than the allocated site MNDP2b. Many of these differences in effects respond to the smaller scale of the site at 2.3ha compared to the 5.3ha of site MNDP3b.

3.6 Alternative combinations of sites to meet housing need

The following assessment of Section 5.5 replaces the corresponding section within the SEA Environmental Report (August 2020).



3.6.1 Reassessment of Section 5.5 Alternative combinations of sites to meet housing need

Alternatives pertaining to individual site allocations have been explored throughout the Plan-making process and subject to comparative assessment through the Site Assessment Report (AECOM, 2019) and early iterations of this SEA Report.

It is important to explore whether the combination of sites allocated within the MNDP represent the most appropriate 'strategy'; that is, whether the sites allocated perform better against the sustainability criteria devised within this Report, against other combinations of sites. Alternative combinations will need to meet the 161 units identified as required in the MNDP area as included within Table 04 of the emerging Local Plan, however of the site allocations within the Plan (see Policy MP1(A)), all but two (in their entirety) have planning permission (full or outline).

The MNDP allocates the land that comprises one of these sites, Land South of Glebe Way, as part of a wider scheme that has a proposed dwelling yield of up to 75 dwellings. The Strategic Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA) that forms part of the evidence base for the emerging Joint Local Plan, does not appear to have considered the full extent of the site as allocated within the MNDP, instead only looking at that portion of the site that is allocated within the Joint Local Plan. The SHELAA summarises that *'access has potential to be from Glebe Way, this would be for a limited increase of development therefore partial development recommended of 1ha.'* The SHELAA adds that this smaller (1.1ha) portion of the site would be *'potentially suitable, but the following considerations would require further investigation: Highways – regarding access, footpaths and infrastructure required; Flood risk - eastern part of site within Flood Zone 3; Biodiversity - impact upon protected species and habitats required; and Heritage - Impact upon heritage assets required.'* Furthermore, outline planning application has been granted for part of this site that comprises an area of land that neither correlates to the MSDC Joint Local Plan allocation or the full extent of the MNDP allocation.

Regarding site MNDP3b within the emerging Joint Local Plan (allocation LA074 – Land north-east of Chapel Road, Mendlesham), the SHELAA identifies that the site is 'potentially suitable, but the following considerations would require further investigation: Highways – regarding access, footpaths and infrastructure required; Townscape - part development (west) recommended to avoid a disjointed development; and Flood Zone - part of the site is within Flood Zone 3.' A smaller area of land at 2.3ha within the larger site option, responding to land within the south adjoining the village envelope, reflects that which is allocated in the emerging Joint Local Plan, however the originally submitted dwelling yield of 50 dwellings remains in the MSDC Joint Local Plan allocation.

The allocation of 'Land to the South of the Ropers Farm estate, South of Glebe Way' (up to 75 dwellings) is the only site allocated within the MNDP that does not have planning consent, although the northern part of this site has been granted outline planning permission for 28 dwellings. The portion of the MNDP allocation without planning permission therefore represents 47 dwellings for the purposes of identifying alternative combinations / scenarios.

The MNDP seeks to deliver a total of up to 161 dwellings through the allocations included within Policy MP1 (excluding a windfall allowance of 36 dwellings in the plan period). Therefore, removing existing permissions within the MNDP area, alternative combination options have been identified as needing to meet, as a minimum, a total of 47 dwellings. This is the dwelling range to which the MNDP needs to allocate land to deliver, and to which 'reasonable' alternative scenarios need to meet.

In regard to the aims of the MNDP in ensuring steady proportionate growth, any permutations regarding options MNDP4 (160 dwellings), MNDP8 (395 dwellings) and MNDP9 (1,750 dwellings) have been discounted, as they represent growth at levels significantly higher than the 47 dwellings being sought through these site combinations. Similarly, any combinations that would also deliver a significantly higher quantum than 47 dwellings have also been discounted on the basis of proportionality.

Excluding existing permissions, there are six sites explored within this SEA that represent preferred sites or reasonable alternatives. These sites (and their dwelling yields) are:

- MNDP1 – 70 dwellings
- MNDP2b – 47 dwellings
- MNDP3b – 50 dwellings
- MNDP5 – 5 dwellings
- MNDP6 – 15 dwellings
- MNDP7 – 45 dwellings

The alternative permutations for exploration within this SEA are included in the table below. Please note that for all alternative permutations, the windfall allowance of 30 dwellings over the period of the MNDP (to 2036) is considered a 'constant' factor.

