

Consultation Report

Appendix 16 - Responses to the SA/SEA and HRA on the Revised Deposit Plan

December 2013

NEWPORT
LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN
2011-26



LOCAL
DEVELOPMENT
PLAN

CYNLLUN
DATBLYGU
LLEOL



Newport
CITY COUNCIL
CYNGOR DINAS
Casnewydd

Representation Details

by: (No grouping)

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=I; Status=M

Rep'n/Para/Policy	Representor	Agent	Accession No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source	Type	Mode	Status	Status Modified
208.11	RSPB			24/07/2013	<input type="checkbox"/>	E	O		M	

Document:SA at Revised Deposit Plan

Summary: Object to contradiction that mitigation can occur where sites have a likely significant effect.

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Representation

The RSPB objects to the contradiction between the second and third paragraphs in the "implications for the LDP" cell in this table. Paragraph two states:-

"... any proposed development (and therefore any proposed allocations) must be categorically proven to not have a likely significant effect on the integrity of designated sites" (emphasis added).

However, this is contradicted by paragraph three which states that:-

"development that may have a significant negative effect on (protected) habitats... should seek to mitigate these effects".

If a proposed development must be categorically proven to not have effects on designated sites, then the question of mitigation should not arise. We consider that is not possible to mitigate adequately for the adverse impacts which would arise as the result of the allocation of CF13 (vii), and EM1 (i) and EM1(vi), for the reasons set out in our objection to the LDP itself.

2 2 Change to Sustainability Appraisal

Delete reference to mitigation.

3 Section

Sustainability Themes linked to the final SA objectives.

Item Question Council Responses

4 Consultant's Response

Paragraph 2 refers specifically to the approach that the SA recommended be taken in the preparation of the LDP regarding protected sites. We believe that the proposed approach does not preclude the incorporation of categorically proven mitigation measures in proposed development to reduce any likely significant effects that could have arisen in designated sites if such mitigation measures weren't put into place in the development. If categorically proven mitigation measures can't be put in place then development will not be supported.

Paragraph 3 is, by nature, a generic paragraph intended to highlight the need for appropriate mitigation of any significant negative effects that are identified on habitats and species, whether they are protected or not. Indeed this paragraph extends the need to mitigate significant negative effects to all developments, not just those in protected areas.

We understand the concerns raised with regards to the approach taken in the assessment of sites CF13 (vii), and EM1 (i) and EM1(vi) (we note that site EM1 (vi) was renamed EM1 (v) in the Revised Deposit Plan) which are either located partially or wholly in the Gwent Levels SSSI. The SA/SEA assessment of allocations inside SSSIs likely to give rise to significant negative will be revised to fully recognise the effects on the integrity of these nationally designated sites.

However, it should be noted that site EM(v) Gwent Europark already has an outline planning permission implemented in 92/0875 and as such it will not be possible to de-allocate this site from the SSSI in the LDP.

Representation Details

by: (No grouping)

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=I; Status=M

Rep'n/Para/Policy	Representor	Agent	Accession No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source	Type	Mode	Status	Status Modified
208.12/1, row 2/	RSPB			24/07/2013	<input type="checkbox"/>	E	O		M	

Document:SA at Revised Deposit Plan, para.1, row 2

Summary: Non conformity to SEA directive need to rule out development which have a significant effect.

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Representation

The RSPB considers that the Assessment Rational is deficient, in that, in setting out how the LDP will need to achieve the objective of "protect, manage and enhance biodiversity" it fails to refer to the need to not allocate land for damaging developments in locations which are UK-nationally important for nature conservation. The SA is therefore not in conformity with Requirement (f) of the SEA Directive Requirements (page 37) ("the likely significant effects...on...biodiversity") because, as stated in the main body of the RSPB's objection to the RDLDP, we consider that built development such as employment or school development will cause significant, long-term and irreversible adverse impacts on the interest features of the Gwent Levels SSSI.

Whilst the LPA might attempt to mount an argument to the effect that, at the Preferred Option stage, individual sites proposed for allocation had not been confirmed, zones were identified which clearly overlapped with SSSI boundaries, and in any event, a strategic objective of not developing within SSSIs could have been established at the Preferred Option stage of plan formulation.

2 2 Change to Sustainability Appraisal

Insert "the LDP option should rule out development on or otherwise have a significant adverse effect on any nationally important, statutorily designated site for nature conservation.

3 Section

Table 8.1

Item Question Council Responses

4 Consultant's Response

The Assessment rationale for biodiversity in Table 8.1 highlights the considerations that have been used in the SA/SEA when comparing proposed strategic LDP options.

The strategic LDP options assessment was undertaken by the SA/SEA team early on in the development of the LDP. LDP options were very broad in nature and there was little knowledge about proposed individual sites and their exact boundaries. In other cases, there were no options, for example for new school or transport development. This type of development and corresponding development sites only became a consideration at the Preferred Option stage of the plan formulation.

As indicated in the answer to the previous representation, the SA/SEA assessment of allocations inside SSSIs likely to give rise to significant negative will be revised to fully recognise the effects on the integrity of these nationally designated sites.

Representation Details

by: (No grouping)

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=I; Status=M

<i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i>	<i>Representor</i>	<i>Agent</i>	<i>Accession No</i>	<i>Date Lodged</i>	<i>Late?</i>	<i>Source</i>	<i>Type</i>	<i>Mode</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Status Modified</i>
208.13/Row 2, colu	RSPB			24/07/2013	<input type="checkbox"/>	E	O		M	

Document:SA at Revised Deposit Plan, para.Row 2, column 15

Summary: Non conformity of SEA directive propose alternative scoring to assessment of employment allocation.

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Representation

The RSPB objects to the assignment of "neutral" (no code provided in the document) to the impact of the LDP Preferred Strategy "Employment" component on the SA objective "protect, manage and enhance biodiversity" because a number of sites are proposed for allocation in the revised draft LDP. As stated above, these would have significant and permanent adverse impacts on the interest features of the Gwent Levels SSSI which would be irreversible and could not be mitigated for. Please see the main body of the RSPBs objection to the RLDP itself, for detail of the nature and severity of these adverse impacts, and for the planning policy context of this matter.

The SA is therefore not in conformity with Requirement (f) of the SEA Directive Requirements (page 37) ("the likely significant effects...on...biodiversity") because, as stated in the main body of the RSPB's objection to the RDLDP, we consider that built development such as employment or school development will cause significant, long-term and irreversible adverse impacts on the interest features of the Gwent Levels SSSI.

2 2 Change to Sustainability Appraisal

Change the score in this cell for neutral (yellow) to damaging (red).

3 Section

Table 9.4

Item Question Council Responses

4 Consultant's Response

Agree. The impact of the LDP Preferred Strategy "Employment" component on the SA objective "protect, manage and enhance biodiversity" should be assigned a "red – in conflict with SA objective" because of the proposed location of sites EM1 (i) inside the Gwent Levels SSSI.

It should be noted that site EM(v) Gwent Europark already has an outline planning permission implemented in 92/0875 and as such it will not be possible to de-allocate this site from the SSSI in the LDP.

Representation Details

by: (No grouping)

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=I; Status=M

Rep'n/Para/Policy	Representor	Agent	Accession No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source	Type	Mode	Status	Status Modified
208.14	RSPB			24/07/2013	<input type="checkbox"/>	E	O		M	

Document:SA at Revised Deposit Plan

Summary: Table 9.5 fails to address all significant environmental effects and propose new scoring for assessment.

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Representation

The RSPB objects to the statement that :-

"It is understood that the intention of the LDP is not to repeat national policy in the protection and enhancement of internationally and nationally designated sites"

Whilst this statement is factually correct, it has been erroneously employed to justify not addressing the adverse impact on proposed allocations on important sites, including the Gwent Levels SSSI. The statement does not mean that the SA should restrict itself merely to addressing impacts on locally-designated sites. Requirement (f) (page 37) is clear that a requirement is placed upon the SA – formulator to address all significant environmental effects, and Table 9.5 fails to do this.

2 2 Change to Sustainability Appraisal

In conjunction with reassigning row 2, column 15 as red, insert an explanation as to why it is red, and the recommendation to remove proposed allocations from the Gwent Levels SSSI.

3 Section

Table 9.5 Conservation of the built and natural environment.

Item Question Council Responses

4 Consultant's Response

We would like to clarify that this statement was not in any way used to downgrade the protection and enhancement of internationally and nationally designated sites which is enshrined in national policy.

The protection of internationally designated sites followed the HRA process (which was separated to that of the SA/SEA) with the HRA results fully taken into consideration in the preparation of the SA/SEA.

As for the protection and enhancement of nationally and locally designated sites and locally non-designated sites these have been dealt with within the SA/SEA.

Representation Details

by: (No grouping)

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=I; Status=M

<i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i>	<i>Representor</i>	<i>Agent</i>	<i>Accession No</i>	<i>Date Lodged</i>	<i>Late?</i>	<i>Source</i>	<i>Type</i>	<i>Mode</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Status Modified</i>
208.15/Row 3 colu	RSPB			24/07/2013	<input type="checkbox"/>	E	O		M	

Document:SA at Revised Deposit Plan, para.Row 3 column 2

Summary: Objection as there is an exclusion for the need to only allocate in sustainable locations.

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Representation

The RSPB objects to the rationale statement of what the LDP should do to achieve the SA objective of "high and stable levels of local employment in Newport" because it excludes reference to the need to only allocate land in sustainable locations.

2 2 Change to Sustainability Appraisal

Insert "sustainable" before "locations" in line 3.

3 Section

Table 8.1

Item Question Council Responses

4 Consultant's Response

The assessment rationale is made up of a number of considerations set against the SA/SEA objectives. There are a number of SA/SEA objectives which specifically deal with locational issues such as objective 1 (landscape and open space), 2 (biodiversity), 3 (use of land), 4 (air quality), 7 (water) and 9 (flooding). Therefore a location was considered sustainable if it scored positively against location related objectives.

Representation Details

by: (No grouping)

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=I; Status=M

<i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i>	<i>Representor</i>	<i>Agent</i>	<i>Accession No</i>	<i>Date Lodged</i>	<i>Late?</i>	<i>Source</i>	<i>Type</i>	<i>Mode</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Status Modified</i>
208.16/Row 4, colu	RSPB			24/07/2013	<input type="checkbox"/>	E	O		M	

Document:SA at Revised Deposit Plan, para.Row 4, column 3

Summary: Objection as there is an exclusion for the need to only allocate in sustainable locations.

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Representation

The RSPB objects to the rationale statement of what the LDP should do to achieve the SA objective of "high and stable levels of local employment in Newport" because it excludes reference to the need to only allocate land in sustainable locations.

2 2 Change to Sustainability Appraisal

Insert "sustainable" before "locations" in line 1.

