



# The Mendlesham Neighbourhood Development Plan (MNDP): Submission Version

## **Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA): Non-Technical Summary – August 2020**







# Contents

<b>1.</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1	Background	1
1.2	The Mendlesham Neighbourhood Development Plan (MNDP)	1
<b>2.</b>	<b>Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)</b>	<b>2</b>
2.1	The Requirement for SEA	2
<b>3.</b>	<b>Outline of the MNDP and Relationship with other Plans</b>	<b>3</b>
3.1	An outline of the MNDP	3
3.2	Relationship with other Policies, Plans and Programmes	4
<b>4.</b>	<b>The Current State of the Environment</b>	<b>5</b>
4.1	Baseline information	5
4.2	The Formation of Relevant SEA Objectives & the SEA Framework	11
4.3	The Assessment of the MNDP's Content	27
<b>5.</b>	<b>The Effects of the MNDP</b>	<b>28</b>
5.1	The MNDP's Policies	28
<b>6.</b>	<b>Assessment of Site Allocation Options</b>	<b>30</b>
6.1	How have Site Options been identified?	30
6.2	Site Options identified within the MNDP area	30
6.3	The Assessment of Site Options	32
6.4	Alternative combinations of sites to meet housing need	34
6.5	The Reasons for Selecting and Rejecting Alternative Options	43
<b>7.</b>	<b>Conclusions and Recommendations / Mitigation</b>	<b>47</b>
7.1	Conclusions	47
<b>8.</b>	<b>Next Steps</b>	<b>52</b>
8.1	Consultation	52



## List of Tables

Table 1: Key Sustainability Issues and Problems .....	5
Table 2: The SEA Framework for Assessing the MNDP .....	11
Table 3: SEA Framework for Assessing the MNDP's Site Options.....	17
Table 4: Effects of the MNDP's Policies .....	28
Table 5: Sites identified for assessment within this SEA.....	30
Table 6: Comparative site assessment .....	33
Table 7: 'Reasonable' alternative combinations of sites .....	35
Table 8: Alternative site combination assessment .....	37
Table 9: Reasons for the Selection / Rejection of Site Options.....	43



## 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 and reiterated in Appendix 1 of this report.

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.



## 2. Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)

### 2.1 The Requirement for SEA

---

The requirement for Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) emanates from a high level national and international commitment to sustainable development. The most commonly used definition of sustainable development is that drawn up by the World Trade Commission on Environment and Development in 1987 which states that sustainable development is:

*'Development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs'*

This definition is consistent with the themes of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), which draws upon The UK Sustainable Development Strategy Securing the Future's five 'guiding principles' of sustainable development: living within the planet's environmental limits; ensuring a strong, healthy and just society; achieving a sustainable economy; promoting good governance; and using sound science responsibly.

SEA originates from the European Directive 2001/42/EC "on the assessment of the effects of certain plans and programmes on the environment" (the 'SEA Directive') which came into force in 2001. It seeks to increase the level of protection for the environment; integrate environmental considerations into the preparation and adoption of plans and programmes; and promote sustainable development. The Directive was transposed into English legislation in 2004 by the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations (the 'SEA Regulation') which requires a SEA to be carried out for plans or programmes,

*'subject to preparation and/or adoption by an authority at national, regional or local level or which are prepared by an authority for adoption, through a legislative procedure by Parliament or Government, and required by legislative, regulatory or administrative provisions'.*

This includes some Neighbourhood Plans. The aim of the SEA is to identify potentially significant environmental effects created as a result of the implementation of the plan or programme on issues such as: *'biodiversity, population, human health, fauna, flora, soil, water, air, climatic factors, material assets, cultural heritage including architectural and archaeological heritage, landscape and the interrelationship between the above factors'* as specified in Annex 1(f) of the Directive.

### 2.2 The Aim and Structure of this Report

---

The aim of this Report is to:

- Test the Plan objectives against the SEA Objectives;
- Predict the effects of the draft Plan, including alternatives;
- Evaluate the effects of the draft Plan, including alternatives;
- Consider ways to mitigate adverse effects; and Propose measures to monitor the environmental effects of Plan implementation.



## 3. Outline of the MNDP and Relationship with other Plans

### 3.1 An outline of the MNDP

The purpose of the MNDP will be to make planning policies that can be used to determine planning applications in the area. In some cases, its policies will encourage development proposals for the benefit of the local community. In others, its policies will aim to protect the special character of the parish.

Neighbourhood Development Plans should set out a positive vision for the future of the area, reflecting the aspirations of the local community, and include agreed priorities to ensure sustainable development. The Vision and Objectives for the Plan are as follows:

#### Vision

To protect and enhance the rural and historic qualities of the neighbourhood / parish while encouraging the right kind of growth to deliver employment, housing (a range of) and community services which meet the needs of the local people.

To develop and sustain the key service status of the neighbourhood / parish by encouraging development that supports a range of employment, services and housing; meeting the needs of local people while protecting and enhancing the quality of the local environment.

To develop a vibrant and prosperous neighbourhood by encouraging development that supports a range of businesses, services and housing; meeting the needs of local people while protecting and enhancing the quality of the local environment.

#### Objectives

- SO1. To embrace change and the development of new homes at a steady, sustainable pace of growth, that will be for the long term benefit of the whole community.
- SO2. To see our parish and its community grow and flourish whilst maintaining the rural village image and not grow so much that Mendlesham village becomes a town.
- SO3. To protect and grow the current services and facilities in the village.
- SO4. To enable the population to grow and become more balanced in terms of age.
- EO1. To have a high quality natural environment, adaptable to climate change, with reduced carbon dependence and protection for important wildlife interests.
- EO2. To enhance access to the open countryside.
- EO3. To protect the rural characteristics of the parish.
- EO4. To maintain our existing rural views.
- EO5. To keep as much of our local agricultural land as possible for agriculture.
- EO6. To enhance the rural character of the parish through new community environmental planting projects, additional footpaths, cycle routes and bridleways.





- EO7. To have distinctive and flourishing settlements that exhibit community vitality.**
- BO1. To maintain and expand our existing services (particularly the Community Primary School, the Mendlesham Health Centre, Post Office and General Stores).**
- BO2. To support the diversification of suitable redundant agricultural, brownfield and previously used sites.**
- BO3. To make the parish an appealing location for small businesses and entrepreneurs by supporting suitable development sites for business start-ups; expanding the local economy including local employment opportunities.**
- BO4. To become a sustainable, thriving and prosperous community that supports a high quality of life for all its residents.**

## 3.2 Relationship with other Policies, Plans and Programmes

---

A Neighbourhood Development Plan attains the same legal status as a Local Plan once it has been approved at a referendum and can be developed before or at the same time as the Local Planning Authority is producing its Local Plan. Once 'made' or adopted, at this point it comes into force as part of the statutory development plan for the area, in this case Mid Suffolk District Council. Applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise

A draft Neighbourhood Development Plan must be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the development (local) plan in force if it is to meet basic conditions. Additionally, Neighbourhood Development Plans must have regard to existing policies, plans and programmes at national and regional levels and strengthen and support other plans and strategies. It is therefore important to identify and review those policies, plans and programmes which are likely to influence the Neighbourhood Development Plan at an early stage.

The content of these plans and programmes can also assist in the identification of any conflicting content of plans and programmes in accumulation with the Neighbourhood Development Plan. A list and description of relevant plans and programmes is included with the SEA Environmental Report.

## 4. The Current State of the Environment

### 4.1 Baseline information

Baseline information identifies current sustainability issues and problems in the MNDP area which should be addressed and provides a basis for predicting and monitoring the effects of implementing the MNDP as required by this SEA. Appendix I of the main SEA Environmental Report outlines the full baseline information profile for the MNDP area, and where relevant, Mid Suffolk District.

The following table outlines the key baseline information and thought process which has led to the formulation of the SEA Objectives for the MNDP, which are outlined in Section 4.2.

**Table 1: Key Sustainability Issues and Problems**

General theme	Description / Supporting Evidence	State of environment in absence of the MNDP
Economy and Employment	The majority of rural employment sites situated outside of Stowmarket are small, with a predominance of single use owner occupiers which have grown organically in the location. Villages such as Mendlesham and Woolpit are characterised by small 'industrial estate' type employment sites.	In the absence of the MNDP it is unlikely that there would be a significant step change from what is attractive to local employers and businesses. Although it is unlikely that the MNDP can influence changes in local employment characteristics, it can seek to promote investment in the local area in a wider variety of sectors through ensuring policy favours relevant applications.
	Almost 70% of households wanted to see more employment opportunities within the Parish of Mendlesham.	
	A local 2014 survey identified that 54.0% of respondents felt that being close to work is important.	
Health	Only 20.2% of the households (responding to the 2014 household survey) participate in some type of sport within the parish. 29.7% of the 404 households responding said there was a need for more recreational facilities.	In the absence of the MNDP, it can be expected that new recreational facilities and accessible green space would not come forward. The MNDP can seek to protect and safeguard existing facilities and secure the funding for new facilities and spaces.
	Natural England's Accessible Natural Green Space Standard (ANGSt <sup>1</sup> ) identifies deficiencies in accessible natural green space Mendlesham and much of Mid Suffolk. There is no access to green space of sizes of 2ha, 20ha, 100ha and 500ha.	