Table 23: 'Reasonable' alternative combinations of sites

Alternative	Site 1 (dwellings)	Site 2 (dwellings)	Site 3 (dwellings)	Site 4 (dwellings)	Total quantum
Alternative 1	MNDP1 (70)	N/A	N/A	N/A	70
Plan Approach	MNDP2b (47)	N/A	N/A	N/A	47
Alternative 3	MNDP3b (50)	N/A	N/A	N/A	50
Alternative 5	MNDP5 (5)	MNDP7 (45)	N/A	N/A	50
Alternative 7	MNDP3b (50)	MNDP6 (15)	N/A	N/A	65
Alternative 8	MNDP3b (50)	MNDP5 (5)	N/A	N/A	55
Alternative 9	MNDP2b (47)	MNDP5 (5)	N/A	N/A	52
Alternative 10	MNDP2b (47)	MNDP6 (15)	N/A	N/A	62
Alternative 11	MNDP7 (45)	MNDP6 (15)	N/A	N/A	60
Alternative 13	MNDP3b (50)	MNDP5 (5)	MNDP6 (15)	N/A	70



3.6.2 Reassessment of Section 5.5.1 Assessment of preferred and alternative site combinations

The assessment of the preferred and reasonable alternative site combinations explores the cumulative effects of notionally allocating the sites contained within each combination, including the preferred MNDP approach. This assessment looks at the site effects highlighted within the assessment of the individual sites (see Section 5.4 and Appendix 2), using the site assessment framework and amalgamates those effects cumulatively, using a principle of precaution. Commentary is given comparing each combination against each broad sustainability objective.

Table 24: Alternative site combination assessment

SEA Obj.		ALT 1	Preferred	ALT 3	ALT 5	ALT 7	ALT 8	ALT 9	ALT 10	ALT 11	ALT 13
1	1.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	1.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
All of the site combinations, should their individual sites be developed, would not lead to any increase or loss of any business or retail premises.											
2	2.1	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?
	2.2	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++
All of the site combinations assessed have been assessed as having similar effects on SEA Objective 2 related to meeting housing needs. All of the site combinations have been identified based on their ability to meeting housing needs in terms of quantum and can also be expected to ensure the delivery of affordable units in line with District level policy. In view of the fact that the individual site options have been assessed without any consideration of proposed schemes or details however, it would not be appropriate to further differentiate between them.											
3	3.1	-	-	?	-	--	?	-	--	--	--
SEA Objective 3, exploring the relationship between the red line boundaries of sites and the existing settlement boundaries / pattern, allows the comparison of sites. It also allows a degree of assessment regarding site combinations, albeit subjectively, where cumulative effects may occur, for instance where more than one greenfield site is located in close proximity to each other. In all relevant instances, those combinations that include sites that have individually been											

SEA Obj.	ALT 1	Preferred	ALT 3	ALT 5	ALT 7	ALT 8	ALT 9	ALT 10	ALT 11	ALT 13	
<p>assessed as having significant negative landscape effects have been assessed as having significant negative effects. Due to the unsuitability of these sites, these are omitted from further discussion against this SEA Objective.</p> <p>The preferred MNDP approach, as well as Alternatives 1, 5, and 9 have all been assessed as having negative effects associated having at least one individual site that has a negative impact. No combination exists that includes two sites each with a negative effect, largely due to the quantum of development required of new sites being small. For this reason, there is no differentiation between those combinations identified as negative above. The 'best' performing sites are identified as Alternatives 3, and 8, which include the common inclusion of site MNDP3b making up the majority of the residential quantum. Site MNDP3b is located to the north of the village of Mendlesham and responds well to the existing settlement pattern in terms of size. In order to meet the housing needs of the MNDP, it can be considered that the site option of MNDP3b would have a more positive overall cumulative effect on landscape around the village. Some uncertainty surrounds the 50 dwelling yield submitted however on a relatively small site and whether the housing density will be in keeping with the characteristics of the existing village.</p>											
4	This Objective is considered a policy consideration / no quantitative information available.										
5	This Objective is considered a policy consideration / no quantitative information available.										
6	6.1	?/-	-	+	-	+/-	+/-	-	-	-	+/-
	6.2	?/-	-	+	+	?	+	+/-	-	?	?/+
	6.3	?/-	+	+	+	+/?	+	+	+	+	+
	6.4	+	?/-	?	?	?	?	?/-	?/-	?	?