3 Section

Table 9.3

Item Question Council Responses

4 Consultant's Response

The assessment rationale is made up of a number of considerations set against the SA/SEA objectives. There are a number of SA/SEA objectives which specifically deal with locational issues such as objective 1 (landscape and open space), 2 (biodiversity), 3 (use of land), 4 (air quality), 7 (water) and 9 (flooding). Therefore a location was considered sustainable if it scored positively against location related objectives.

Representation Details

by: (No grouping)

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=I; Status=M

<i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i>	<i>Representor</i>	<i>Agent</i>	<i>Accession No</i>	<i>Date Lodged</i>	<i>Late?</i>	<i>Source</i>	<i>Type</i>	<i>Mode</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Status Modified</i>
208.17/10.96/	RSPB			24/07/2013	<input type="checkbox"/>	E	O		M	

Document:SA at Revised Deposit Plan, para.10.96

Summary: Object to statement that only Duffryn employment site is in SSSI. Gwent Europark is also in SSSI.

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Representation

The RSPB objects to the statement at paragraph 10.96 that :-

"the only remaining site that includes an SSSI designation is Duffryn EM1(i)"

This is factually incorrect as EM1(vi) Gwent Europark is within the Gwent Levels SSSI. We would also like to point out that the Land South of Percoed Lane proposed school allocation also falls within the Gwent Levels SSSI. See further representations in respect of this matter.

2 2 Change to Sustainability Appraisal

Correct factual errors.

3 Section

Component 18 - Employment.

Item Question Council Responses

4 Consultant's Response

We confirm that proposed employment sites EM 1(i) Duffryn and EM1 (v) Gwent Europark in the Revised Deposit Plan include SSSI designations.

However, it should be noted that site EM(v) Gwent Europark already has an outline planning permission implemented in 92/0875 and as such it will not be possible to de-allocate this site from the SSSI in the LDP.

CF13 (vii) Land South of Percoed Lane is not an employment site and therefore commentary with regards to this site is to be found in Component 13: Existing and New Community Facilities.

Representation Details

by: (No grouping)

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=I; Status=M

<i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i>	<i>Representor</i>	<i>Agent</i>	<i>Accession No</i>	<i>Date Lodged</i>	<i>Late?</i>	<i>Source</i>	<i>Type</i>	<i>Mode</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Status Modified</i>
208.18/Objective 6/	RSPB			24/07/2013	<input type="checkbox"/>	E	O		M	

Document:SA at Revised Deposit Plan, para.Objective 6

Summary: Spelling error.

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Representation

There is a drafting error in line 2 of objective 6 the NERC Act wording refers to species of "principal importance" not "principle importance".

2 2 Change to Sustainability Appraisal

Delete "principle", insert "principal".

3 Section

Changes to the LDP Vision and objectives.

Item Question Council Responses

4 Consultant's Response

Noted.

Representation Details

Newport City Council Local Development Plan

by: (No grouping)

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=I; Status=M

<i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i>	<i>Representor</i>	<i>Agent</i>	<i>Accession No</i>	<i>Date Lodged</i>	<i>Late?</i>	<i>Source</i>	<i>Type</i>	<i>Mode</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Status Modified</i>
208.19	RSPB			24/07/2013	<input type="checkbox"/>	E	O		M	

Document:SA at Revised Deposit Plan

Summary: Objection to how SAR address proposed allocation EM1(i).

Item Question *Representation Text*

Representation Details

Newport City Council Local Development Plan

by: (No grouping)

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=I; Status=M

<i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i>	<i>Representor</i>	<i>Agent</i>	<i>Accession No</i>	<i>Date Lodged</i>	<i>Late?</i>	<i>Source</i>	<i>Type</i>	<i>Mode</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Status Modified</i>
--------------------------	--------------------	--------------	---------------------	--------------------	--------------	---------------	-------------	-------------	---------------	------------------------

1 1 Representation

The RSPB sets out here all its objections to the way in which the SAR addresses proposed allocation EM1(i) Duffryn. These are drawn from both the SAR main document and from Volume 2 of the appendices, instead of having a separate but identical representation in respect of each reference to EM1(i) throughout the documentation. This is done in the interest of avoiding needless repetition, and it is hoped that this approach is acceptable to the Local Planning Authority and to the Inspector.

Introduction:

Please see the main body of the RSPBs objection to the RLDP itself, for detail of the nature and severity of these adverse impacts, and for the planning policy context of this matter.

The RSPB objects to the way in which the SAR addresses proposed allocation EM1(i) Duffryn for the following reasons:-

The SAR underplays the severity of the adverse impacts of the EM1(i) on the Gwent Levels SSSI, assigning them a score of "moderate" adverse effects. (- -). It is difficult to understand how the significant and irreversible damage to 20.15 hectares of a SSSI as set out in the main body of the RSPBs objection to the RLDP could be merely a "moderate" adverse impact, especially bearing in mind the duties placed upon the LPA and the Inspector with regard to the protection of SSSIs, as set out in the NERC Act and high-level policy imperative for their protection, as set out in Planning Policy Wales, Edition 4.

The SAR documentation provides no justification for this downplaying of the likely significant effects, and indeed it is contradicted by paragraph 10.96 of the SAR (page 233), which refers to the adverse effects as being "significant". This is not in conformity with SEA Directive Requirement (f), as set out in page 37 of the SAR, which states that SEAs must give information on the "likely significant effects on the environment". The information supplied in respect of EM1(i) is not accurate, and therefore the SAR is deficient.

Furthermore, the RSPB objects to the assignment of a score of "sub-regional" to the likely significant effects. As SSSIs are UK-national designations, significant damage to them is by definition national. We also object to the assignment of a score of "low" in terms of the certainty of significant environmental effects manifesting themselves. Given the evidence we provide in the main body of our objection, based as it is on post-construction monitoring, the level of certainty is high. We note that there are contradictions between the above underplaying of significant adverse effects, and scores for other aspects of significance. We thus support the assignment of a maximum score for the magnitude of significant adverse effects, and the score of "permanent" for the duration of effects. It is difficult therefore to mount an argument to the effect that the impacts could have the maximum magnitude, and be permanent whilst at the same time be "moderate".

Mitigation:

The RSPB notes and welcomes a key admission at paragraph 10.97 of the SAR, which was not present in the previous version of the Deposit Plan, namely a rebuttal of the RDLDP assertion that "with care", protection of the ree features of the SSSI features is possible. (lines 3 to 4, paragraph 10.97).

The SARs response to this assertion is as follows:-

"however the effects on biodiversity are still likely to be significant in the long term, give the scale of the proposed development and potential cumulative impacts" (emphases added)

The RSPB considers this to be key issue with regard to the LDP's likely impacts on the SSSI, because for the first time, it is acknowledged that mitigation measures cannot remove or satisfactorily reduce significant adverse effects on the SSSI features.

Notwithstanding the above underplaying of the severity of the effects, and the internal contradictions in the SAR of the EM1(i), the RSPB considers that the only logical course open to the SEA formulator is to recommend deletion of that portion of EM1(i) which lies within the Gwent Levels SSSI.

The purpose of the of the SEA Directive is to : -

Representation Details

by: (No grouping)

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=I; Status=M

<i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i>	<i>Representor</i>	<i>Agent</i>	<i>Accession No</i>	<i>Date Lodged</i>	<i>Late?</i>	<i>Source</i>	<i>Type</i>	<i>Mode</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Status Modified</i>
--------------------------	--------------------	--------------	---------------------	--------------------	--------------	---------------	-------------	-------------	---------------	------------------------

"provide for a high level of protection of the environment",

and : -

"to contribute to the integration of the environmental considerations in to the preparation of adoption of plans" (Article 1 of the SEA Directive).

To fail to recommend the deletion of a proposed allocation which, by its own admission would have adverse impacts which would be of a large magnitude, and be permanent (and therefore irreversible) in nature would be to frustrate the purpose of the Directive.

The RSPB fully accepts that it is the role of the LDP formulator to delete sites, however the SEA must make an assessment and recommendations from the environmental point of view, leaving the LDP formulator to weigh up that assessment and recommendations in the context of other planning matters, in order to reach a decision. Without a full and honest assessment and recommendation, the LDP formulator is not in a position to do this.

2 2 Change to Sustainability Appraisal

The RSPB would like to see the following changes to the SAR and appendices in relation to EM1(i).

1. Re-draft paragraph 10.96 et seq of the SAR and the relevant sector table G.2 of Appendix G of Volume 2 of the Appendices in order to provide an accurate assessment of the likely significant effects thus bringing the SAR into conformity with requirement f (page 37 of the SAR). This would include:-

- Reassigning it to "strongly negative" from "moderately negative"
- Reassigning the scale from "sub regional" to "national"
- Reassigning the certainty level from "low" to "high"

2. The SAR is re-drafted to include a clear recommendation to delete that portion of EM1(i) which lies within the Gwent Levels.

3 Section

Page 233-235 of main report and pages 189-190 of Appendices Volume 2 (appendix G)
All matters relating to proposed allocations EM1(i), Duffryn

Item Question Council Responses

4 Consultant's Response

The consultant's acknowledge that the SAR doesn't consistently address the effects of proposed sites on SSSIs and this will be amended as set below:

We confirm the effect of the proposed EM1(i) site on the Gwent Levels SSSI to be strongly negative in view of the extensive area of SSSI that would be affected.

In terms of significance, the assessment scale used in the SA assigns a significant effect whether the assessment results of the assessment are moderate or strong. Therefore the report recognises that the adverse effect of EM1 (i) is significant and this resulted in a SA recommendation for only previously developed sites to be considered for development at this location.

We believe that the likely effects are sub-regional rather than national as the assessment is considering the territorial extent over which the effects will be felt and not whether the sites are a national designation.

Noted.

We agree that the SA should go further than the recommendation for only previously developed sites be considered for development (as development could still occur inside the SSSI) and recommend deletion of the portion of EM1 (i) which lies within the Gwent Levels SSSI.

Representation Details

Newport City Council Local Development Plan

by: (No grouping)

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=I; Status=M

<i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i>	<i>Representor</i>	<i>Agent</i>	<i>Accession No</i>	<i>Date Lodged</i>	<i>Late?</i>	<i>Source</i>	<i>Type</i>	<i>Mode</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Status Modified</i>
3240.11/1.21/	Pulis, Mr			04/07/2013	<input type="checkbox"/>	P	O		M	

Document:SA at Revised Deposit Plan, p.9, para.1.21

Summary: Redwick would benefit from a small housing development.

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Representation

Objective 1 states to ensure all development "makes a positive contribution to local communities". Redwick is a small village populated by an ageing community. It would benefit from a small housing development which could bring younger people/returning villagers with their children back into the community.

Item Question Council Responses

4 Consultant's Response

Mr Pulis has submitted the site for inclusion within the village boundary and provided comments to suggest the land is allocated for residential development. This is being dealt with as part of the representations received on the Revised Deposit Local Development Plan. If the Plan is amended to include such a site the final SA would be required to assess its inclusion.