<sup>1</sup> Within the ANGSt model, accessibility means the "ability of visitors to physically gain access to a site" (Handley et al, 2003b). In the Essex analysis, sites with unrestricted entry (full access sites) are included, but those with known access restrictions (e.g. footpath only, entrance fee, restricted opening hours) or no right of access were excluded from the analysis of accessible natural greenspace provision.



General theme	Description / Supporting Evidence	State of environment in absence of the MNDP
Biodiversity	<p>57.9% of households (responding to the 2014 household survey) visit the Mendlesham woodland for recreation. Mendlesham Wood is a Woodland Priority Habitat (with a High Spatial Priority).</p>	<p>The condition of the woods could be susceptible to recreational pressure in the absence of the MNDP. The MNDP can seek to identify alternative recreational land or ensure (through policy) that such is forthcoming through new development proposals.</p>
	<p>A 2014 household survey showed that 60.4% of respondents wanted wildlife habitats to be created</p>	<p>The MNDP can seek to identify land for new habitat creation, or ensure (through policy) that such is forthcoming through new development proposals.</p>
	<p>South of Mendlesham Green a strip of Elm, Ash, Oak, Maple, Thorn and Hazel along One Hundred Lane is protected by TPO no. 66. Also at Mendlesham Green there is TPO no. 308 protecting a solitary Holly at Holly Cottage and TPO no. 324 protecting a woodland group of Maple, Ash, Oak, Cherry and Apple at High House Farm.</p>	<p>The protection of TPOs can be expected to be ensured at the District level. As such there would be no significant change in the absence of the MNDP; however the MNDP can ensure wider landscape benefits through relevant policy criteria.</p>
Housing	<p>46.1% of houses in Mendlesham are detached, a significantly higher percentage nationally at 22.3%.</p>	<p>In the absence of the MNDP, there can be expected to be a continuation of this market-led trend. A plan-led approach to housing can ensure that specific housing needs are more specifically addressed and forthcoming.</p>
	<p>94% of residents were in favour of an affordable housing scheme in the Parish, as evidenced from a Housing Needs Survey (HNS) in 2010.</p>	
	<p>A 2014 local survey shows that over 88% of households (354 out of 399 responding) want future housing development within the Parish of Mendlesham to be small scale and dispersed. Regarding the definition of 'small scale' development the housing needs survey (2014) identified that residents' views are that this represents more than 20 dwellings on a single site 39 (35.14%) / no more than 10 dwellings on a single site 50 (45.05%).</p>	<p>The MNDP can shape the scale of housing needs through site allocations that respond to identified housing needs however it should be noted that these may not necessarily reflect any specific planning applications / proposals. In the absence of the MNDP the scale of proposals can be expected to reflect both small and larger scale opportunities.</p>
	<p>The HNS also identified that 54% wanted small units for rent by local people, and 49.8% wanted homes suitable for retirees (e.g. bungalows).</p>	<p>The MNDP can ensure that land is allocated with supporting policy criteria that reflects identified needs in terms of housing types, tenures and</p>

General theme	Description / Supporting Evidence	State of environment in absence of the MNDP
	<p>The HNS suggests that there is a need for 2 and 3 bed properties in the Parish, echoing the wider needs of both the District and region.</p>	<p>sizes. In the absence of the MNDP proposals can be expected to come forward that do not necessarily reflect such needs.</p>
<p>Changing population and demographics</p>	<p>Around 1,405 people live within Mendlesham. 17.2% people are over the age of 66, a figure above the average for England (Census 2011).</p>	
	<p>Net migration per age group shows that there is a higher level of people moving in (inward migration) than are moving out (outward migration) of Mendlesham (ONS 2009/10). The largest increases in population as a result of migration are in the 25-44 and 1-14 age groups</p>	
<p>Landscape</p>	<p>Development pressure across the majority of the NCA has generally been low, although scattered development resulting in creeping suburbanisation of many settlements has occurred.</p>	<p>It can be expected that this trend will continue with or without the MNDP in line with a general housing shortage and identified housing needs within the wider Housing Market Area. The MNDP can ensure, through allocations and suitable policy approaches, that development is directed to the most sustainable and least environmentally sensitive areas in the first instance. This may not be forthcoming in the absence of a plan-led approach.</p>
	<p>A Landscape and Visual Assessment of Mendlesham was undertaken in 2016 identifying a number of viewpoints as having a high level of impact - Viewpoint 3: View from Old Station Road looking South West towards the Millennium Woods; Viewpoint 7: View from Mendlesham Road looking South East; Viewpoint 8: View from Mendlesham Road looking East; and</p> <p>Viewpoint 9: View from Chapel Road looking East in from stream bridge.</p>	<p>The MNDP can ensure, through allocations and suitable policy approaches, that development is directed to the most sustainable and least environmentally sensitive areas in the first instance. This may not be forthcoming in the absence of a plan-led approach</p>
<p>The availability of suitable land for development</p>	<p>There is a limited supply of previously developed land (PDL) in Mendlesham and wider in Mid Suffolk.</p>	<p>The MNDP can ensure, through allocations and suitable policy approaches, that development is directed to the most sustainable and least environmentally sensitive areas in the first</p>
	<p>There are a number of land uses (such as a chicken farm and a duck farm) within the plan area that are potentially</p>	

General theme	Description / Supporting Evidence	State of environment in absence of the MNDP
	<p>incompatible with any neighbouring development in regard to noise and odour.</p> <p>A waste water treatment plant exists to the south east of the built up area of Mendlesham. This plant is safeguarded within the emerging Suffolk County Council Minerals &amp; Waste Local Plan (Regulation 19 Plan being consulted on at the time of writing).</p>	<p>instance. This may not be forthcoming in the absence of a plan-led approach</p>
Townscape	<p>There are a few instances of inappropriate design within the village, including poor quality modern fascia and illuminated signs that detract from both traditional character (including within the Conservation Area).</p>	<p>The MNDP can ensure that, through suitable policy criteria, good design is forthcoming from any future development and that it is well related to existing characteristics and sensitivities.</p>
Soils	<p>Areas of the Plan area are also classified as having 'very good' (Grade 2) quality soil, notably that area to the east and south-east of the built up area of Mendlesham. Grade 2 soil represents the 'best and most versatile' soil within the District and also the County and represents a relatively small proportion of land holistically.</p>	<p>The loss of agricultural land and soil quality are important considerations in the determination of planning applications. In the absence of the MNDP, it is possible that there could be an increased loss through speculative development. A plan-led system can ensure that site allocations and policy approaches seek to minimise or avoid such losses.</p>
Historic Environment	<p>There are 45 listings covering the parish of Mendlesham, 23 of which are within the conservation area. The grade I listed Church of St Mary lies at the eastern end of the village. There is a grade II* listed Elms Farmhouse in Old Station Road south of the centre of the village. Another wealden house, listed grade II, can be found at 16 Old Market Street.</p> <p>The Suffolk County Sites and Monuments Record lists nearly 150 sites of archaeological interest from various periods in the parish of Mendlesham.</p> <p>Roads into the main built up area from the north, east south and west are largely forced to travel through the Conservation Area, as evidenced by the 'Traffic movements in Mendlesham' report (September 2019).</p>	<p>In the absence of the MNDP heritage assets above and below ground (and their settings) can still be expected to be protected in line with District and national policy. Nevertheless, the MNDP can seek to ensure that such protection is given a local context through suitable policy criteria.</p> <p>In the absence of the MNDP, it can be expected that this trend will continue. There is similarly likelihood that this could not be improved through a plan-led approach to development. Site</p>