SEA Obj.	ALT 1	Preferred	ALT 3	ALT 5	ALT 7	ALT 8	ALT 9	ALT 10	ALT 11	ALT 13
----------	-------	-----------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	--------	--------	--------

The assessment of combinations against SEA Objective 6, regarding accessibility to services and access to the road network, shows a range of negative and uncertainty effects. These are predominantly related to two main considerations: the small and rural nature of the village meaning only single occurrences of services are present (only one primary school, one GP surgery etc), and also the need to develop greenfield land on the periphery of the village to meet housing needs. This last consideration leads to inevitable issues surrounding services being accessible by walking distances, although it should be noted that none of the individual sites included within this assessment are so remotely located that issues become 'significant.' In terms of exploring cumulative effects, and meaningful comparison of options, there is no worsening of impacts through development under any of the combinations, as effects would only be experienced at the individual site level. At the individual scales proposed, it is unlikely that any new services would be incorporated on any of the sites, in terms of meeting dwelling thresholds for statutory service provision.

7	7.1	?	?	+	+	+	+	?	?	+	+
	7.2	?	?	?	0	?	?	?	?	0	?

This SEA Objective explores the sites' distances to a bus stop, as well as exploring whether the sites would require the diversion or removal of any Public Right(s) of Way (PRoWs). Similar to SEA Objective 6 (above), meaningful cumulative effects cannot be made due to any effects being experienced on-site. Many of the sites are in close proximity to bus services either in walking distance or just outside this distance, which for purposes of this assessment is 400m. To some extent, these distances negate the distances to services assessed in SEA Objective 6, however frequency has not been a factor in this assessment due to the changing nature of bus timetabling.

8	8.1	?	?	?/-	?/-	?/-	?/-	?	?/-	?/-	?/-
---	-----	---	---	-----	-----	-----	-----	---	-----	-----	-----

The sites' effects regarding SEA Objective 8, which explores whether site location could lead to an increase in traffic journeys through the core of the Conservation Area, can lead to some cumulative observations. Effects are all highlighted as uncertain at this stage however due to the objective nature of such judgements without any reliable data; there remains an element of choice as to which routes will be taken to access higher order roads (and settlements) to the



SEA Obj.	ALT 1	Preferred	ALT 3	ALT 5	ALT 7	ALT 8	ALT 9	ALT 10	ALT 11	ALT 13	
<p>north and south. Nevertheless, assumptions can be made that development in certain locations will either have to travel through the Conservation Area for north-south journeys or would be more likely as the most convenient route. Development in the north and east of the settlement can be expected to increase such journeys, and for that reason a degree of negative effect has been assumed. The preferred approach of allocating MNDP2b includes an aspiration of a solution being sought to alleviate existing and future trips through the Conservation Area. Likely this would require access to be from both the east and west of the site. This would not only ensure that north-south journeys would avoid the core of the Conservation Area but would serve to alleviate existing issues. Uncertainty however surrounds whether such provision would be achievable and viable.</p>											
9	9.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<p>Regarding site proximity to potentially incompatible uses, no cumulative effects can be highlighted as effects are relevant to individual sites only. Any unidentified effects that may be forthcoming can be considered minimal as mitigation should be possible through adhering to MNDP policy and that at the District level.</p>											
10	10.1	?	?/-	?	?	?/-	?	?/-	?/-	?/-	?/-
<p>All of the combinations have been assessed as having varying degrees of uncertainty (some potentially negative leaning) regarding this SEA Objective, which considers soils. In terms of the loss of agricultural land, all of the site options will have a broadly similar effect, with those that have a lower accumulated loss in hectares performing better than those without. Regarding quality, those sites that include Grade 2 quality agricultural land (defined as 'good') have been assessed as having a higher possibility of negative effect. No positive effects are highlighted as all combinations lead to the inevitable loss of greenfield / agricultural land.</p>											
11	11.1	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	11.2	--	0	-	--	-	-	0	0	--	-