Representation Details

by: (No grouping)

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=I; Status=M

Rep'n/Para/Policy	Representor	Agent	Accession No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source	Type	Mode	Status	Status Modified
3683.I1	Natural Resources Wales			26/07/2013	<input type="checkbox"/>	E	C		M	

Document:SA at Revised Deposit Plan

Summary: Cover letter, detailed comments and responses against representations 3683.I2-60.

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Representation

Our comments here, on the Sustainability Assessment Report, are made in the context of our role as consultation body under the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes (Wales) Regulations 2004.

We refer you to CCW's letter of 13 June 2012 and EAW's previous representations where we made our original comments on the Sustainability Appraisal Report of the 2012 Deposit Consultation version of the Newport LDP.

As before, NRW wishes to note and welcome the overall quality of the SA/SEA report, once again noting that many of our previously made comments, as the two separate bodies, have been taken on board in reviewing the document, including;

- Objective 2 aims to improve the efficiency in the use of energy, waste and water; minimising, adapting to or mitigating the effects of climate change; and seeking to change travel behaviour.
- The previous objective relating to the natural and built environment has been divided (Objective 5 and 6), which is in accordance with recommendations of your SA (Main Report: Table 9.5 Assessment Results: Explanations and Recommendations (January 2010), component 5).
- Updates to assessment indicator scores to reflect recommendations made previously by CCW

However, we do have some outstanding concerns with aspects of the appraisal, summarised below and reflected in more detail in the accompanying Annex:

- We welcome the recommendation that certain sites should not be carried forward to the LDP in order to avoid negative effects, in particular the reduction in size of the Queensway Meadows allocation. We are disappointed to note that this advice has not always been followed.
- We disagree with the assessment results for some strategic sites and policies, particularly with regard to SA objective 2 (protection of biodiversity). We feel that key concerns for some sites – especially those on or adjacent to the Gwent Levels SSSI designations - have not always been adequately reflected, particularly with respect to indirect impacts where proposed allocations are adjacent to the Gwent Levels SSSIs
- Mitigation measures suggested in the SA Report have not always been carried forward to the LDP. We seek reassurance that the mitigation proposed will deal effectively with the negative environmental impacts identified.

Item Question Council Responses

4 Consultant's Response

Support and concerns noted, full responses will be set out against the detailed representation.

This aspect will be addressed in the SA report and all sites partially or wholly inside SSSIs will be recommended to either remove the part of the allocation inside the SSSIs or be removed altogether as an allocation (see responses to RSPB comments above).

The SA report makes recommendations in order to mitigate the negative effects identified but the ultimate decision whether to adopt such recommendations falls on the Council. The Council has carefully considered each recommendation from the SA process and implemented the proposed mitigation measure where appropriate. Justification for not progressing with a proposed recommendation is supplied. The policy framework within the Revised Deposit LDP is considered to provide an adequate framework to deal with environmental impacts

Representation Details

by: (No grouping)

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=I; Status=M

<i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i>	<i>Representor</i>	<i>Agent</i>	<i>Accession No</i>	<i>Date Lodged</i>	<i>Late?</i>	<i>Source</i>	<i>Type</i>	<i>Mode</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Status Modified</i>
3683.I2	Natural Resources Wales			26/07/2013	<input type="checkbox"/>	E	S		M	

Document:SA at Revised Deposit Plan

Summary: Support acceptance of previous comments.

Item Question Representation Text

- 1 1 Representation
 Glossary
 We note and welcome that previous suggestions for additions to the glossary, made by CCW have been taken forward

Item Question Council Responses

- 4 Consultant's Response
 Support noted.

3683.I3	Natural Resources Wales			26/07/2013	<input type="checkbox"/>	E	S		M	
----------------	-------------------------	--	--	------------	--------------------------	---	---	--	---	--

Document:SA at Revised Deposit Plan

Summary: Support non-technical summary and acceptance of previous comments made.

Item Question Representation Text

- 1 1 Representation
 Non-technical summary
 This summary provides a clear and thorough account of the Sustainability Appraisal process to date.
 We support and welcome the fact that our (EAW) previous comment with respect to the waste hierarchy has been taken on board, in accordance with WG's Towards Zero Waste.

Item Question Council Responses

- 4 Consultant's Response
 Noted.

Representation Details

by: (No grouping)

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=I; Status=M

Rep'n/Para/Policy	Representor	Agent	Accession No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source	Type	Mode	Status	Status Modified
-------------------	-------------	-------	--------------	-------------	-------	--------	------	------	--------	-----------------

3683.14	Natural Resources Wales			26/07/2013	<input type="checkbox"/>	E			M	
---------	-------------------------	--	--	------------	--------------------------	---	--	--	---	--

Document:SA at Revised Deposit Plan

Summary: Suggest key to provide explanation for figure.

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Representation
 Figure 1.1: Newport City Council Area in Context
 This figure would benefit from a key to explain what the different kinds of shading mean.

3 Section
 Introduction

Item Question Council Responses

4 Consultant's Response
 A key will be added to Figure 11.1 to explain the different kinds of shading.

3683.15/1.17/1.25/	Natural Resources Wales			26/07/2013	<input type="checkbox"/>	E	S		M	
--------------------	-------------------------	--	--	------------	--------------------------	---	---	--	---	--

Document:SA at Revised Deposit Plan, para.1.17/1.25

Summary: Support clarity between SA and SEA process

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Representation
 1.17 – 1.25: Strategic Environmental Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal We are encouraged to see a clear explanation of the relationship between Strategic Environmental Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal and reference to the iterative nature of both processes, including the diagram at figure 1.2.

Item Question Council Responses

4 Consultant's Response
 Noted.

Representation Details

by: (No grouping)

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=I; Status=M

<i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i>	<i>Representor</i>	<i>Agent</i>	<i>Accession No</i>	<i>Date Lodged</i>	<i>Late?</i>	<i>Source</i>	<i>Type</i>	<i>Mode</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Status Modified</i>
3683.16/1.29/	Natural Resources Wales			26/07/2013	<input type="checkbox"/>	E	S		M	

Document:SA at Revised Deposit Plan, para.1.29

Summary: Support reference to HRA process

Item Question *Representation Text*

1 1 Representation

1.29: Habitats Regulations Assessment

We welcome this reference to the Habitats Regulations Assessment. Please note that we are providing a separate response to the HRA final screening report.

Item Question *Council Responses*

4 Consultant's Response

Noted.

3683.17/1.40/	Natural Resources Wales			26/07/2013	<input type="checkbox"/>	E	S		M	
----------------------	-------------------------	--	--	------------	--------------------------	---	---	--	---	--

Document:SA at Revised Deposit Plan, para.1.40

Summary: Support colour coding for ease of reference.

Item Question *Representation Text*

1 1 Representation

1.40: Navigating between the Tasks

We very much appreciate the efforts made to simplify the process of consultation. This includes the 'colour-coding approach' which does help to make the stages of the SA process more easily navigable.

Item Question *Council Responses*

4 Consultant's Response

Noted.

Representation Details

by: (No grouping)

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=I; Status=M

<i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i>	<i>Representor</i>	<i>Agent</i>	<i>Accession No</i>	<i>Date Lodged</i>	<i>Late?</i>	<i>Source</i>	<i>Type</i>	<i>Mode</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Status Modified</i>
3683.I8	Natural Resources Wales			26/07/2013	<input type="checkbox"/>	E	S		M	

Document:SA at Revised Deposit Plan

Summary: Clear explanation supplied of SA process to date.

Item Question *Representation Text*

- 1 1 Representation
2. Methodology
In general, this chapter provides a very clear explanation of the SA process that has taken place.

Item Question *Council Responses*

- 4 Consultant's Response
- Noted.

3683.I9/2.40-2.45/	Natural Resources Wales			26/07/2013	<input type="checkbox"/>	E	S		M	
---------------------------	-------------------------	--	--	------------	--------------------------	---	---	--	---	--

Document:SA at Revised Deposit Plan, para.2.40-2.45

Summary: Encouraged by the secondary and cumulative effect assessment.

Item Question *Representation Text*

- 1 1 Representation
- 2.40-2.45: Secondary and cumulative effects assessments
It is very encouraging to see explicit recognition of the importance of secondary, cumulative and synergistic effects, as well as specific assessment methodology put in place to detect such effects. We are particularly encouraged to see reference to the sensitivity and threshold limits of receptors.

Item Question *Council Responses*

- 4 Consultant's Response
- Noted.

Representation Details

by: (No grouping)

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=I; Status=M

Rep'n/Para/Policy	Representor	Agent	Accession No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source	Type	Mode	Status	Status Modified
3683.I10	Natural Resources Wales			26/07/2013	<input type="checkbox"/>	E	S		M	

Document: Revised LDP

Summary: Provided a useful record of where SEA Directive has been met.

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Representation

Table 2.6: Schedule of SEA requirements

This figure provides a useful record of where the requirements of the SEA Directive have been met within the Environment Report.

Item Question Council Responses

4 Consultant's Response

Noted.

3683.I11	Natural Resources Wales			26/07/2013	<input type="checkbox"/>	E	C		M	
----------	-------------------------	--	--	------------	--------------------------	---	---	--	---	--

Document: SA at Revised Deposit Plan

Summary: Support update of other plans and programmes and provide other plans and programme for inclusion.

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Representation

3. Other Plans and Programmes and Sustainability Objectives

This stage of the SA process was initially undertaken as part of the 'scoping stage' in 2008. However, plans and programmes dated later than 2008 have since been included. This is to be warmly welcomed as it will make both the Environment Report and the LDP more relevant in a current policy context. However, it would be worthmaking reference to this updating exercise within the methodology. We also point out that, since your SA has been published WG have begun preparations on a draft plan for options for the M4 corridor in the Newport and Monmouthshire area.

Item Question Council Responses

4 Consultant's Response

Agree. A paragraph will be added to that effect in the methodology section for other plans and programmes.

NCC provide comments to such consultations on the M4 relief road but it remains that we have an order placed on us to protect the route set out on the Constraints plan of the Revised LDP. Nothing has been decided and future decisions will be noted and appropriate updates to the plan provided when necessary.

Representation Details

by: (No grouping)

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=I; Status=M

<i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i>	<i>Representor</i>	<i>Agent</i>	<i>Accession No</i>	<i>Date Lodged</i>	<i>Late?</i>	<i>Source</i>	<i>Type</i>	<i>Mode</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Status Modified</i>
3683.I12	Natural Resources Wales			26/07/2013	<input type="checkbox"/>	E	S		M	

Document:SA at Revised Deposit Plan

Summary: Welcome table and links to health and natural greenspace and geodiversity.

Item Question *Representation Text*

1 1 Representation

Table 3.2: Sustainability themes linked to final SA objectives

We very much welcome inclusion of this table, which is very thorough and clear. It provides a useful base for the subsequent development of the SA objectives. We welcome the fact that geodiversity has been added to this table. We also support and welcome the updates made with respect to making the link between health and natural greenspace.