General theme	Description / Supporting Evidence	State of environment in absence of the MNDP
	<p>The conservation area in Mendlesham is centred around an area that originally may have been an open green or market place. This area between the parallel Old Market Street and Front Street has been built up since at least Medieval times. The centre of the village thus has a fairly urban built up character. In many places listed buildings, tight onto the back of pavement, face each other across a narrow street.</p>	<p>allocations can however be included that seek to locate development in areas that have direct access to roads that would ensure either north or south traffic movements would be less likely to be forthcoming through the Conservation Area.</p>
Energy efficiency and renewable energy	<p>The Housing Needs Survey (2014 questionnaire results) identified that out of the 399 households responding, 49.3% wanted Eco homes with little energy impact.</p>	<p>It could be expected that in the absence of planning policy and relevant policy approaches, there would be less development coming forward that would embrace renewable energy. Regarding energy efficiency, this is likely to be high on the agenda of housing developers in line with national requirements.</p>
Transport	<p>Car ownership in Mendlesham is high, with only 10.3% of households not owning a car as opposed to 12.8% nationally. Regarding car ownership, 12.5% of household own three cars with the national average being 5.5%.</p> <p>There are no strategic roads running through or near the Plan area, with a reliance on narrow rural roads only.</p> <p>Road distances to key services are also above national averages. This is particularly true of access to a job centre (Mendlesham: 10.2km; England: 4.6km) and a Secondary School (Mendlesham: 6.8km; England: 2.1km).</p> <p>Only 2.6% of residents of a working age travel to work by public transport in contrast to 11.0% nationally.</p>	<p>It is unlikely that the sustainability issues regarding wider access would be addressed with or without the MNDP. The MNDP can however ensure that site allocations are located in close proximity to services within the village and can also ensure that a heightened level of services and facilities are promoted and directly sought where possible.</p>
Water	<p>Mendlesham Stream and the River Dove in the plan area have experienced bad ecological statuses in the recent past.</p> <p>The Environment Agency has defined Source Protection Zones (SPZs) for groundwater sources such as wells, boreholes and springs used for public drinking water supply. These zones show the risk of contamination from any activities that might cause pollution in the area. The majority of the Plan</p>	<p>The MNDP can ensure that development is sensitively located in order to ensure that there is no further deterioration of water quality through site allocations and policy approaches. In the absence of the MNDP, this could be considered to be less likely to be forthcoming in line decisions being made on the balance of sustainability themes.</p>

General theme	Description / Supporting Evidence	State of environment in absence of the MNDP
	<p>area is within a Source Protection Zone (Zone III - Total Catchment)</p> <p>High concentrations of both nitrate and phosphate in the river systems mean that all the rivers within the broad area are priority catchments under the Catchment Sensitive Farming initiative</p>	
<p>Flooding &amp; Climate change</p>	<p>Climate change impacts may come from increased levels of rainfall particularly during storm events, which may result in flash flooding in the river valleys as well as across the flat plateau. River valleys prevented from evolving naturally may increase flood risks. Increased flash flood events or seasonal flooding events may also impact on footpaths and infrastructure increasing their maintenance requirements.</p> <p>Areas of Flood Risk Zone 3 are found to the east / south-east of the main built up area of Mendlesham following the channel of the River Dove. Additionally, a similar stretch can be found to the north of the main built up area. Both of these areas of flood risk are extensive and are in close proximity to the development boundary</p>	<p>In the first instance development proposals in Flood Zones 2 and 3 should meet the Sequential Test requirements of paragraphs 101 and 102 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). Where it is not possible to locate the development in zones with a lower probability of flooding, the Exception Test in paragraph 102 can be applied. With this in mind, it is unlikely that the MNDP would influence the effects of flooding, however site allocations can direct development away from flood risk zones 3 and 2 in the first instance.</p>
<p>Infrastructure and Utilities</p>	<p>A 2014 household survey showed that 64.9% of respondents felt that the local education facilities are important; 65.3% of respondents wanted improved rights of way (footpaths); and 50.7% of respondents wanted to see more cycle paths developed.</p> <p>The Mid Suffolk District Council Infrastructure Delivery Plan (2014) identifies Mendlesham Airfield (indicated at the time for 5.5ha of B8 employment use) as possibly needing wastewater treatment and network enhancement requirements, and a confirmed requirement for increased discharge consent. This can be considered as indicative of an infrastructure capacity issue for wastewater treatment.</p>	<p>It is unlikely that the MNDP could strongly influence the majority of day to day infrastructure improvements at the scale of development that is included. It should also be noted that many infrastructure improvements are not within the remit of the MNDP and are more specifically relevant to Suffolk County Council and services providers. The MNDP can however seek local infrastructure improvements through a plan-led system.</p>



## 4.2 The Formation of Relevant SEA Objectives & the SEA Framework

SEA Objectives respond to the key issues identified in Section 4.1 and ask important questions regarding the sustainability of the Plan they are assessing.

The following table sets out the SEA Objectives and key questions devised for the assessment of the MNDP. It also includes monitoring indicators which can be used to assess the effectiveness of the MNDP's content over time.

**Table 2: The SEA Framework for Assessing the MNDP**

SEA Objective	SEA Criteria / Key Questions	Potential Indicators
1) To ensure the retention and expansion of existing businesses and attract new business start-ups and retail activity within the Plan area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Will it promote a range of employment opportunities?</li> <li>- Will the employment opportunities available be mixed to suit a varied employment skills base?</li> <li>- Does it seek to ensure new employment floorspace?</li> <li>- Will it support business innovation, diversification, entrepreneurship and changing economies?</li> <li>- Does it seek to promote a suitable level of convenience shopping?</li> <li>- Does it seek to promote an increase in the level of retail space, or conversion of non-retail premises to retail use?</li> <li>- Does it seek to locate development within easy public travelling distance to retail premises?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amount of floor space developed for employment, sqm</li> <li>- Employment status of residents in ward.</li> <li>- Average gross weekly earnings.</li> <li>- Standard Occupational Classification.</li> <li>- Type and amount of employment uses delivered</li> <li>- Traffic flows</li> </ul>
2) To ensure a mix of housing types, tenures and sizes from new residential or mixed-use development proposals in the Plan area that meet identified local needs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Does it seek to provide housing for an ageing population?</li> <li>- Does it ensure a proportion of housing for social rent?</li> <li>- Does it seek to ensure a mix of dwelling types?</li> <li>- Does it seek to include a mix of dwelling sizes, including those of 2-3 bedrooms?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Number of lifetime homes (proportion of stock and as a result of new development)</li> <li>- Number of affordable units (proportion of stock and as a result of new development)</li> <li>- Housing mix (proportion of stock and as a result of new development)</li> <li>- Housing size (bedrooms) of new completions</li> </ul>



SEA Objective	SEA Criteria / Key Questions	Potential Indicators
3) To ensure good quality design that is compatible with local characteristics.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Does it seek to restrict sprawl and 'ribbon development' between existing settlements / development boundaries?</li> <li>- Does it support 'infill development' to meet housing and employment needs?</li> <li>- Does it seek to restrict development of 'the countryside'<sup>2</sup> as defined by the LPA?</li> <li>- Is new development in keeping with local design characteristics?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Applications refused / approved within 'the countryside'</li> <li>- Applications approved for infill development</li> <li>- Applications approved with design conditions as per plan policies</li> </ul>
4) To ensure necessary improvements in infrastructure to support new development.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Will it put capacity pressure on the local primary school?</li> <li>- Will it put capacity pressure on the health centre?</li> <li>- Will it stimulate any requirement for new roads?</li> <li>- Will it lead to capacity pressures for utilities infrastructure?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- School places (surplus / deficit)</li> <li>- Infrastructure contributions collected regarding schools</li> <li>- Capacity updates from service providers (utilities)</li> </ul>
5) To ensure that development is as energy efficient as possible	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Will it aspire to energy efficient development as far as is possible?</li> <li>- Will it lead to renewable energy generation?</li> <li>- Will development include electric car charging points?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Proportion of dwellings deemed energy efficient (in reflection of industry standards and above)</li> <li>- Numbers of electric car charging points</li> </ul>
6) To ensure suitable access to services and facilities and ensure appropriate linkages to the existing road network to reduce congestion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Does it seek to improve or avoid increasing traffic flows generally?</li> <li>- Does it seek to ensure that adequate road access is addressed?</li> <li>- Does it direct developers to appropriate guidance regarding street design?</li> <li>- Does it seek to strike a balance between an increase in car parking and promoting sustainable methods of transportation (including walking and</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Traffic flows</li> <li>- Percentage of journeys to work by walking and cycling and percentage of journeys to work by public transport</li> </ul>

<sup>2</sup> Areas outside of identified development boundaries are considered 'the countryside'