SEA Obj.	ALT 1	Preferred	ALT 3	ALT 5	ALT 7	ALT 8	ALT 9	ALT 10	ALT 11	ALT 13	
13.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
13.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
This SEA Objective explores the effects of the sites in regard to any subsequent loss of publically accessible open space, leisure, recreational or community facilities. No sites proposed would lead to any such loss, leading to 'no effects.'											
14	14.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
This SEA Objective explores the effects of the sites in regard to any subsequent loss of designated ecological or biodiversity features. No sites proposed would lead to any such loss, leading to 'no effects.' Ecological assessments may be needed to accompany any of the sites regarding the presence of protected species on site, however this is considered a development management matter, and not 'strategic' for the purposes of assessment in this Report. More holistically, the HRA Screening Report undertaken for the MNDP highlights that there would be no likely effect on the integrity of any Habitats Sites as a result of the Plan's content. This is due to the location of the Plan area in being outside of the 'Zones of Influence' within which any effects could occur.											
15	15.1	?	-	0	?	?	0	-	-	-	?
	15.2	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	15.3	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?
Regarding flood risk (SEA Objective 15), the sites have been assessed on the basis that if an individual site has been assessed as having a potential issue regarding fluvial flood risk on site, then that issue would be the same for any combination that that site is included within. Effects are not identified as significant within any individual site assessment, due to the level of information available for a comparable assessment of sites, and the possibility that the presence of land											



SEA Obj.	ALT 1	Preferred	ALT 3	ALT 5	ALT 7	ALT 8	ALT 9	ALT 10	ALT 11	ALT 13	
<p>in flood risk zones 2 and 3 is no barrier to development. In all instances, sites are likely to overcome flood risk issues in so far as other areas of the site can be the focus for development in line with the recommendations of the SFRA Part 2. To this extent, comparisons are hard to make between the sites and the combinations. Uncertainty is prevalent for all sites due them being located within Source Protection Zone III (Total Catchment) regarding groundwater. These zones show the risk of contamination from any activities that might cause pollution in the area and the closer the activity, the greater the risk. The possibility of contamination is raised in caution within this SEA Report, however it is unlikely that any residential development proposals would lead to contaminants.</p>											
16	16.1	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-	-	-
<p>In most instances, the sites are located near to water sources, and there could be a negative effect on water quality of these, and the River Dove, as a result. Negative effects are raised cautiously in this regard, subject to consultation on this SEA Report and the MNDP with the statutory consultees of the Environment Agency and Natural England.</p>											



3.7 The Reasons for Selecting and Rejecting Alternative Options

The following assessment of Section 5.6 replaces the corresponding section within the SEA Environmental Report (August 2020).

3.7.1 Reassessment of Section 5.6.1 Individual Sites – Preferred and Alternatives

The following table outlines the Parish Council's reasons for selecting and rejecting each of the sites assessed above.

Table 25: Reasons for the Selection / Rejection of Site Options

Site Ref.	Reasons for Selection / Rejection
Preferred Site Proposals within the MNDP	
MNDP11	The site 'Land North West of Mason Court and adjacent to Horsefair Close (Old Engine Meadow)' is allocated as outline planning permission has been granted.
MNDP2b (including MNDP2a)	The site 'Land South of Glebe Way' is allocated for up to 75 dwellings, 46 of which do not have planning permission. A total of 28 dwellings have planning permission which can be viewed as the first of a two phase development. The whole site could take advantage of the opportunity to enable local traffic to avoid the Conservation Area as a site to the south that adjoins possible access points to the east and west. Landscape value is also comparatively low in this part of the village.
Rejected Site Proposals	
MNDP1	The site 'Land North of Mill Road and South of Chapel Road Mendlesham' has been rejected as both Mill Road and Chapel Road are more minor access routes in and out of Mendlesham Village; a significant amount of traffic to and from this site would be directed through the Conservation Area. The site would have an effect on important views particularly those on the Western approaches along Chapel Road. The Western side of the village is already under development (Old Engine Meadow) and there are concerns that further development may compromise existing flooding and foul water drainage issues. Similarly are there concerns that a safe pedestrian footpath could be created along Mill Road to village facilities.
MNDP3a	The site 'Land to the North East of Chapel Road, Mendlesham' for 50 dwellings has been rejected due to the negative impact on character of immediate rural area and adjacent listed building as included within the MNDP's supporting evidence. The full extent of this site would extend built development into the open countryside and significant flood risk