Item Question *Council Responses*

4 Consultant's Response

Noted.

3683.I13	Natural Resources Wales			26/07/2013	<input type="checkbox"/>	E	S		M	
-----------------	-------------------------	--	--	------------	--------------------------	---	---	--	---	--

Document:SA at Revised Deposit Plan

Summary: Welcome clarification as to % of borough in countryside.

Item Question *Representation Text*

1 1 Representation

4. Baseline characteristics for Newport

4.3: General characteristics of the County Borough of Newport We welcome the changes made here which clarify that 70% of the plan area is countryside.

Item Question *Council Responses*

4 Consultant's Response

Noted.

Representation Details

by: (No grouping)

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=I; Status=M

<i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i>	<i>Representor</i>	<i>Agent</i>	<i>Accession No</i>	<i>Date Lodged</i>	<i>Late?</i>	<i>Source</i>	<i>Type</i>	<i>Mode</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Status Modified</i>
3683.I14/4.13/	Natural Resources Wales			26/07/2013	<input type="checkbox"/>	E	S		M	

Document:SA at Revised Deposit Plan, para.4.13

Summary: Welcome reference to data limitations and gaps.

Item Question *Representation Text*

- 1 1 Representation
4.13: Data limitations and updates
We welcome the reference to data limitations and gaps encountered.

Item Question *Council Responses*

- 4 Consultant's Response
Noted.

Representation Details

by: (No grouping)

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=I; Status=M

Rep'n/Para/Policy	Representor	Agent	Accession No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source	Type	Mode	Status	Status Modified
3683.I15	Natural Resources Wales			26/07/2013	<input type="checkbox"/>	E	C		M	

Document:SA at Revised Deposit Plan

Summary: Welcome strong focus on water quality/quantity and ecological connectivity etc. Suggest detail is added on European Protected Species.

Item Question Representation Text

- 1 1 Representation
5. Identifying key sustainability issues and opportunities

Table 5.1: Key sustainability issues and opportunities

There is a great deal of content to welcome in this Table. We are particularly encouraged to see a strong focus on water quality, water quantity and the importance of maintaining ecological connectivity.

We note and welcome that previous comments made by EAW with respect to the Water Framework Directive and compliance with the Severn Basin Management Plan (RBMP) have been included within Table 5.1. An interactive map is available on the Environment Agency's website, which shows the existing and predicted (for 2015) chemical and ecological water quality:

http://maps.environmentagency.gov.uk/wiyby/dataSearchController?lang=_e&textonly=off&topic=wfd_rivers .

The majority of Newport is currently at "Moderate" status under the RBMP, and would therefore need to be improved in order to comply with the WFD. Please note that the water quality data used to inform the RBMPs includes more stringent methods of measuring water quality than GQA. As a result, rivers that were classed as passing the GQA standards may now fail under the criteria used under the WFD.

We welcome the amendments made with respect to poor air quality and CO2 emissions, in light of comments previously made by CCW. With respect to biodiversity we welcome the reference to SINC sites but recommend that detail is added with respect to European Protected Species known to be present in Newport (otters, bats, dormice and great crested newts)

Item Question Council Responses

- 4 Consultant's Response

Noted.

Paragraph to be added as follows: With respect to European Protected Species, a number of them are known to be present in Newport such as otters, bats, dormice and great crested newts.

Representation Details

by: (No grouping)

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=I; Status=M

Rep'n/Para/Policy	Representor	Agent	Accession No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source	Type	Mode	Status	Status Modified
3683.I16	Natural Resources Wales			26/07/2013	<input type="checkbox"/>	E	S		M	

Document:SA at Revised Deposit Plan

Summary: Welcome amendments to indicators and previous comments being taken into account.

Item Question Representation Text

- 1 1 Representation
6. Sustainability Appraisal Framework

We note the amendments made to the indicators and accept the logic for change (ability to measure/monitor)

We note and welcome that previous advice given by EAW with respect to Table 6.1, Objective 7 (Water Quality and Quantity) has been taken into account and there is now a target with respect to WFD requirements, as previously recommended.

Item Question Council Responses

- 4 Consultant's Response
Noted.

3683.I17	Natural Resources Wales			26/07/2013	<input type="checkbox"/>	E	C		M	
----------	-------------------------	--	--	------------	--------------------------	---	---	--	---	--

Document:SA at Revised Deposit Plan

Summary: Not explicit where vision has undergone assessment. Continue to note lack of aspiration for the natural environment.

Item Question Representation Text

- 1 1 Representation
7. Testing the LDP Objectives against the SA Objectives
7.3: Task B1

It is not explicitly stated whether the LDP vision has undergone SA assessment and this should be made clear. We agree with the recommendations given to improve the original vision. However, NRW retains the previous concerns of CCW about the Plan vision and its lack of aspiration for the natural environment (see our response to the Plan itself).

Item Question Council Responses

- 4 Consultant's Response

The LDP vision has undergone iterative generic assessment in terms of alignment with both the proposed LDP objectives and SA objectives, as the vision evolved, and recommendations made as deemed necessary at each point in time.

Representation Details

by: (No grouping)

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=I; Status=M

<i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i>	<i>Representor</i>	<i>Agent</i>	<i>Accession No</i>	<i>Date Lodged</i>	<i>Late?</i>	<i>Source</i>	<i>Type</i>	<i>Mode</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Status Modified</i>
3683.I18	Natural Resources Wales			26/07/2013	<input type="checkbox"/>	E	S		M	

Document:SA at Revised Deposit Plan

Summary: Welcome amendments to additional objectives on travel and housing.

Item Question *Representation Text*

1 1 Representation
7.14: Suggestions for additional objectives

We very much support the rationale given here and the recommendation to include an additional LDP objective, specifically addressing 'Reducing the need to travel'. We welcome that this recommendation has been addressed by amending Objective 4: Housing.

Item Question *Council Responses*

4 Consultant's Response
Noted.

Representation Details

by: (No grouping)

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=I; Status=M

Rep'n/Para/Policy	Representor	Agent	Accession No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source	Type	Mode	Status	Status Modified
3683.I19	Natural Resources Wales			26/07/2013	<input type="checkbox"/>	E	O		M	

Document:SA at Revised Deposit Plan

Summary: Question basis on which to have selected the preferred housing number.

Item Question Representation Text

- 1 1 Representation
 8. Developing the Plan Options
 8.11: Housing Numbers

We note that the decision to put forward option HN2 as the preferred option was 'marginal' and was put forward 'in the absence of further information on potential environmental effects'. From a Strategic Environmental Assessment perspective, this does not necessarily seem a robust basis on which to have selected a preferred housing number. It is not clear how this absence of information has been addressed within this Environment Report, nor is there detail of how the potential adverse environmental effects of selecting option HN2 will be dealt with at a strategic policy level (although we appreciate there are some details of mitigation for individual strategic sites).

Item Question Council Responses

- 4 Consultant's Response

At the time the Strategic Options assessment was undertaken by the SA/SEA team there was little detail available about the location of development associated with the options. On the basis of the information made available by NCC, option NH2 emerged as the preferred option, but only marginally. This is clearly highlighted in the SA Report and recommendations were made to NCC. Further work regarding the environmental effects of the options being considered by NCC was carried out by the team preparing the LDP and the preferred housing option that emerged focus on the development of previously developed sites although some development will be on green sites. It is not the role of the SA/SEA to determine which of the options should be chosen as the basis for the LDP Preferred Options; that responsibility falls to the Local Planning Authority team preparing the plan.

The LDP Revised Deposit Plan (2013) provides an explanation of the preferred option chosen in relation to housing numbers. The environmental impact of the strategy has been considered in relation to the capacity of the plan area to accommodate such numbers, with a focus on the development of previously developed sites. "The focus on reusing previously developed land will help in the protection of the countryside, including the Green Belt on the Cardiff boundary (currently the only formally designated Green Belt in Wales). Areas which are assessed as being of particular value using the Landmap methodology will have their character protected as Special Landscape Areas." Following the selection of a preferred option, the SA has assessed effects and recommended mitigation in relation to the detailed proposals (Stage B5).

Representation Details

by: (No grouping)

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=I; Status=M

<i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i>	<i>Representor</i>	<i>Agent</i>	<i>Accession No</i>	<i>Date Lodged</i>	<i>Late?</i>	<i>Source</i>	<i>Type</i>	<i>Mode</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Status Modified</i>
3683.I20/8.12/	Natural Resources Wales			26/07/2013	<input type="checkbox"/>	E	S		M	

Document:SA at Revised Deposit Plan, para.8.12

Summary: Welcome the mitigation and enhancement measures.

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Representation
8.21: Village Development

We note the decision to choose a hybrid of options V2 and V3, which perform less well against environmental objectives than V1. In our response to the Initial Sustainability Appraisal Report (March, 2010), we suggested the need to include a suite of recommended mitigation measures and policy refinements to address this decision. We welcome the addition of mitigation and enhancement measures.

Item Question Council Responses

4 Consultant's Response

The hybrid recommended only includes the CfSH levels proposed in option V3, with option V2 being the majority of the recommended hybrid. This is recommended as mitigation for negative effects of V2. Further mitigation and enhancement measures have been identified in the Revised Deposit Plan could include:

- Enhancement of public transport accessibility;
- Enhancing air, water, biodiversity and human health through the provision of green infrastructure;
- Creating buffer zones from activities that may generate increased noise pollution;
- Sensitive design; and
- Enhancing community integration through the provision of facilities and employment as part of the site development.

Representation Details

by: (No grouping)

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=I; Status=M

<i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i>	<i>Representor</i>	<i>Agent</i>	<i>Accession No</i>	<i>Date Lodged</i>	<i>Late?</i>	<i>Source</i>	<i>Type</i>	<i>Mode</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Status Modified</i>
3683.I21	Natural Resources Wales			26/07/2013	<input type="checkbox"/>	E	S		M	

Document:SA at Revised Deposit Plan

Summary: Welcome the recommendation and Councils response.

Item Question *Representation Text*

1 1 Representation

9. Preferred Strategy Compatibility Assessment

Table 9.6: SA Recommendations and NCC Responses

This record of the Council's response to the SA recommendations is good practice and is to be welcomed. We are very encouraged to see that the majority of SA recommendations have been agreed by the Council and amendments made accordingly. Conservation of the Natural and Built Environment– we welcome the recommendation concerned with 'mapping sites of local importance for biodiversity'.

Item Question *Council Responses*

4 Consultant's Response

Noted.

Representation Details

by: (No grouping)

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=I; Status=M

<i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i>	<i>Representor</i>	<i>Agent</i>	<i>Accession No</i>	<i>Date Lodged</i>	<i>Late?</i>	<i>Source</i>	<i>Type</i>	<i>Mode</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Status Modified</i>
3683.I22	Natural Resources Wales			26/07/2013	<input type="checkbox"/>	E	S		M	

Document:SA at Revised Deposit Plan

Summary: Support provision of useful and informative table.