SEA Objective	SEA Criteria / Key Questions	Potential Indicators
	cycling)?	
7) To promote and maximise the use of sustainable transport modes and to promote home working	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Does the Plan seek to ensure a high quality and safe public realm?</li> <li>- Does the Plan seek to preserve PRoWs and bridleways?</li> <li>- Does the Plan seek to promote active modes?</li> <li>- Does the Plan seek to ensure sufficient cycle parking provision at destinations?</li> <li>- Does the Plan seek to ensure sufficient cycle parking provision within new residential developments?</li> <li>- Will the Plan ensure / promote new development to be within walking distance (800m) of existing / new services and facilities?</li> <li>- Will the Plan ensure / promote new development to be within walking distance (800m) of the train station?</li> <li>- Will the Plan ensure / promote new development to be within walking distance (800m) of an existing bus stop?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Loss of bridleways / PRoWs</li> <li>- Traffic flows</li> <li>- Applications permitted within 800m of services and facilities</li> <li>- Applications permitted within 800m of the train station</li> <li>- Applications permitted within 800m of a bus stop</li> </ul>
8) To minimise traffic movements through the Conservation Area.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Will development lead to an increase in traffic through the Conservation Area?</li> <li>- Is development to be located within the Conservation Area?</li> <li>- Will development be located within walking distance to services and facilities (including public transport modes)?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Vehicle counts through the Conservation Area.</li> <li>- Number of successful applications within the Conservation Area.</li> </ul>
9) To ensure that the location of development is compatible with neighbouring uses.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Will noise impact assessments be required of relevant applications?</li> <li>- Will mitigation measures be sought?</li> <li>- Will the location of development experience potential issues regarding odour?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Applications submitted with accompanying noise impact assessments</li> <li>- Applications approved with noise related mitigation measures</li> </ul>

SEA Objective	SEA Criteria / Key Questions	Potential Indicators
<p>10) To minimise the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land and to promote the development of brownfield land in the first instance.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Will it seek to locate development in areas of lower soil quality or not in farming use?</li> <li>- Will it ensure that soil quality is not compromised?</li> <li>- Will it support or lead to the remediation of contaminated land, avoiding environmental pollution or exposure of occupiers or neighbouring land uses to unacceptable health risk?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Loss of Grade 2 ALC (Ha).</li> <li>- Contaminated land brought back into beneficial use, hectares</li> </ul>
<p>11) To ensure the protection, enhancement and creation of features of a landscape value throughout the Plan area, including views to, from and across the Plan area.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Does it seek to create new landscape features on site?</li> <li>- Does it seek to include a high quality public realm?</li> <li>- Does it seek to protect and enhance existing on-site features of a landscape value?</li> <li>- Does it also seek to enhance 'townscape'?</li> <li>- Does it seek to address crime and the fear of crime through effective design measures?</li> <li>- Does it seek to utilise current conditions and character in the wider landscape?</li> <li>- Will existing features be utilised as part of landscape character of newly created areas?</li> <li>- Does it seek to improve areas between existing settlements?</li> <li>- Does it seek to ensure that there is no coalescence with Mendlesham and Mendlesham Green?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Loss of TPOs</li> <li>- Applications permitted contrary to recommendations within the Landscape Character Assessment</li> </ul>
<p>12) To protect, and where possible, enhance designated and non-designated heritage assets and their settings both above and below ground.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Will it protect and enhance designations, features and areas of historical, archaeological and cultural value in both built up and rural areas?</li> <li>- Will it have a negative impact on the significance of a designated historic environment asset or its setting?</li> <li>- Does it seek to enhance the range and</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Percentage of new and converted dwellings on previously developed land</li> <li>- Number of listed buildings demolished, repaired or brought back to use, including locally listed buildings</li> <li>- New Conservation Area Appraisals adopted</li> </ul>

SEA Objective	SEA Criteria / Key Questions	Potential Indicators
	<p>quality of the public realm and open spaces?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Does it encourage the use of high quality design principles to respect local character?</li> <li>- Will / can any perceived adverse impacts be reduced through adequate mitigation?</li> <li>- Will it lead to the alteration of field boundaries?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Number of Listed Buildings, Conservation Areas (and percentage at risk)</li> <li>- Area of highly sensitive historic landscape characterisation type(s) which have been altered and their character eroded</li> <li>- Number of major development projects that enhance or detract from the significance of heritage assets or historic landscape character</li> <li>- Percentage of planning applications where archaeological investigations were required prior to approval or mitigation strategies developed or implemented</li> </ul>
<p>13) To retain existing, and seek the provision of new community, leisure and recreation facilities and accessible natural green space within the Plan area</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Does it seek to improve health and well-being?</li> <li>- Does it seek to promote and support applications for new public leisure and recreation facilities?</li> <li>- Does it seek to retain existing community, leisure and recreation land for that use?</li> <li>- Does it seek enhancements to existing community, leisure and recreation uses?</li> <li>- Will new facilities be in broadly accessible locations to new and existing communities?</li> <li>- Does it seek to preserve PRoWs and bridleways?</li> <li>- Does it seek to ensure increased green and open space provision that is accessible to all?</li> <li>- Does it seek to retain and enhance existing open space?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Walking distances to natural greenspace (800m)</li> <li>- Applications approved for new community, leisure and recreational uses?</li> <li>- Applications approved that seek a replacement of existing community, leisure and recreational uses?</li> <li>- Condition of existing community, leisure and recreation facilities (as identified in Parish Council meeting minutes etc.)</li> </ul>
<p>14) To protect and enhance existing features of biodiversity within the Plan area</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Will development have a potential impact on a national, international or European designated site (SPA, SAC, Ramsar, SSSI)?</li> <li>- Will it maintain and enhance sites</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Impacts (direct and indirect) on designated sites (leading to loss / improvement in monitored conditions)</li> <li>- Applications required to submit</li> </ul>

SEA Objective	SEA Criteria / Key Questions	Potential Indicators
	<p>otherwise designated for their nature conservation interest?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Will it conserve and enhance natural/semi natural habitats?</li> <li>- Will it conserve and enhance species diversity, and in particular avoid harm to indigenous BAP priority species?</li> <li>- Will recreational spaces be carefully managed and promoted?</li> <li>- Will habitats be suitably protected and enhanced, either physically or through careful management?</li> </ul>	<p>ecological surveys</p>
<p>15) To ensure that there is no increase in fluvial or ground water flood risk as a result of development and to ensure the promotion of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Does it seek to avoid development in areas at risk of flooding (fluvial, groundwater, surface water)?</li> <li>- Does it seek to avoid increasing flood risk (fluvial, surface water, groundwater) in areas away from initial development?</li> <li>- Does it promote the inclusion of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) in new developments and will their integration be viable?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Number of planning permissions granted contrary to the advice of the Environment Agency on flood defence grounds</li> <li>- Number of SuDS schemes approved</li> </ul>
<p>16) To ensure that there is no deterioration in air or water quality within the Plan area and beyond as a result of development.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Will it lead to no deterioration on the quality of water bodies?</li> <li>- Will water resources and sewerage capacity be able to accommodate growth?</li> <li>- Will air quality assessments be required of relevant applications?</li> <li>- Will mitigation measures be sought?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Quality of Rivers (number achieving ecological good status)</li> <li>- Number of planning permissions granted contrary to the advice of the Environment Agency on grounds of water quality</li> <li>- Applications submitted with accompanying air quality assessments</li> </ul>

#### 4.2.1 The SEA Framework for Assessing Site Options

In addition to formulating a SEA Framework, used for assessing the MNDP's policies, it is also important to put together a framework for assessing sites. Such an assessment is used where a Neighbourhood Development Plan proposes to allocate land for future development to meet the Plan's aims. Many alternative sites are often submitted for consideration.

The SEA Framework for sites ensures that all sites, both those that are preferred and non-preferred, can be compared in a like-for-like manner using all available information. The following table sets out the SEA Framework for sites.