Site Ref.	Reasons for Selection / Rejection
	<p>concerns exist in the north of the site. There could also be an increased level of traffic through the Conservation Area to access higher order roads to the south.</p>
MNDP3b	<p>The site 'Land to the North East of Chapel Road, Mendlesham' for 50 dwellings (although on a smaller area of land than MNDP3a) has been rejected due to the negative impact on character of immediate rural area and adjacent listed building as included within the MNDP's supporting evidence. The full extent of this site would extend built development into the open countryside and significant flood risk concerns exist in the north of the site. There could also be an increased level of traffic through the Conservation Area to access higher order roads to the south.</p>
MNDP4	<p>The site 'Land between Mill Road and Old Station Road, Mendlesham' was rejected due to performing poorly against alternative options within the AECOM Site Assessment Report (Support Document SD24, page 28).</p>
MNDP5	<p>The site 'Land East of Old Station Road' is considered too small an option to warrant allocation within the MNDP. It is considered that the site may be suitable, should development of MNDP2b (as allocated) be forthcoming.</p>
MNDP6	<p>The site 'Land to the East of Oak Farm Lane, Mendlesham' was rejected due to performing poorly against alternative options within the AECOM Site Assessment Report (Support Document SD24, page 29).</p>
MNDP7	<p>The site 'Land North of Brockford Road, Mendlesham (1.8 ha)' was rejected due to performing poorly against alternative options within the AECOM Site Assessment Report (Support Document SD24, page 29).</p>
MNDP8	<p>The site 'Land North of Brockford Road, Mendlesham (15.83 ha)' was rejected due to performing poorly against alternative options within the AECOM Site Assessment Report (Support Document SD24, page 29).</p>
MNDP9	<p>The site 'Land West of A140, Mendlesham' was rejected due to performing poorly against alternative options within the AECOM Site Assessment Report (Support Document SD24, page 30).</p>



3.7.2 Reassessment of Section 5.6.2 Site Combinations – Preferred and Alternatives

Table 25(2): Reasons for the Selection / Rejection of Site Options

Ref.	Reasons for Selection / Rejection
Preferred Scenario within the MNDP	
MNDP2b	MNDP2b presents the unique opportunity to reduce the amount of traffic using the Conservation Area as this site abuts the two main roads into and out of Mendlesham Village. Additionally there will be a minimal effect on key views entering and leaving the Village. Furthermore, the site MNDP2b has overwhelming support from residents as evidenced in consultation material of October 2017.
Rejected Scenarios	
Alternative 1	The alternative permutation contains a site that is not individually a preferred / allocated site within the MNDP.
Alternative 3	The alternative permutation contains a site that is not individually a preferred / allocated site within the MNDP.
Alternative 5	The alternative permutation contains a site that is not individually a preferred / allocated site within the MNDP.
Alternative 7	The alternative permutation contains a site that is not individually a preferred / allocated site within the MNDP.
Alternative 8	The alternative permutation contains a site that is not individually a preferred / allocated site within the MNDP.
Alternative 9	The alternative permutation contains a site that is not individually a preferred / allocated site within the MNDP.
Alternative 10	The alternative permutation contains a site that is not individually a preferred / allocated site within the MNDP.
Alternative 11	The alternative permutation contains a site that is not individually a preferred / allocated site within the MNDP.
Alternative 13	The alternative permutation contains a site that is not individually a preferred / allocated site within the MNDP.



SEA Obj.	Long Term Impacts of Policies													Cumulative Impact	
	MP1	MP1(A)		MP2	MP3	MP4	MP5	MP6	MP7	MP8	MP9	MP10	MP11		
		2	4												
15	0	0	?/0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The MNDP’s policies have been assessed as having predominantly positive impacts or ‘no impact’ on most of the SEA Objectives, particularly those related to design and landscape themes. This reflects the MNDP’s stance of both maintaining and enhancing the local characteristics of the settlements of Mendlesham village and Mendlesham Green. Significant positive cumulative effects have been identified regarding design and housing (through policies that allocate suitable development sites, ensuring development sites of more than 10 dwellings contain 35% affordable housing and through policies that aim to conserve designated and non-designate heritage assets found in the MNDP area).