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Representation
10. Assessment of Detailed Policies (and Appendix G: Detailed Assessment Tables)

Table 10.2: Assessment Rationale

We reiterate CCW's previous comment that this is a useful and informative Table that will also help to ensure that mitigation measures identified in previous sections are adequately addressed and incorporated into strategic and detailed policies.

Item Question Council Responses

4 Consultant's Response
Noted.

3683.I23	Natural Resources Wales			26/07/2013	<input type="checkbox"/>	E	S		M	
-----------------	-------------------------	--	--	------------	--------------------------	---	---	--	---	--

Document:SA at Revised Deposit Plan

Summary: Welcome detail in scoring system.

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Representation
10.15: Results of the Assessment

We welcome the level of detail in the scoring system, particularly the distinction between 'neutral', 'positive/negative' and 'uncertain' outcomes.

Item Question Council Responses

4 Consultant's Response
Noted.

Representation Details

by: (No grouping)

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=I; Status=M

<i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i>	<i>Representor</i>	<i>Agent</i>	<i>Accession No</i>	<i>Date Lodged</i>	<i>Late?</i>	<i>Source</i>	<i>Type</i>	<i>Mode</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Status Modified</i>
3683.I24	Natural Resources Wales			26/07/2013	<input type="checkbox"/>	E	S		M	

Document:SA at Revised Deposit Plan

Summary: Support positive assessment against all SA objectives.

Item Question *Representation Text*

1 1 Representation

Component 1: Sustainability – we note the positive assessment against all of the SA objectives and support all 7 recommendations made. We are particularly encouraged to see strong recognition of the multi-functional role of green infrastructure.

Item Question *Council Responses*

4 Consultant's Response

Noted.

3683.I25	Natural Resources Wales			26/07/2013	<input type="checkbox"/>	E	C		M	
-----------------	-------------------------	--	--	------------	--------------------------	---	---	--	---	--

Document:SA at Revised Deposit Plan

Summary: More should be made of green infrastructure.

Item Question *Representation Text*

1 1 Representation

Component 2: Health & Amenity – we agree with the 2 recommendations made.
More should be made of the opportunity to build green infrastructure into development design and to recognise the benefits that the natural environment can have for health and amenity.

Item Question *Council Responses*

4 Consultant's Response

Noted.

Representation Details

by: (No grouping)

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=I; Status=M

<i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i>	<i>Representor</i>	<i>Agent</i>	<i>Accession No</i>	<i>Date Lodged</i>	<i>Late?</i>	<i>Source</i>	<i>Type</i>	<i>Mode</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Status Modified</i>
3683.I26	Natural Resources Wales			26/07/2013	<input type="checkbox"/>	E	C		M	

Document:SA at Revised Deposit Plan

Summary: Consider that a minor/moderate negative score should be given,

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Representation

Component 6: Green Belt, Landscape and Countryside Development – we consider that inclusion of CE1(vi) and CE2(vi) within this component, and the possibility of mineral working within Green Belt and Green Wedges, means that a minor/moderate negative score should be given for SA Objective 1 (Protection of open space).

Item Question Council Responses

4 Consultant's Response

Agree that a minor negative effect should be given.

3683.I27	Natural Resources Wales			26/07/2013	<input type="checkbox"/>	E	S		M	
-----------------	-------------------------	--	--	------------	--------------------------	---	---	--	---	--

Document:SA at Revised Deposit Plan

Summary: Welcome recommendation and clarity of green infrastructure.

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Representation

Component 7: Conservation of the Natural Environment – we very much welcome the discussion around 'environmental spaces' and recognition of the multifunctional value of the natural environment. We support the recommendation to further recognise the role of green infrastructure and would welcome clarity on the Council's definition 'green infrastructure' and what it encompasses.

Item Question Council Responses

4 Consultant's Response

Noted.

Representation Details

by: (No grouping)

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=I; Status=M

Rep'n/Para/Policy	Representor	Agent	Accession No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source	Type	Mode	Status	Status Modified
3683.I28	Natural Resources Wales			26/07/2013	<input type="checkbox"/>	E	O		M	

Document:SA at Revised Deposit Plan

Summary: Concerns on housing sites H1(56) and H1(57) need to consider cumulative effects, welcome recognition of sites adjacent or contain areas of environmental protection.

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Representation

Component 10: Housing – because of the inclusion of policies H1(56) and H1(57) in this component, NRW has concerns that development will lead to the loss of seminatural habitat and reduced connectivity. As such, this component should score a moderate negative for SA Objectives 1 (Protection of open space). We welcome that Objective 2 (Protection of Biodiversity) has been update to a moderate negative due to the location of allocations.

We welcome the recognition that a number of housing sites are either adjacent to, or contain areas with, a high level of environmental protection and could cumulatively lead to significant effects on biodiversity, even with the application of the relevant LDP policies. The recommendation is that the cumulative environmental effect of housing development should be considered when individual planning applications are assessed against other LDP policy criteria that seek to protect the natural and built environment and that this consideration could be included in policy SP10. We note that Policy H1 paragraph 5.4 refers to sites in close proximity to the River Usk and the requirement to carry out an HRA. However, no reference is made to sites in close proximity to/within other sensitive locations and we would like to see further detail as to how this recommendation will be met with respect to such sites. We welcome the recommendation to develop SPG in order to maintain the integrity of protected areas, with respect to the development of Gypsy and Traveller sites.

Item Question Council Responses

4 Consultant's Response

This representation is confusing as it refers to site references as in the Deposit Plan rather than the Revised Deposit Plan. It should be noted that in the Deposit Plan site H56 was Woodland Site, Ringland and site H57 was Hartridge Farm Road, both housing sites. In the Revised Deposit Plan site H56 was relabelled site H55 and remained as a housing site but site H57 was removed as a housing allocation and subsequently allocated for use as a Gypsy and Traveller allocation.

Site H57 has therefore been assessed as a Gypsy and Traveller allocation in the last iteration of assessment of the plan.

However, the SA report has wrongly considered that site H55 has been removed from allocation, although it indicates that the overall scoring remained unchanged despite the removal given the consideration of the other sites.

LDP's Policy GP5 General Development Principles – Natural Environment indicates that "developers should consider wildlife at the pre application stage and must seek to avoid impacting on wildlife features in line with the relevant statutory and nonstatutory provisions. Developments should also seek to provide biodiversity enhancement, whatever the current level. Supplementary Planning Guidance on Wildlife and Development will be produced in order to advise developers how to achieve high quality natural environments while addressing statutory duties.

Development proposals should be accompanied by appropriate ecological surveys and appraisals as requested by the Council."

In addition, the Council will look at the supporting text of policy GP5 and look to clarify that the need to avoid/mitigate and then compensate for sites in close proximity to/within other sensitive locations is not left to interpretation through the relevant legislation

Representation Details

by: (No grouping)

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=I; Status=M

<i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i>	<i>Representor</i>	<i>Agent</i>	<i>Accession No</i>	<i>Date Lodged</i>	<i>Late?</i>	<i>Source</i>	<i>Type</i>	<i>Mode</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Status Modified</i>
3683.I29	Natural Resources Wales			26/07/2013	<input type="checkbox"/>	E	S		M	

Document:SA at Revised Deposit Plan

Summary: Welcome further emphasis on linking infrastructure.

Item Question *Representation Text*

1 1 Representation

Component 14: Developer Contributions - we welcome the recommendation to further emphasise the importance of linking infrastructure (such as transport or green infrastructure) to sustainable modes of transport.

Item Question *Council Responses*

4 Consultant's Response

Noted.

Representation Details

by: (No grouping)

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=I; Status=M

<i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i>	<i>Representor</i>	<i>Agent</i>	<i>Accession No</i>	<i>Date Lodged</i>	<i>Late?</i>	<i>Source</i>	<i>Type</i>	<i>Mode</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Status Modified</i>
3683.I30	Natural Resources Wales			26/07/2013	<input type="checkbox"/>	E	O		M	

Document:SA at Revised Deposit Plan

Summary: Concerns over allocation at Coedkernew for a train station, should have a negative score.

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Representation

Component 15: Transport - because of the inclusion of policy T1 (Coedkernew) in this component, NRW has concerns that development will lead to the direct loss of an area of the Gwent Levels St Brides SSSI. The interconnected nature of the drainage system also means that there is potential for detrimental effects over a wider area of the SSSI and may exacerbate existing water quality concerns. As such, the assessment for this policy should score a moderate/major negative for SA Objective 2 (Protection of biodiversity) and Objective 7 (Water quality).

Item Question Council Responses

4 Consultant's Response

Agree that score should be moderate for SA Objective 2 and Objective 7.

The SA already recognises that allocation at Coedkernew is likely to result in the Percoed Reen being crossed. This is a known commuting otter habitat connecting to the River Usk SAC (otters are a qualifying feature of this European site) and makes the following recommendations which are considered sufficient:

- Any works affecting the Percoed Reen must be completed in a sensitive manner for otters.
- The Reen must be maintained in situ (this watercourse must not be culverted) with a minimum of 5m of bank side habitat retained on either side.
- Developers will be required to complete an otter survey to determine levels of otter activity in the affected area.
- A sensitive working programme must be compiled to minimise disturbance to this species (this may include obtaining relevant licenses from CCW). Furthermore, should the Percoed Reen need to be crossed, the crossing will be designed to ensure continued otter movement up and downstream (even in flood conditions). In accordance with Policy GP5 the developer will be expected to carry out a Habitat Regulation Assessment of these works as part of the planning process.

Due to the proximity of the Coedkernew rail site to the SSSI, the interconnected nature of the drainage system means that there is potential for detrimental effects over a wider area of the SSSI and may exacerbate existing water quality concerns. In recognition of this potential effect, it is recommended that as part of the planning process the developer will need to ensure that water quality is not impacted upon negatively.

Representation Details

by: (No grouping)

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=I; Status=M

<i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i>	<i>Representor</i>	<i>Agent</i>	<i>Accession No</i>	<i>Date Lodged</i>	<i>Late?</i>	<i>Source</i>	<i>Type</i>	<i>Mode</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Status Modified</i>
3683.I31	Natural Resources Wales			26/07/2013	<input type="checkbox"/>	E	O		M	

Document:SA at Revised Deposit Plan

Summary: Object to allocation for Duffryn Link Road, should have a negative score.

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Representation

Component 17: Highways Infrastructure – because of the inclusion of policy SP16(iii) in this component, we welcome the fact that a strong negative score has been given against SA Objective 2 (Protection of biodiversity). We have serious concerns in relation to a western extension of the southern distributor road which is located within, and has the potential to have adverse effects on, the Gwent Levels St Brides SSSI. We note the large number of significant negatives for this component, especially against environmental objectives. The recommendation is made that Policy GP4 be amended to include a need for Travel Plans and Construction Management Plans but cross-reference to the LDP itself indicates that this policy has not been amended.