Table 3: SEA Framework for Assessing the MNDP's Site Options

SEA Objective	Indicator / Source	Impact / Effect					
		Strong Positive	Minor Positive	No impact / Neutral	Uncertainty	Minor Negative	Strong Negative
		++	+	0	?	-	--
1. To ensure the retention and expansion of existing businesses and attract new business start-ups and retail activity within the Plan area	(1.1) Increase in business premises / site submission	N/A	Proposal would see an increase in business premises	Proposal would see no change in number of business premises	Uncertain impacts	Proposal would see a loss of business premises	N/A
	(1.2) Increase in retail premises / site submission	N/A	Proposal would see an increase in retail premises	Proposal would see no change in number of retail premises	Uncertain impacts	Proposal would see a loss of retail premises	N/A
2. To ensure a mix of housing types, tenures and sizes from new residential or mixed-use development proposals in the Plan area that meet identified local needs	(2.1) Increase in mix of housing types / site submission	N/A	Proposal specifies a mix of housing types	Proposal does not specify a mix of housing types	Uncertain impacts	N/A	N/A
	(2.2) Increase in affordable housing / affordable	Allocation of >=15 dwellings contributes significantly to the	Allocation of 5-14 dwellings makes minor contribution to	Allocation of 0-4 dwellings makes no contribution to the	Uncertainty surrounding delivery.	N/A	N/A



SEA Objective	Indicator / Source	Impact / Effect					
		Strong Positive	Minor Positive	No impact / Neutral	Uncertainty	Minor Negative	Strong Negative
		++	+	0	?	-	--
	housing requirements in adopted MSDC policy (35% on sites of 5 dwellings or more).	delivery of affordable housing.	the delivery of affordable housing.	delivery of affordable housing.			
3. To ensure good quality townscape / design that is compatible with local characteristics.	Settlement pattern / GIS Mapping	N/A	The site is within the settlement boundary	N/A	The site is adjacent to the settlement boundary OR Uncertainty (to be explained in commentary)	The site is adjacent to the settlement boundary but significantly extends the built development outward	The site is detached from the settlement boundary
4. To ensure necessary improvements in infrastructure to support new development.	N/A	This Objective is considered a policy consideration / no quantitative information available.					



SEA Objective	Indicator / Source	Impact / Effect					
		Strong Positive	Minor Positive	No impact / Neutral	Uncertainty	Minor Negative	Strong Negative
		++	+	0	?	-	--
5. To ensure that development is as energy efficient as possible	N/A	This Objective is considered a policy consideration / no quantitative information available.					
6. To ensure suitable access to services and facilities and ensure appropriate linkages to the existing road network to reduce congestion	(6.1) Distance to GP Surgery / GIS mapping	N/A	<= 800m from a GP surgery (represents 10 mins walking distance)	N/A	Uncertainty	> 800m from a GP surgery (represents 10 mins walking distance)	N/A
	(6.2) Distance to convenience shopping / GIS mapping	N/A	<= 800m from a convenience shop (represents 10 mins walking distance)	N/A	Uncertainty	> 800m from a convenience shop (represents 10 mins walking distance)	N/A
	(6.3) Distance to Primary school / GIS mapping	<= 400m Primary School (represents 5 mins walking distance)	<= 800m, > 400m from Primary School (represents 5-10 mins walking distance)	N/A	Uncertainty	> 800m from Primary School (represents 10 mins walking distance)	N/A





SEA Objective	Indicator / Source	Impact / Effect					
		Strong Positive	Minor Positive	No impact / Neutral	Uncertainty	Minor Negative	Strong Negative
		++	+	0	?	-	--
	(6.4) Access to site (transport network) / Site Assessment Final Report (AECOM)	N/A	Access exists	N/A	Access can be achieved	Access cannot be achieved	N/A
7. To promote and maximise the use of sustainable transport modes and to promote home working	(7.1) Distance to bus stop / GIS mapping	N/A	<= 400 m from a bus stop (represents 5 mins walking distance)	N/A	Uncertainty	> 400 m from a bus stop (represents 5 mins walking distance)	N/A
	(7.2) Proximity to PRoWs & Byways / GIS mapping	N/A	N/A	No PRoW / Byway present in or adjacent to site	PRoW / Byway is adjacent to the site	PRoW / Byway runs through the site	N/A
8. To minimise traffic movements through the Conservation Area.	(8.1) Distance to Conservation Area & likely traffic routes north and	N/A	N/A	Proposal is not located within or adjacent to the Conservation Area	Proposal is located adjacent to Conservation Area or might lead to	Proposal is located within the Conservation Area and can be expected	N/A



SEA Objective	Indicator / Source	Impact / Effect					
		Strong Positive	Minor Positive	No impact / Neutral	Uncertainty	Minor Negative	Strong Negative
		++	+	0	?	-	--
	south / GIS mapping			and north and south journeys will not bypass the Conservation Area	northern or southern journeys through the Conservation Area	to lead to increased traffic within the Conservation Area	
9. To ensure that the location of development is compatible with neighbouring uses.	(9.1) Distance to potentially incompatible uses / GIS mapping	N/A	N/A	The proposal does not adjoin a potentially incompatible use (for information only)	The proposal adjoins a potentially incompatible use (for information only)	N/A	N/A
10. To minimise the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land and to promote the development of brownfield land in the first instance.	(10.1) Soil quality / ALC mapping (Natural England)	N/A	N/A	All other proposals	Significant proportion of allocated land (>= 25%) on grade 3 agricultural land	Significant proportion of allocated land (>= 25%) on grade 2 agricultural land	N/A



SEA Objective	Indicator / Source	Impact / Effect					
		Strong Positive	Minor Positive	No impact / Neutral	Uncertainty	Minor Negative	Strong Negative
		++	+	0	?	-	--
11. To ensure the protection, enhancement and creation of features of a landscape value throughout the Plan area, including views to, from and across the Plan area.	(11.1) Loss of hedgerows / aerial mapping	N/A	N/A	The proposal would not lead to a loss of or change to field boundaries.	Where applicable.	The proposal would lead to a loss of or change to field boundaries.	N/A
	(11.2) Loss of key views / Landscape and Visual Assessment of Mendlesham (LVAM) & Mid-Suffolk Settlement Assessment (MSSA) (2018)	N/A	N/A	Site is located in an area identified as having a low level of impact (LVAM) AND/OR Site is not located in an area identified as a 'key view' (MSSA)	Site is located in an area identified as having a moderate level of impact (LVAM) AND/OR General uncertainty in site location (MSSA)	Site is located in an area identified as having a high level of impact OR Site is located in an area identified as a 'key view' (MSSA)	Site is located in an area identified as having a high level of impact AND Site is located in an area identified as a 'key view' (MSSA)
	(11.3) Coalescence / GIS mapping	N/A	N/A	The proposal would not diminish the extent of currently undeveloped land	The proposal would diminish the extent of currently undeveloped land	N/A	N/A



SEA Objective	Indicator / Source	Impact / Effect					
		Strong Positive	Minor Positive	No impact / Neutral	Uncertainty	Minor Negative	Strong Negative
		++	+	0	?	-	--
	(qualitative assessment)			between Mendlesham and Mendlesham Green / Brockford Street	between Mendlesham and Mendlesham Green / Brockford Street		
12. To protect, and where possible, enhance designated and non-designated heritage assets and their settings both above and below ground.	(12.1) Impact on historic environment (as identified by Place Services' historic environment specialists)	N/A	Development likely to enhance historic asset, for example by bringing an 'at risk' structure into appropriate use or improving a degraded setting.	The proposal will not have any effect on any historic assets.	Uncertainty	Harm to significance of designated heritage asset or its setting where mitigation is likely to be feasible, for example via design and layout of the new development.	Loss of or considerable harm to significance of designated heritage asset or its setting, where mitigation is unlikely to be feasible.
13. To retain existing, and seek the provision of new community, leisure and recreation facilities and	(13.1) Loss of accessible open space / GIS mapping	N/A	Provision of new open space / accessible natural greenspace	No loss of open space / accessible natural greenspace	Uncertain impacts	Loss of open space / accessible natural greenspace	N/A



SEA Objective	Indicator / Source	Impact / Effect					
		Strong Positive	Minor Positive	No impact / Neutral	Uncertainty	Minor Negative	Strong Negative
		++	+	0	?	-	--
accessible natural green space within the Plan area	(13.2) Loss of leisure and recreation facilities / GIS mapping	N/A	Provision of new leisure and recreation facilities	No loss of leisure and recreation facilities	Uncertain impacts	Loss of leisure and recreation facilities	N/A
	(13.3) Loss of community facilities / GIS mapping	N/A	Suitability for new community facilities where none exist currently; or Enhancement of existing community facilities.	Existing community facilities remain.	Uncertainty surrounding impacts.	Removal of community facilities with no relocation	N/A
14. To protect and enhance existing features of biodiversity within the Plan area	(14.1) Loss of biodiversity features / GIS mapping	N/A	N/A	Proposal would not see the loss of any part of a designated site or priority habitat	Uncertain impacts	Proposal borders a designated site or priority habitat OR	Proposal would see the loss of any part of a designated site or priority habitat