Minor positive cumulative effects are assessed as likely regarding those SEA Objectives related to minimising landscape effects, the historic environment and open space, leisure, and recreation. The suite of policies included within the MNDP serve to ensure their protection as far as possible in the first instance and also in consideration of the implications of the MNDP area’s growth needs. This includes several positive policies regarding employment growth, on a small scale, which combine to offer a cumulative strengthening.

Uncertain effects have been highlighted regarding access and congestion throughout the MNDP area, particularly within the Conservation Area. This is a result of the MNDP’s aspiration to, where possible, reduce traffic movements throughout the Conservation Area as a result of the proposed site allocations, particularly the likelihood of a solution to this problem being required of any development of the site allocation ‘Land to the South of the Ropers Farm estate, South of Glebe Way’ within Policy MP1.

Neutral or ‘no impacts’ have been assessed for the rest of the SEA Objectives in so far as there are no identified cumulative effects arising from any of the individual policy effects highlighted.

3.9 ‘Whole Plan’ Effects

The following assessment of Section 7.1.1 replaces the corresponding section within the SEA Environmental Report (August 2020). Please note that only those sub-sections within this Section that lead to an amendment required within the SEA Environmental Report (either the ‘effect’ or commentary) are included below.

3.9.1 Reassessment of Section 7.1.1 ‘Whole Plan’ Effects

The following sub-sections explore the range of individual impacts highlighted within the assessment of the MNDP’s Policies, on a thematic basis responding to each of the SEA Objectives. This assessment can be seen as an assessment of the MNDP as a whole.



3.9.1.1 Reassessment of Section 7.1.1.2 Housing

Significant Positive Effects

Allocations within the MNDP seek to deliver a quantum of 161 new homes. The MNDP also goes further to include positive policies regarding affordable housing, and includes requirements for housing allocations that would, should permission be granted, significantly increase affordable housing in the MNDP area.

3.9.1.2 Reassessment of Section 7.1.1.6 Access to services

Uncertain Effects

At 161 dwellings, the identified housing need of Mendlesham could realistically only be met through the utilisation of Greenfield land for development. More peripherally located land is inevitably going to be distanced from existing services within the core of the village, in comparison to existing dwellings. Uncertainty has been highlighted in response to the MNDP's allocations, which assessed against reasonable alternatives can be seen to either further outward from the existing development boundary and the location of existing services.

3.9.1.3 Reassessment of Section 7.1.1.8 Minimising traffic through the Conservation Area

Uncertain Effects

One of the main aims of the MNDP is to ensure that although growth is required, traffic movements should be reduced through the Conservation Area, representing the historic core of the village. To travel to higher order roads north, services in the village to the west, and Stowmarket and Stowupland to the south, the most convenient route directs traffic through the Conservation Area. Uncertain effects are highlighted of the MNDP as a whole, as although Policy MP1's allocation of land south of Glebe Way for up to 75 dwellings includes a site criterion requiring dual access points that could offer a solution to the problem is forthcoming of any submitted scheme, no further details are available at this stage. The MNDP's allocation of this site however, and the policy requirements of Policy MP1, ensure that negative effects can be ruled out as a result of growth in the MNDP area.

3.10 Recommendations and Suggested Mitigation Measures

The following assessment of Section 7.1.2 replaces the corresponding section within the SEA Environmental Report (August 2020).

3.10.1 Reassessment of 7.1.2 Recommendations and Suggested Mitigation Measures

This SEA makes no recommendations at this stage. Through iterative working, the SEA, other supporting evidence base documents and an independent 'health check' on the Plan have ensured that all previously identified effects have been adequately mitigated or avoided in the first instance through Plan amendments.



Place Services

Essex County Council

County Hall, Chelmsford, Essex CM1 1QH

T: +44 (0)333 013 6840

E: enquiries@placeservices.co.uk

www.placeservices.co.uk

January 2021



Essex County Council