Item Question Council Responses

4 Consultant's Response

The need for Travel Plans is noted in Policy SP15 and the need for Construction Management Plans is noted in Policy GP7 of the Revised LDP.

Representation Details

by: (No grouping)

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=I; Status=M

Rep'n/Para/Policy	Representor	Agent	Accession No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source	Type	Mode	Status	Status Modified
3683.I32	Natural Resources Wales			26/07/2013	<input type="checkbox"/>	E	O		M	

Document:SA at Revised Deposit Plan

Summary: Agree with negative assessment, need further clarification as to national economic benefit evaluation. Concern over indirect impacts on drainage.

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Representation

Component 18: Employment – we note with concern (and agree with) the significant negative results for this component against multiple environmental objectives. These include landscape (especially development in the Eastern Expansion Area and the River Usk corridor) and biodiversity (allocated employment sites will impact on local, national and international conservation designations). Policy EM1 (i) and (ii) requires that development may be permitted provided that "the national economic benefits of the proposal outweigh the environmental impacts...". We agree with the statement made that that it is unclear how such an evaluation may be undertaken as the economic value cannot be directly compared to environmental value or impacts. We note that Strategic Site 5 (including Queensway Meadows) has been reduced in size and no longer lies within the Gwent Levels: Nash and Goldcliff SSSI. However we point out the strong possibility for indirect impacts as the revised allocated area lies within the same drainage area as the SSSI.

Item Question Council Responses

4 Consultant's Response

We agree that the SA should go further than the recommendation for only previously developed sites be considered for development (as development would still occur inside the SSSI) and recommend deletion of the portion of EM1 (i) which lies within the Gwent Levels SSSI.

The Revised Deposit Plan has excluded much of the employment sites from SSSI designations. Policy EM1(i) has been amended in the Revised Deposit Plan thus the need to provide evidence that the economic benefits outweigh the environment impacts is no longer in the policy wording.

LDP's Policy GP5 General Development Principles – Natural Environment indicates that "developers should consider wildlife at the pre application stage and must seek to avoid impacting on wildlife features in line with the relevant statutory and nonstatutory provisions. Developments should also seek to provide biodiversity enhancement, whatever the current level. Supplementary Planning Guidance on Wildlife and Development will be produced in order to advise developers how to achieve high quality natural environments while addressing statutory duties. Development proposals should be accompanied by appropriate ecological surveys and appraisals as requested by the Council."

This should provide the necessary level of protection.

Representation Details

by: (No grouping)

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=I; Status=M

<i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i>	<i>Representor</i>	<i>Agent</i>	<i>Accession No</i>	<i>Date Lodged</i>	<i>Late?</i>	<i>Source</i>	<i>Type</i>	<i>Mode</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Status Modified</i>
3683.I33	Natural Resources Wales			26/07/2013	<input type="checkbox"/>	E	O		M	

Document:SA at Revised Deposit Plan

Summary: Object to site allocation at EM1(i) Duffryn due to impact on SSSI

Item Question *Representation Text*

1 1 Representation

Allocation EM1(i) (Duffryn – Strategic Site 28) – development at this site will lead to the direct loss of a large area of the Gwent Levels: St Brides SSSI. Whilst we note and support the reduction in size of this allocation within the SSSI boundary there would still be direct loss of SSSI area as well as the potential for indirect impacts due to the interconnected nature of the drainage. It is NRW's view that the SA should recommend that this site not be carried forward to the LDP.

Item Question *Council Responses*

4 Consultant's Response

Agree. SA will recommend that only the portion of EM1 (i) which lies outside the Gwent Levels SSSI is carried forward in the LDP.

Representation Details

by: (No grouping)

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=I; Status=M

Rep'n/Para/Policy	Representor	Agent	Accession No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source	Type	Mode	Status	Status Modified
3683.I34	Natural Resources Wales			26/07/2013	<input type="checkbox"/>	E	O		M	

Document:SA at Revised Deposit Plan

Summary: Table should set out detail of potential mitigation for identified effects.

Item Question Representation Text

2 2 Change to Sustainability Appraisal

11. Cumulative, Synergistic and Indirect Effects

Table 11.1: Summary of cumulative, synergistic and indirect effects We welcome this Table, which is a concerted effort to draw out potential cumulative, synergistic and indirect effects for SA 'themes'. It is not clear what the 'significance' column refers to and, while we can see some very outline ideas for mitigation, it is disappointing that the Table does not contain detail about potential mitigation for the effects identified. Under 'Biodiversity', for example, it states that 'measures may minimise effects'. This does not help to identify specific action that will mitigate for the adverse effects identified. While we understand that there is more mitigation detail in several of the appendices, it would be beneficial to have listed the appropriate mitigation here.

Item Question Council Responses

4 Consultant's Response

The significance column in Table 11.1 refers to the significance of the cumulative effects identified and indicates whether the effects are short, medium or long term. These effects have been arrived at assuming that no mitigation is put into place and therefore represent the worst case scenario. Potential long term adverse effects of development have been highlighted on landscape and open spaces, biodiversity, flooding and coastal erosion, should appropriate mitigation measures not be put in place. Appropriate mitigation measures will only be confirmed at the planning application stage over which the SA/SEA has little influence, apart from ensuring that certain mitigation measures are referred to in the LDP itself.

Details about mitigation are provided in detail in section 10 (given that each development site has unique characteristics that requires a unique combination of mitigation measures) and generically in section 12 of the report.

Representation Details

by: (No grouping)

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=I; Status=M

<i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i>	<i>Representor</i>	<i>Agent</i>	<i>Accession No</i>	<i>Date Lodged</i>	<i>Late?</i>	<i>Source</i>	<i>Type</i>	<i>Mode</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Status Modified</i>
3683.I35	Natural Resources Wales			26/07/2013	<input type="checkbox"/>	E	S		M	

Document:SA at Revised Deposit Plan

Summary: Welcome outline of what mitigation is and support reference to HRA.

Item Question *Representation Text*

1 1 Representation

12. Mitigation

We welcome this outline of what mitigation is. We are encouraged to note once again that additional measures identified as a result of the Habitats Regulations Assessment have been incorporated into the LDP.

Item Question *Council Responses*

4 Consultant's Response

Noted.

3683.I36	Natural Resources Wales			26/07/2013	<input type="checkbox"/>	E	S		M	
-----------------	-------------------------	--	--	------------	--------------------------	---	---	--	---	--

Document:SA at Revised Deposit Plan

Summary: Support intention to monitor SA alongside LDP.

Item Question *Representation Text*

1 1 Representation

13. Monitoring

We support the intention to conduct SA monitoring alongside monitoring of the LDP. We also welcome the intention to focus on creating a balanced, effective, yet achievable set of monitoring criteria.

Item Question *Council Responses*

4 Consultant's Response

Noted.

Representation Details

by: (No grouping)

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=I; Status=M

Rep'n/Para/Policy	Representor	Agent	Accession No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source	Type	Mode	Status	Status Modified
-------------------	-------------	-------	--------------	-------------	-------	--------	------	------	--------	-----------------

3683.137	Natural Resources Wales			26/07/2013	<input type="checkbox"/>	P	C		M	
-----------------	-------------------------	--	--	------------	--------------------------	---	---	--	---	--

Document:SA at Revised Deposit Plan

Summary: Support potential indicators would welcome an addition for geodiversity.

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Representation
 Table 13.1: Monitoring programme
 In our opinion, the potential suite of indicators outlined form a reasonably thorough and diverse basis for a monitoring programme. We recommend that an indicator be added for geodiversity.

Item Question Council Responses

4 Consultant's Response
 Noted.

3683.138	Natural Resources Wales			26/07/2013	<input type="checkbox"/>	E	C		M	
-----------------	-------------------------	--	--	------------	--------------------------	---	---	--	---	--

Document:SA at Revised Deposit Plan

Summary: Require clarification as to what level of assessment supporting documents e.g. SPG have undergone.

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Representation
 14. Conclusions
 We note the conclusion here that predicted negative effects of the LDP can be mitigated through the implementation of measures included in LDP policies, but will also need to be supported by other documents including the Pillgwenlly Regeneration Framework and the East Newport Development Framework Plan SPG. It is not clear whether these supporting documents have themselves undergone Sustainability Appraisal/Strategic Environmental Assessment and we request that the assessment status of the Plans listed be clarified.

Item Question Council Responses

4 Consultant's Response
 The supporting documents referenced will undergo SA/SEA as part of the separate processes of preparation of such documents. Such information is not currently available.

Representation Details

by: (No grouping)

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=I; Status=M

<i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i>	<i>Representor</i>	<i>Agent</i>	<i>Accession No</i>	<i>Date Lodged</i>	<i>Late?</i>	<i>Source</i>	<i>Type</i>	<i>Mode</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Status Modified</i>
3683.I39	Natural Resources Wales			26/07/2013	<input type="checkbox"/>	E	O		M	

Document:SA at Revised Deposit Plan

Summary: Not clear why candidate sites have been agglomerated which has lead to uncertainty.

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Representation
Appendix D – Candidate Sites Strategic Assessment

D.1.3: Assessment Methodology

As previously noted by CCW, it is not clear why the candidate sites have been agglomerated to form strategic sites, prior to assessment. It would be beneficial to offer a rationale for this methodology. As it stands, this led to some uncertainty and confusion, namely:

- it is difficult to ascertain whether the Sustainability Appraisal has been applied to all candidate sites. For example, we cannot determine which strategic site encompasses site H16(iii)

- cross-referencing between the LDP candidate sites and the SA strategic sites was difficult. The sites were numbered differently and presented differently on the respective site location maps. The boundaries of LDP candidate sites are not the same as those of the strategic sites having undergone assessment.

- some of the strategic sites are large and it is difficult to determine which assessment results are attributable to which of the component candidate sites. In recommending not to take forward Solutia (strategic site 5), for example, is the SA recommending that both component candidate sites should not be taken forward to the LDP?

It is not clear which (if any) of the candidate sites have been brought forward from the Unitary Development Plan or whether previously committed sites without planning permission have been subject to the SA process or simply rolled forward into the LDP.

Item Question Council Responses

Representation Details

by: (No grouping)

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=I; Status=M

Rep'n/Para/Policy	Representor	Agent	Accession No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source	Type	Mode	Status	Status Modified
-------------------	-------------	-------	--------------	-------------	-------	--------	------	------	--------	-----------------

4 Consultant's Response

As explained in the SA report, the original site appraisal was undertaken by NCC, to inform the development of the LDP. The Newport Sites Assessment Methodology led to the agglomeration of a number of candidate sites, forming the 46 strategic sites as shown in Table D.1. The original candidate sites were first assessed for compatibility by the LDP team using the candidate sites form. The subsequent candidate sites forming the strategic sites have been assessed to demonstrate compatibility with the SA process. Sites were assessed from a strategic perspective to reduce repetition in assessments due to their similar locational characteristics. Where there were notable differences, these were noted in the commentary and recommendations made.