SEA Objective	Indicator / Source	Impact / Effect					
		Strong Positive	Minor Positive	No impact / Neutral	Uncertainty	Minor Negative	Strong Negative
		++	+	0	?	-	--
						Proposal includes designations or priority habitat that could be integrated into the scheme	
15. To ensure that there is no increase in fluvial or ground water flood risk as a result of development and to ensure the promotion of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS)	(15.1) Areas of fluvial flood risk / (EA, DCLG mapping)	N/A	N/A	< 5% of site within Flood Zone 3, or < 20% within Flood Zone 2, or proposed use is classified as 'water compatible development' by Technical Guidance to the NPPF.	Uncertainty	Significant proportion of site (>=20%) is within Flood Zone 2 or smaller area (5% to < 25%) is within Flood Zone 3.	Significant proportion of site (>=20%) is within Flood Zone 3a or 3b.
	(15.2) Areas of surface water flood risk / EA mapping	N/A	N/A	The site does not have any risk of surface water flooding	Part of the site has a risk of surface water flooding	The whole site has a risk of surface water flooding.	N/A



SEA Objective	Indicator / Source	Impact / Effect					
		Strong Positive	Minor Positive	No impact / Neutral	Uncertainty	Minor Negative	Strong Negative
		++	+	0	?	-	--
	(15.3) Proximity to SPZs / EA mapping	N/A	N/A	Allocation does not fall in any SPZs or insignificant proportion (<25%) lies within SPZ1, 2 or 3	Significant proportion of allocation (>=25%) falls within SPZ3	Significant proportion of allocation (>=25%) falls within SPZ1 or SPZ2	N/A
16. To ensure that there is no deterioration in air or water quality within the Plan area and beyond as a result of development.	(16.1) Proximity to water bodies / GIS mapping	N/A	N/A	All other proposals.	N/A	The proposal is adjacent to a water body.	N/A



## 4.3 The Assessment of the MNDP's Content

The SEA of the MNDP within the SEA Environmental Report assesses the MNDP's content against the SEA Objectives and key questions / criteria outlined in the above frameworks. The aim is to assess the sustainability effects of the document following implementation. The strength of impacts can vary dependant on the relevance of the policy content to certain SEA Objectives or themes. Where the policies have been appraised against the SEA Objectives the basis for making judgements within the assessment is identified within the following key:

Possible impact	Basis for judgement
++	Strong prospect of there being significant positive impacts.
+	Strong prospect of there being minor positive impacts.
?	Possibility of either positive or negative impacts, or general uncertainty where there is a lack on current information (to be elaborated in commentary in each instance).
0	No impact.
-	Strong prospect of there being minor negative impacts and mitigation would be possible / issues can be rectified.
--	Strong prospect of there being significant negative impacts with mitigation unlikely to be possible (pending further investigation).
N/A	Not applicable to the scope or context of the assessed content.

Commentary is also included to describe the significant effects of the MNDP's policies or site options against the SEA Objectives.







SEA Objective	Long Term Impacts of Policies														
	MP1	MP1(A)				MP2	MP3	MP4	MP5	MP6	MP7	MP8	MP9	MP10	MP11
		1	2	3	4										
10	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
11	?	0	?/+	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	+	+	+	0
12	?	0	0	0	?	0	0	0	++	+	0	0	0	+	0
13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+
14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
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 following points summarise the effects of the MNDP policies highlighted within the main SEA Environmental Report:

- The MNDP 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 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.
- 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 significant effects arising from any of the individual policy effects highlighted.

## 6. Assessment of Site Allocation Options

### 6.1 How have Site Options been identified?

Sites have been identified by the MNDP Group and also from MSDC's emerging Joint Local Plan evidence base documents, principally the Strategic Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA). A number of sites were identified within the MNDP boundary through the SHELAA process, as informed by a District-wide call-for-sites undertaken for the LPA's emerging Joint Local Plan process.

All residential sites submitted through this process within the MNDP area have been assessed. Additionally, the MNDP Group have identified a number of additional sites through discussions with local landowners, some of which have not been submitted for consideration at the District level as a result.

A number of employment sites were identified through MSDC's call-for-sites exercise. These sites have not been explored within this SEA Environmental Report as no employment sites have been identified for allocation within the MNDP. The suitability of these sites for employment purposes can be considered a development management issue and relevant to the criteria-based policies within both the MNDP and adopted MSDC policy.

### 6.2 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 5: 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
<b>Proposed for Housing</b>			
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	<p>Residential development. 4.6ha – estimated dwelling yield 50 (as submitted in the MSDC Local Plan call-for-sites process)</p> <p>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).</p> <p>Site subject to outline planning application at time of writing (REF. DC/19/05915): 2.3ha – submitted dwelling yield 20 dwellings.</p>	<p>MNDP3a (50 dwellings)</p> <p>MNDP3b (50 dwellings)</p> <p>MNDP3c (20 dwellings)</p>
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

Site Ref in SHELAA (SS) / Reference in NP	Address	Potential / submitted site yield (as per SHELAA, or as per assumption included)	SEA Reference
SS1063	Land west of A140, Mendlesham	A new settlement of approx. 1,750 dwellings (based on 35dph).	MNDP9
Site 1 (identified by MNDP Group)	Land to the West of Old Station Road formerly known as the G. R. Warehousing site, now under development as 'Station Fields.'	Site proposed for 56 dwellings (6 affordable). 1.76ha.	MNDP10
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
Site 3 (identified by MNDP Group)	Land to the east of the Mendlesham Road and Mendlesham Green	Site proposed for up to 10 affordable or rented dwellings. 0.55ha.	MNDP12

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

- MNDP10: Land to the West of Old Station Road formerly known as the G. R. Warehousing site, now under development as 'Station Fields.'
- 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.
- MNDP12: Land to the east of the Mendlesham Road and Mendlesham Green
- MNDP2b: Land to the south of Ropers Farm estate, South of Glebe Way

## 6.3 The Assessment of Site Options

The following table represents an overview of the impacts associated with the site options in the MNDP area, and their assessment against the SEA Framework for Assessing the MNDP's Site Options contained earlier within this Non-Technical Summary. Appendix 2 of the main SEA Environmental Report outlines the more detailed assessments of these site options, with further consideration of opportunities and constraints.



Table 6: Comparative site assessment

SEA Obj.		Site Reference (*indicates allocated site in MNDP)														
		MNDP1	MNDP2a	MNDP2b*	MNDP3a	MNDP3b	MNDP3c	MNDP4	MNDP5	MNDP6	MNDP7	MNDP8	MNDP9	MNDP10*	MNDP11*	MNDP12*
1.	1.1	0	0	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	0	0	0
2.	2.1	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	0	?	+
	2.2	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	+	++	++	++	++	0	++	++
3.	3.1	-	-	-	-	?	?	-	?	--	-	-	?/-	?	?	-
4.	N/A	This Objective is considered a policy consideration / no reliable information available.														
5.	N/A	This Objective is considered a policy consideration / no reliable information available.														
6.	6.1	?/-	-	-	?/-	+	+	?/-	-	-	?/-	?/-	-	-	+	-
	6.2	?/-	-	-	?/-	+	+	?	+	?/-	+	?/+	-	+	?/-	-
	6.3	?/-	+	+	?/-	+	+	+	+	+	+	?/+	-	+	?/-	-
	6.4	+	+	?/-	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	+	+	?
7.	7.1	?/+	?/+	?/-	?/-	+	+	?/+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	+
	7.2	?	?	?	?	?	?	0	0	0	0	-	-	0	0	0
8.	8.1	?	?/-	?	?/-	?/-	?/-	0	0	?/-	?/-	?/-	0	0	0	?/-
9.	9.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?	0	0	?



SEA Obj.		Site Reference (*indicates allocated site in MNDP)														
		MNDP1	MNDP2a	MNDP2b*	MNDP3a	MNDP3b	MNDP3c	MNDP4	MNDP5	MNDP6	MNDP7	MNDP8	MNDP9	MNDP10*	MNDP11*	MNDP12*
10.	10.1	?	?/-	?/-	?	?	?	?	0	-	?	?	?	0	?	?
	11.1	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	-	0	-	0
11.	11.2	--	0	0	-	-	-	--	0	0	--	--	?	0	-	?
	11.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
12.	12.1	?	?/-	-	0	0	0	-	-	-	--	--	-	0	0	0
13.	13.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	0	0	0
	13.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?/+	+	0	0	0
	13.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?/+	+	0	0	0
14.	14.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0
15.	15.1	0	0/?	-	--	0	0	0	0	?/-	?	0	0	0	-	0
	15.2	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	?	0	0	0
	15.3	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?
16.	16.1	-	-	-	-	0	0	0	0	-	-	0	-	0	-	-

## 6.4 Alternative combinations of sites to meet housing need

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 the appraisal of Policy MP1(A)), all but two (in their entirety) have planning permission (full or outline).

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.

Excluding existing permissions, there are eight 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
- MNDP3c – 20 dwellings
- MNDP5 – 5 dwellings
- MNDP6 – 15 dwellings
- MNDP7 – 45 dwellings
- MNDP12 – 10 dwellings

The alternative permutations for exploration within this SEA are included in the table below.

**Table 7: 'Reasonable' alternative combinations of sites**

Alternative	Site 1 (dwellings)	Site 2 (dwellings)	Site 3 (dwellings)	Site 4 (dwellings)	Total number of new dwellings
Plan approach	MNDP2b (47)	MNDP12 (10)	N/A	N/A	57
Alternative 1	MNDP1 (70)	N/A	N/A	N/A	70
Alternative 2	MNDP2b (47)	N/A	N/A	N/A	47
Alternative 3	MNDP3b (50)	N/A	N/A	N/A	50
Alternative 4	MNDP3b (50)	MNDP12 (10)	N/A	N/A	60
Alternative 5	MNDP5 (5)	MNDP7 (45)	N/A	N/A	50
Alternative 6	MNDP7 (45)	MNDP12 (10)	N/A	N/A	55
Alternative 7	MNDP3b (50)	MNDP6 (15)	N/A	N/A	65





Alternative	Site 1 (dwellings)	Site 2 (dwellings)	Site 3 (dwellings)	Site 4 (dwellings)	Total number of new dwellings
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 12	MNDP5 (5)	MNDP7 (45)	MNDP12 (10)	N/A	60
Alternative 13	MNDP3b (50)	MNDP5 (5)	MNDP6 (15)	N/A	70
Alternative 14	MNDP2b (47)	MNDP5 (5)	MNDP12 (10)	N/A	62
Alternative 15	MNDP3b (50)	MNDP5 (5)	MNDP12 (10)	N/A	65
Alternative 16	MNDP3c (20)	MNDP2b (47)	N/A	N/A	67
Alternative 17	MNDP3c (20)	MNDP7 (45)	N/A	N/A	65
Alternative 18	MNDP3c (20)	MNDP5 (5)	MNDP6 (15)	MNDP12 (10)	50

### 6.4.1 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 of the main SEA Environmental Report), using the site assessment framework and combines those effects cumulatively, using a principle of precaution. Commentary is given comparing each combination against each broad sustainability objective.



**Table 8: Alternative site combination assessment**

SEA Obj.		Preferred	ALT 1	ALT 2	ALT 3	ALT 4	ALT 5	ALT 6	ALT 7	ALT 8	ALT 9	ALT 10	ALT 11	ALT 12	ALT 13	ALT 14	ALT 15	ALT 16	ALT 17	ALT 18	
1	1.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	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	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 Those combinations that include the purely social housing proposal of MNDP12 however have been assessed as having a higher degree of positive effect in regard to type and tenure. 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 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.																					



SEA Obj.	Preferred	ALT 1	ALT 2	ALT 3	ALT 4	ALT 5	ALT 6	ALT 7	ALT 8	ALT 9	ALT 10	ALT 11	ALT 12	ALT 13	ALT 14	ALT 15	ALT 16	ALT 17	ALT 18	
<p>The preferred MNDP approach, as well as Alternatives 1, 2, 5, 6, 9, 12, 14, 16 and 17 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, 4, 15 and 8, which all 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 larger site option of MNDP3b (as opposed to MNDP3c) 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	?/-	+	?/-	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?/-	?/-	?	?	?	?/-	?	?/-	?
<p>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</p>																				



SEA Obj.	Preferred	ALT 1	ALT 2	ALT 3	ALT 4	ALT 5	ALT 6	ALT 7	ALT 8	ALT 9	ALT 10	ALT 11	ALT 12	ALT 13	ALT 14	ALT 15	ALT 16	ALT 17	ALT 18
----------	-----------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------

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	?	?	?	?	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 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 combination of allocating MNDP2b and MNDP12 in Mendlesham Green has been assessed as uncertain in a slightly different way however; due to the aspiration of a solution being sought to alleviate existing and future trips through the Conservation Area within site MNDP2b. 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.



SEA Obj.	Preferred	ALT 1	ALT 2	ALT 3	ALT 4	ALT 5	ALT 6	ALT 7	ALT 8	ALT 9	ALT 10	ALT 11	ALT 12	ALT 13	ALT 14	ALT 15	ALT 16	ALT 17	ALT 18		
9	9.1	0/?	0	0	0	0/?	0	0/?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0/?	0	0/?	0/?	0	0	0/?

Regarding site proximity to potentially incompatible uses, no cumulative effects can be highlighted as effects are relevant to individual sites only. Those combinations that include the allocated MNDP12 have been highlighted as having a degree of potential effect regarding noise and odour due to a nearby poultry farm. These effects can be considered minimal however and mitigation should be suitable through adhering to MNDP policy and that at the District level.

10	10.1	?/-	?	?/-	?	?	?	?	?/-	?	?/-	?/-	?/-	?	?/-	?/-	?	?/-	?	?/-
----	------	-----	---	-----	---	---	---	---	-----	---	-----	-----	-----	---	-----	-----	---	-----	---	-----

All of the combinations have been assessed as having varying degrees of uncertainty (some positive leaning and 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 degree of negative effect. No positive effects are highlighted as all combinations lead to the inevitable loss of greenfield / agricultural land.

11	11.1	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	11.2	?	--	0	-	-	--	--	-	-	0	0	--	--	-	?	-	-	--	-
	11.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				

SEA Objective 11 considers landscape effects, and in using the Landscape and Visual Assessment of Mendlesham (LVAM) and the Mid-Suffolk Settlement Assessment (MSSA) as evidence and this allows for the comparison of alternative combinations (11.2). These evidence base documents both look at key views and important elements of landscape in and around specific areas of the village, within which the proposed sites lie. Several of the individual sites are located within highly sensitive areas and those that form 'key views' in these documents respectively, culminating in significant negative effects. Those combinations that include these sites have been assessed here in the same manner. The 'best performing' combinations are those with the largest site (in terms of dwelling contribution) being MNDP2b, lying in the south of the village, and excluding those combinations with significant negative effects, those with negative effects have site MNDP3b as the





SEA Obj.	Preferred	ALT 1	ALT 2	ALT 3	ALT 4	ALT 5	ALT 6	ALT 7	ALT 8	ALT 9	ALT 10	ALT 11	ALT 12	ALT 13	ALT 14	ALT 15	ALT 16	ALT 17	ALT 18
----------	-----------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------

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	?	?	?	0	-	-	-	?	?	-	0	-	?	?
	15.2	0	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	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 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 to 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.

16	16.1	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
----	------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

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.



## 6.5 The Reasons for Selecting and Rejecting Alternative Options

The allocation of the four sites within Policy MP1 is broadly supported by the findings of this SEA Report in so far as they either have planning permission (full or outline) or will not give rise to any significant effects on the environment.

In some instances, alternative sites can be seen to have less uncertainty surrounding effects or have been identified as ‘performing better’ than alternatives, notably in consideration of the ‘main alternative’, site MNDP3b, to the Plan’s allocation of site MNDP2b.

This sub-section offers the MNDP Group’s main reasons behind selecting and rejecting the alternative options that they have faced through the plan-making process.

### 6.5.1 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 9: Reasons for the Selection / Rejection of Site Options**

Site Ref.	Reasons for Selection / Rejection
<b>Preferred Site Proposals within the MNDP</b>	
MNDP10	The site ‘Land West of Old Station Road’ is allocated as development has recently been completed.
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.
MNDP12	The site ‘Land to the East of Mendlesham Road and Mendlesham Green’ is land owned by the Parish Council and is allocated as it represents an opportunity for development of 10 social housing units, to be built and managed by the Mendlesham Community Land Trust (as its inaugural project).  Such units have been identified as required within the Housing Needs Survey accompanying the MNDP.
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.





Site Ref.	Reasons for Selection / Rejection
-----------	-----------------------------------

#### Rejected Site Proposals

MNDP1	<p>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.</p>
MNDP3a	<p>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 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>
MNDP3c	<p>The site 'Land to the North East of Chapel Road, Mendlesham' for 20 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 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>

Site Ref.	Reasons for Selection / Rejection
MNDP7	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).
MNDP8	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).
MNDP9	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).