The Strategic Candidate Sites assessments (see Appendix D) assessed sites submitted to the Council for consideration in the LDP, in September 2008 (major sites) and March 2009 (other sites). Sites were initially assessed by the Council, and were then assessed in relation to SA objectives on a broad scale. To clarify H16(iii) was not submitted as a Candidate site and therefore will not be found in that assessment. The assessment has been undertaken in Appendix G page 69 onwards.

These assessments have been used to inform the SA of the LDP Deposit Plan policies (February 2012) that contains site allocations (components 10, 11, 18 and 19). The candidate sites information was updated in December 2012, the results of which were integrated into an update to the policies assessment in December 2012 (Appendix G). Sites that were not considered as Candidate Sites, but were included within the LDP Deposit Plan policies as site allocations, have also been assessed. Information has been provided by NCC pertaining to other sites that are included in the policies but were not assessed as candidate sites at the earlier stage. Specific site assessment information is integrated into the LDP Deposit Plan policies assessments (February 2012) where appropriate. Again, this information was updated in December 2012 and integrated into the policies assessment included within Appendix G.

Additional Gypsy and Traveller sites were assessed following the consultation on the Deposit LDP and accompanying SAR (February 2012 consultation). These assessments were undertaken to inform the development of the Revised Deposit LDP. The resulting policies included with the Revised Deposit LDP have been assessed as part of the June 2013 assessments.

Cross-referencing between sites to be provided in the SA report.

See responses above. The assessment in Appendix D for Solutia did recommend that both of component candidate sites were not taken forward.

Indication of these sites to be provided in the SA Report.

3683.140	Natural Resources Wales		26/07/2013	<input type="checkbox"/>	E	C	M
-----------------	-------------------------	--	------------	--------------------------	---	---	---

Document:SA at Revised Deposit Plan

Summary: Assessment for transport proposals should have been undertaken.

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Representation

We note that no sites safeguarded for transport proposals have undergone assessment, which would have been good practice.

Item Question Council Responses

4 Consultant's Response

Sites safeguarded for transport proposals have been assessed as part of the assessment of Component 15 (see Appendix G, Table G.16). These sites were not considered at the Candidate Sites stage.

Representation Details

by: (No grouping)

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=I; Status=M

<i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i>	<i>Representor</i>	<i>Agent</i>	<i>Accession No</i>	<i>Date Lodged</i>	<i>Late?</i>	<i>Source</i>	<i>Type</i>	<i>Mode</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Status Modified</i>
3683.I41	Natural Resources Wales			26/07/2013	<input type="checkbox"/>	E	O		M	

Document:SA at Revised Deposit Plan

Summary: Clarity why SINC's were not considered as part of the SA assessment.

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Representation

Table D.3: Candidate Sites SA Framework and Rationale

We very much welcome this detailed and modified SA Framework, which seems to be a clear, robust and thorough tool for undertaking SA of the candidate sites. For objective 2, it is not clear whether the 'environmental protection designations' include SINC's. These local sites should have been considered as part of the SA assessment and it is not clear whether that has taken place. Clarity would be welcomed.

Item Question Council Responses

4 Consultant's Response

We can confirm that the environmental protection designations include SINC's. The assessments were undertaken against constraints maps of Newport County Borough showing the following data:

- Gwent Levels Historic Landscape
- SPA;
- SAC;
- SSSI's;
- SINC's;
- RAMSAR;
- Welsh Index of Multiple Deprivation;
- Air Quality Management Areas;
- TAN15; and
- Listed Buildings

Representation Details

by: (No grouping)

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=I; Status=M

<i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i>	<i>Representor</i>	<i>Agent</i>	<i>Accession No</i>	<i>Date Lodged</i>	<i>Late?</i>	<i>Source</i>	<i>Type</i>	<i>Mode</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Status Modified</i>
3683.I42	Natural Resources Wales			26/07/2013	<input type="checkbox"/>	E	C		M	

Document:SA at Revised Deposit Plan

Summary: Note reference to most sustainable sites.

Item Question *Representation Text*

- 1 1 Representation
D.2.4: Conformity with the SA Criteria
We note the reference to here to the 3 most sustainable sites (Whiteheads, Pirelli, and Retail East).

Item Question *Council Responses*

- 4 Consultant's Response
Noted.

3683.I43	Natural Resources Wales			26/07/2013	<input type="checkbox"/>	E	S		M	
-----------------	-------------------------	--	--	------------	--------------------------	---	---	--	---	--

Document:SA at Revised Deposit Plan

Summary: Welcome cross reference to HRA.

Item Question *Representation Text*

- 1 1 Representation
D.2.8: Predicted Conflict with Biodiversity and Habitats Regulations
We welcome the cross-reference here to the Habitats Regulations Assessment. We are providing a separate response to the HRA final screening report.

Item Question *Council Responses*

- 4 Consultant's Response
Noted.

Representation Details

by: (No grouping)

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=I; Status=M

Rep'n/Para/Policy	Representor	Agent	Accession No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source	Type	Mode	Status	Status Modified
3683.I44	Natural Resources Wales			26/07/2013	<input type="checkbox"/>	E	C		M	

Document:SA at Revised Deposit Plan

Summary: Note which sites have been recommended not to be carried forward into the Plan.

Item Question Representation Text

- 1 1 Representation
 D.2.14: Recommendations
 We note here the SA recommendation that the following sites should not be carried forward to the LDP
 – Solutia, Michaelston, Marshfield West, Marshfield East and Airport.

Item Question Council Responses

- 4 Consultant's Response
 Noted.

3683.I45	Natural Resources Wales			26/07/2013	<input type="checkbox"/>	E	S		M	
-----------------	-------------------------	--	--	------------	--------------------------	---	---	--	---	--

Document:SA at Revised Deposit Plan

Summary: Welcome the update to the scoring of the site.

Item Question Representation Text

- 1 1 Representation
 Table D.4: Site Assessment Results
 Rogerstone (strategic site 8) – we welcome the update to scores here, as recommended by CCW so that this site scores red with respect to SA objective (biodiversity)

Item Question Council Responses

- 4 Consultant's Response
 Noted with thanks.

Representation Details

by: (No grouping)

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=I; Status=M

<i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i>	<i>Representor</i>	<i>Agent</i>	<i>Accession No</i>	<i>Date Lodged</i>	<i>Late?</i>	<i>Source</i>	<i>Type</i>	<i>Mode</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Status Modified</i>
3683.I46	Natural Resources Wales			26/07/2013	<input type="checkbox"/>	E	O		M	

Document:SA at Revised Deposit Plan

Summary: Propose amended scoring against protection of greenspace.

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Representation

Table D.4: Site Assessment Results

Duffryn (strategic site 28) –this site should score red for objective 3.15 (protection of greenspace and connectivity). The site is currently open countryside so we cannot see how development there could be considered to protect ecological connectivity.

Item Question Council Responses

4 Consultant's Response

Noted.

3683.I47	Natural Resources Wales			26/07/2013	<input type="checkbox"/>	E	S		M	
-----------------	-------------------------	--	--	------------	--------------------------	---	---	--	---	--

Document:SA at Revised Deposit Plan

Summary: Welcome update to scoring on the site.

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Representation

Table D.4: Site Assessment Results

Castleton (strategic site 33) – we welcome the update to scores here, as recommended by CCW so that this site scores red with respect to SA objective (biodiversity) due to its proximity to the Gwent Levels: St Brides SSSI.

Item Question Council Responses

4 Consultant's Response

Noted.

Representation Details

by: (No grouping)

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=I; Status=M

Rep'n/Para/Policy	Representor	Agent	Accession No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source	Type	Mode	Status	Status Modified
-------------------	-------------	-------	--------------	-------------	-------	--------	------	------	--------	-----------------

3683.I48	Natural Resources Wales			26/07/2013	<input type="checkbox"/>	E	O		M	
-----------------	-------------------------	--	--	------------	--------------------------	---	---	--	---	--

Document:SA at Revised Deposit Plan

Summary: Propose amended to scoring against protection of greenspace.

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Representation

Eastern Expansion Area (strategic site 39) – this site should score red for objective 3.15 (protection of greenspace and connectivity). The site is currently open countryside so we cannot see how development of up to 1100 houses there could be considered to protect ecological connectivity.

Item Question Council Responses

4 Consultant's Response

It should be noted that this site already has planning permission which does not remove all greenfield space. Open spaces will be provided which will provide some connectivity. Thus the score in the SA report reflects the known conditions of the planning application.

3683.I49	Natural Resources Wales			26/07/2013	<input type="checkbox"/>	E	O		M	
-----------------	-------------------------	--	--	------------	--------------------------	---	---	--	---	--

Document:SA at Revised Deposit Plan

Summary: Propose amended scoring for site.

Item Question Representation Text

2 2 Change to Sustainability Appraisal

Table D.4: Site Assessment Results

Glan Llyn (strategic site 41) – this site should score amber for objective 3.15 as it provides a connection corridor down to the Gwent Levels.

Item Question Council Responses

4 Consultant's Response

Disagree. The Glan Llyn site involves the comprehensive redevelopment of a former steelworks site.

Further detail on the development of the site can be found in the LDP as well as an SPG26. Within this, paragraph 3.22 states “The form of development proposed will protect the areas of existing woodland, and will also keep ridgelines free from development. It is also important that connectivity between areas of ecological interest should be maintained, because without that connectivity value can soon be lost.

The greenways through the development therefore have ecological importance as well as visual and aesthetic value. Any development on the Gwent Levels SSSI should seek to conserve and enhance the features of the SSSI. The Baseline Ecological Assessment produced by Capita Symonds in September 2004 provides information on species, habitats and ecological constraints.” Therefore, as the site would introduce new habitats to the site, a green score has been give.

Representation Details

by: (No grouping)

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=I; Status=M

<i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i>	<i>Representor</i>	<i>Agent</i>	<i>Accession No</i>	<i>Date Lodged</i>	<i>Late?</i>	<i>Source</i>	<i>Type</i>	<i>Mode</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Status Modified</i>
3683.I50	Natural Resources Wales			26/07/2013	<input type="checkbox"/>	E	O		M	

Document:SA at Revised Deposit Plan

Summary: Propose amended scoring for site.

Item Question *Representation Text*

1 1 Representation

Table D.4: Site Assessment Results

Adjacent Hartridge (strategic site 44) – this site should score amber for objective 3.15 as it provides a connection corridor down to the Gwent Levels.

Item Question *Council Responses*

4 Consultant's Response

Disagree. The site scores red for environmental protection designations. The baseline Ecological Assessment produced as part of the SPG (as above - Eastern Expansion Area) provides information on species, habitats and ecological constraints. The form of development proposed will protect the areas of existing woodland and keep ridgelines from development. Therefore it is considered that connectivity would be 'maintained'.