## 5.6.2 Site Combinations – Preferred and Alternatives

Ref.	Reasons for Selection / Rejection
------	-----------------------------------

### Preferred Scenario within the MNDP

MNDP2b & MNDP12	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. The site MNDP12 is available and owned by the Parish Council and represents an opportunity for the Mendlesham CLT (Community Land Trust) to develop the site for social housing that can be available for those with valid local connections and not be subject to right to buy legislation.
-----------------	--

### Rejected Scenarios

Alternative 1	The alternative permutation contains a site that is not individually a preferred / allocated site within the MNDP.
Alternative 2	Future development of this site alone could produce the required numbers for development when taking windfall development into consideration, however the opportunity to ensure social housing scheme comes forward on land owned by the Parish Council (MNDP12) for the benefit of the community is a preferred option.
Alternative 3	The alternative permutation contains a site that is not individually a preferred / allocated site within the MNDP.
Alternative 4	The alternative permutation contains a site that is not individually a preferred / allocated site within the MNDP.



Ref.	Reasons for Selection / Rejection
Alternative 5	The alternative permutation contains a site that is not individually a preferred / allocated site within the MNDP.
Alternative 6	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 12	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.
Alternative 14	The alternative permutation contains a site that is not individually a preferred / allocated site within the MNDP.
Alternative 15	The alternative permutation contains a site that is not individually a preferred / allocated site within the MNDP.



## 7. Conclusions and Recommendations / Mitigation

### 7.1 Conclusions

---

The conclusions of the MNDP's assessment have been drawn from:

- exploring the range of individual effects of the MNDP's policies and whether the SEA Objectives, as devised from the identification of 'key issues' within the Plan area, have been adequately addressed within the MNDP's overall content and;
- the effects that can be considered likely as a result of required growth, as identified in the assessment of sites.

These two factors combine to identify the effects of the MNDP as a whole.

#### 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.

##### 7.1.1.1 Employment

#### Positive Effects

The MNDP does not allocate any land for employment purposes, however does seek to ensure positive effects regarding employment growth. The MNDP includes several positive policies regarding employment growth, on a small scale, which combine to offer a cumulative strengthening.

##### 7.1.1.2 Housing

#### Significant Positive Effects

Allocations within the MNDP seek to deliver a quantum of 161 new homes. Although many of these have either been built since the start of the plan-making process, or have planning permission, these contribute to the 161 dwelling target included for the MNDP within the emerging Babergh & Mid Suffolk Councils' Joint Local Plan. 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.

##### 7.1.1.3 Design and local characteristics

#### Positive Effects

Although residential allocations are included within the MNDP that are located on Greenfield land, the MNDP



seeks positive outcomes in regard to design and preserving and enhancing local characteristics through effective policy requirements. In light of many of the alternatives to the MNDP's allocations, those sites selected for development offer better outcomes in regard to the overall settlement pattern.

#### 7.1.1.4 Infrastructure

### Uncertain Effects

Aside from open space, and community facilities, the MNDP does not include any proposals for infrastructure improvements, which may be required of development at the scale proposed within the MNDP (161 dwellings). Despite this, effects are not considered 'negative' in line with the planning status of many of the MNDP allocations, which have been determined at the District level with developer contributions either secured or factored into the viability considerations of the proposals. Uncertainty does surround the allocation to the south of Glebe Way however, and Policy MP1's requirement that a solution to divert traffic away from the core of the Conservation Area is provided.

#### 7.1.1.5 Energy efficiency

### No Effects

The MNDP includes reference to the need for energy efficiency in buildings through Policy content and requirements which reiterate those at the District level. This leads to 'no effect' being assessed at the Plan level.

#### 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 either extend further outward from the existing development boundary, or are otherwise located in Mendlesham Green, which as a hamlet settlement does not include many existing services.

#### 7.1.1.7 Sustainable transport

### No Effects

As stated within the MNDP, sustainable development for Mendlesham means carefully siting new dwellings to provide their residents with easy access to local public transport facilities. This is suitably ensured in the most part, and in comparison, with the majority of reasonable alternative site options. The MNDP includes criteria that new allocations provide walking and cycling infrastructure in order to access services in the village's core, however there is little that Neighbourhood Development Plans can ensure in the way of increasing public transport frequency or capacity, which is market driven. For this reason, 'no effects' are highlighted of the MNDP as a whole.



### 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 requirement that 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.

### 7.1.1.9 Land use compatibility

#### No Effects

There will be no effects on ensuring that neighbouring land uses are compatible arising from the MNDP's content. Incompatibilities can however be considered and addressed through other Plan policies within the MNDP and also at the District level in regard to any negative effects that may be realised, such as odour, noise or light pollution.

### 7.1.1.10 Promoting brownfield use and protecting soils

#### No Effects

The MNDP area does not contain any brownfield land that has not already been developed or earmarked for development, and none of a size that would serve to meet growth needs. The MNDP's allocations that do not have planning permission are located on what is presently agricultural land adjacent to existing development boundaries. No effects have been highlighted in regard to this SEA Objective, on the balance of needs and the fact that the land allocated has been submitted for development consideration by the landowner.

### 7.1.1.11 Landscape value

#### Positive Effects

Positive 'whole Plan' effects are highlighted regarding landscape, in consideration of policy requirements and also the MNDP's allocations. Of those that do not have planning permission, none are considered to be in locations assessed as having high sensitivity to development or land use change, and neither are any in locations identified as representing key views. In regard to the reasonable site alternatives, the allocations represent those with the least landscape impact.

### 7.1.1.12 The Historic Environment

#### Uncertain Effects

Uncertain effects are highlighted regarding the historic environment in consideration of the MNDP's policy content and allocations. The MNDP does not include explicit criteria regarding the preservation and enhancement of the historic environment as these exist at the District level. The MNDP's Policy MP1



allocation of Land south of Glebe Way, is located in close proximity to a Grade II\* listed farmhouse and its setting, which will need consideration at the planning application stage. Mitigation is possible however, as identified within the Heritage Assessment of Potential Growth Sites (Place Services, 2019) that accompanies the Plan.

#### 7.1.1.13 Open space, leisure and recreation

### Positive Effects

Regarding 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.

#### 7.1.1.14 Biodiversity

### No Effects

The MNDP has been assessed as having no effect on biodiversity in terms of designated sites and habitats. The MNDP's allocations avoid such designations and 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 MNDP's content. This is due to the location of the MNDP area being outside of the 'Zones of Influence' within which any effects could occur. 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.

#### 7.1.1.15 Flood risk

### Uncertain Effects

Uncertain effects are highlighted at the 'whole Plan' level regarding flood risk, due to land within Flood Risk Zones 2 and 3 being present in the allocation land to the south of Glebe Way. Despite this however, requirements for effects to be addressed are included within the MNDP's policies. Effects are not identified as negative within any individual site assessment or at the 'whole Plan' level, due to the possibility that the presence of land in Flood Risk Zones 2 and 3 is no barrier to development. 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.

#### 7.1.1.16 Water / air quality

### Uncertain Effects

This SEA cautiously assesses the effects of the MNDP on air and water quality indicators as no available evidence exists regarding the baseline or subsequent effects regarding air quality. District level policy exists to ensure that suitable assessments are required to be submitted alongside planning applications, however effects are raised cautiously, subject to consultation on this SEA Report and the MNDP with the statutory consultees of the Environment Agency and Natural England.



## 7.1.2 Recommendations and Suggested Mitigation Measures

This SEA makes a single recommendation for consideration by the MNDP Group to improve the MNDP's position on environmental protection on a policy level. Previously, early versions of the SEA Report, which were shared with the MNDP Group, made recommendations that have since been factored into the final MNDP. The only recommendation made at this stage is included below.

### 7.1.2.1 Policy MP1 - Land to the East of the Mendlesham Road at Mendlesham Green:

- Access to the site does not currently exist but could be achieved from Mendlesham Road to the west, however there is a general uncertainty surrounding SEA Objective 6 and access arrangements. It is recommended that the Policy be expanded to ensure that suitable access to the site could be achieved.





## 8. Next Steps

### 8.1 Consultation

---

Following the finalisation of the SEA, it requires consultation. There are three statutory consultees or 'environmental authorities' that are required to be consulted for all Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment documents. These are:

- The Environment Agency;
- Natural England; and
- Historic England.

In addition to these, consultation will seek to engage the wider community in order to encompass comprehensive public engagement. The MNDP Group may additionally wish to invite comments from focussed groups, relevant stakeholders and interested parties. The detailed arrangements for consultation are to be determined by the MNDP Group in association with MSDC.

The environmental authorities and public are to be given 'an early and effective opportunity' within appropriate time-frames to express their opinion. This includes the specific notification of the consultation documents and timeframes to those persons or bodies identified through any existing consultation databases.



## Place Services

Essex County Council

County Hall, Chelmsford, Essex CM1 1QH

T: +44 (0)333 013 6840

E: [enquiries@placeservices.co.uk](mailto:enquiries@placeservices.co.uk)

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

August 2020



Essex County Council