3683.I51	Natural Resources Wales			26/07/2013	<input type="checkbox"/>	E	C		M	
-----------------	-------------------------	--	--	------------	--------------------------	---	---	--	---	--

Document:SA at Revised Deposit Plan

Summary: Support recommendation not to progress site into Plan.

Item Question *Representation Text*

1 1 Representation

Table D.5: Recommendations by site

Solutia (strategic site 5) – we agree with the recommendation not to carry this site forward to the LDP.

Item Question *Council Responses*

4 Consultant's Response

Noted.

Representation Details

by: (No grouping)

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=I; Status=M

Rep'n/Para/Policy	Representor	Agent	Accession No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source	Type	Mode	Status	Status Modified
3683.I52	Natural Resources Wales			26/07/2013	<input type="checkbox"/>	E	S		M	

Document:SA at Revised Deposit Plan

Summary: Welcome amendment for mitigation measures to be included.

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Representation

Table D.5: Recommendations by site

Rogerstone (strategic site 8) – we welcome the changes made with respect to recognition of need to include mitigation for otters

Item Question Council Responses

4 Consultant's Response

Noted.

3683.I53	Natural Resources Wales			26/07/2013	<input type="checkbox"/>	E	C		M	
----------	-------------------------	--	--	------------	--------------------------	---	---	--	---	--

Document:SA at Revised Deposit Plan

Summary: Development must ensure no detrimental impact to SSSI and outfall is maintained in perpetuity.

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Representation

Table D.5: Recommendations by site

Llanwern (strategic site 26) – development must ensure that there is no detrimental impact to the SSSI and its features. It is important that the designated outfall is maintained in perpetuity.

Item Question Council Responses

4 Consultant's Response

Agree. The SA already recommends that development should seek to connect to and enhance the ecological value of the area. It also recommends that any development likely to harm the environmental designations or protected species should not be permitted and that water quality should be maintained.

Representation Details

by: (No grouping)

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=I; Status=M

Rep'n/Para/Policy	Representor	Agent	Accession No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source	Type	Mode	Status	Status Modified
3683.I54	Natural Resources Wales			26/07/2013	<input type="checkbox"/>	E	O		M	

Document:SA at Revised Deposit Plan

Summary: Object to site due to its impact on SSSI and propose recommendation to be amended to site is not carried forward.

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Representation

Table D.5: Recommendations by site

Duffryn (strategic site 28) – Whilst we note that this proposed allocation has been reduced in size, development at this site will lead to the direct loss of an area of the Gwent Levels St Brides SSSI. The interconnected nature of the drainage system also affords the potential for detrimental effects over a wider area of the SSSI. In NRW's opinion, the SA should also recommend that this site not be carried forward to the LDP, a point we have also made with respect to the deposit LDP itself. If development proceeds it must ensure that there is no detrimental impact to the SSSI and its features. It should be noted that there may also be otters in the vicinity.

Item Question Council Responses

4 Consultant's Response

This issue has been dealt with above in responses to representations regarding the Duffryn site. The SA will recommend that only the portion of EM1 (i) which lies outside the Gwent Levels SSSI is carried forward in the LDP.

3683.I55	Natural Resources Wales			26/07/2013	<input type="checkbox"/>	E	S		M	
----------	-------------------------	--	--	------------	--------------------------	---	---	--	---	--

Document:SA at Revised Deposit Plan

Summary: Welcome amendments in recognition of SAC and EPS.

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Representation

Table D.5: Recommendations by site

Celtic Manor (strategic site 29) – we welcome the changes made here in recognition of the River Usk SAC and presence of European Protected Species (dormice, bats and otters).

Item Question Council Responses

4 Consultant's Response

Noted.

Representation Details

by: (No grouping)

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=I; Status=M

Rep'n/Para/Policy	Representor	Agent	Accession No	Date Lodged	Late?	Source	Type	Mode	Status	Status Modified
3683.I56	Natural Resources Wales			26/07/2013	<input type="checkbox"/>	E	S		M	

Document:SA at Revised Deposit Plan

Summary: Welcome recognition of woodland buffer at the site.

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Representation

Table D.5: Recommendations by site

Eastern Expansion Area (strategic site 39) – we welcome that the importance of the woodland buffer has now been recognised.

Item Question Council Responses

4 Consultant's Response

Noted.

3683.I57	Natural Resources Wales			26/07/2013	<input type="checkbox"/>	E	C		M	
----------	-------------------------	--	--	------------	--------------------------	---	---	--	---	--

Document:SA at Revised Deposit Plan

Summary: Development must ensure no detrimental effect on SSSI and outfall is maintained in perpetuity,

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Representation

Table D.5: Recommendations by site

Glan Lyn (strategic site 41) - development must ensure that there is no detrimental impact to the Gwent Levels: SSSIs. and its features. It is important that the designated outfall is maintained in perpetuity.

Item Question Council Responses

4 Consultant's Response

Noted. The site is being developed as part of an implemented planning approval which has taken into account the impact on the environment.

Representation Details

by: (No grouping)

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=I; Status=M

<i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i>	<i>Representor</i>	<i>Agent</i>	<i>Accession No</i>	<i>Date Lodged</i>	<i>Late?</i>	<i>Source</i>	<i>Type</i>	<i>Mode</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Status Modified</i>
3683.I58	Natural Resources Wales			26/07/2013	<input type="checkbox"/>	E	C		M	

Document:SA at Revised Deposit Plan

Summary: Recommendation not to carry certain sites forward is not addressed here, disappointed with Council response.

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Representation

Table D.6: NCC Response to SA Recommendations

The SA recommendation not to carry certain sites forward to the LDP has not been addressed in this Table.

It is disappointing to note that, for many of the candidate sites, the NCC response is the same – that 'the policies within the LDP provide an adequate framework to control these issues to ensure any planning applications consider these critical issues for the site at the detailed stage' even though the LDP will establish the principle of development at the site.

Item Question Council Responses

4 Consultant's Response

The majority of the sites that were recommended not to be taken forward were not allocated within the LDP. i.e. Sites 20, 21, 22 and 43.

Site 5 Solutia (EM1(iv) in the Revised Deposit Plan) has remained in the plan but the area within the SSSI has been removed from the allocation. The same applies to Queensway Meadows (EM1(ii) in the Revised Deposit Plan), originally part of site 5 Solutia.

The concerns raised within each recommendation were considered by the Council. NCC considered that the policies within the LDP provide adequate control to ensure that any potential issues are dealt with. These schemes are being considered at the strategic scale and it is considered that any such issues will need to be dealt with at the planning application stage. Such issues are not of a concern that it is thought that they cannot be overcome during detailed assessment. If an application is unsuitable then permission will need to be resisted until such issues are dealt with.

Representation Details

by: (No grouping)

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=I; Status=M

<i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i>	<i>Representor</i>	<i>Agent</i>	<i>Accession No</i>	<i>Date Lodged</i>	<i>Late?</i>	<i>Source</i>	<i>Type</i>	<i>Mode</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Status Modified</i>
3683.I59	Natural Resources Wales			26/07/2013	<input type="checkbox"/>	E	C		M	

Document:SA at Revised Deposit Plan

Summary: Noted that mitigation for EM1(i) links to SA recommendation.

Item Question *Representation Text*

1 1 Representation

Table D.6: NCC Response to SA Recommendations

EM1(i) Duffryn – it is noted that mitigation for this site links to the SA recommendations for Policy EM1(i), namely guidance so that proposals can demonstrate that the national economic benefits of proposals outweigh the environmental impacts.

Item Question *Council Responses*

4 Consultant's Response

Noted. The Revised Deposit Plan has excluded much of the employment sites from SSSI designations. Policy EM1(i) has been amended in the Revised Deposit Plan thus the need to provide evidence that the economic benefits outweigh the environment impacts is no longer in the policy wording.

3683.I60	Natural Resources Wales			26/07/2013	<input type="checkbox"/>	E	S		M	
-----------------	-------------------------	--	--	------------	--------------------------	---	---	--	---	--

Document:SA at Revised Deposit Plan

Summary: Welcome record of consultaiton and NCCs actions.

Item Question *Representation Text*

1 1 Representation

Appendix F: Consultation response to the ISAR (May 2010)

We welcome this record of consultation responses to the Initial Sustainability Appraisal Report, NCC's responses and action taken as a result.

Item Question *Council Responses*

4 Consultant's Response

Noted.

Representation Details

by: (No grouping)

Filtered to show: (all of) Stage=O; Status=M

<i>Rep'n/Para/Policy</i>	<i>Representor</i>	<i>Agent</i>	<i>Accession No</i>	<i>Date Lodged</i>	<i>Late?</i>	<i>Source</i>	<i>Type</i>	<i>Mode</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Status Modified</i>
3683.O1	Natural Resources Wales			26/07/2013	<input type="checkbox"/>	E			M	

Document:HRA at Revised Deposit Plan

Summary: Support HRA but require clarification as to assessment of previous UDP allocations.

Item Question Representation Text

1 1 Representation

We note the assessment of changes to the plan identified within the HRA, particularly Appendix F. Again, we welcome the iterative approach taken and note that where potential likely significant effects resulting from the policies and allocations in the Plan were identified, they have been largely addressed by the incorporation of changes and additions to the policy wording and specific allocations.

We also note and welcome the changes made to the HRA in response to the Countryside Council for Wales' previous comments dated 13 June 2012, in particular the inclusion of the summary table of mitigation measures and further clarification of potential 'in-combination' and cumulative impacts.

However, we note that the information provided in table E1 to inform the 'in combination' assessment only lists existing housing commitments with planning permission. We understand that the other elements of the plan, for example allocations carried forward from the UDP without planning permission, and other allocations such as employment allocations, have also been assessed as part of the main LDP process. We would welcome confirmation that this is the case.

Finally, we remind you that if any further changes are made to the plan, for example, at the focused changes stage or to take account of major new infrastructure proposals, then these may also require an update to the HRA.

Item Question Council Responses

3 Council Response

Support noted and welcomed.

The document has been amended so that the appendices are correctly referenced. In addition appendix E2 has been retitled to ensure that it is clear that the assessment is for Housing and Regeneration policies. Those designations allocated in the LDP both housing and regeneration site have been assessed and not just carried forward into the Plan. This update to the document has been undertaken to ensure clarity by including the following text to Appendix E2:

EM2(iii)Phoenix Park

(Pirelli)10/0852YesAn AA was undertaken. Concerns over potential run-off were alleviated through the imposition of conditions. Potential in-combination effects of the adjoining housing development and other developments in the vicinity were assessed. No significant adverse effects were considered likely.

EM2(ix)Monmouthshire Bank Sidings07/0540YesAn AA was undertaken which found that with suitable conditions, such as the agreement of all works with CCW and NCC prior to commencement, there would be no adverse effects on the internationally protected sites alone or in combination.