

# Southend on Sea Central Area Action Plan

## Sustainability Appraisal Addendum of Proposed Post Examination Modifications

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



Project Ref: 28511/2017 | Rev: B | Date: August 2017





## Contents

- 1 Introduction ..... 1**
  - 1.1 Background ..... 1
  - 1.2 The SCAAP Sustainability Appraisal Framework..... 1
- 2 Screening and Appraisal of Proposed Modifications..... 2**
  - 2.1 Introduction ..... 2
- 3 Predicted Significant Effects ..... 16**
  - 3.1 Introduction ..... 16
  - 3.2 Predicted Significant Effects..... 16
  - 3.3 Conclusion ..... 16

## Tables

- Table 2.1 SA Screening of SCAAP Post Examination Proposed Modifications ..... 1
- Table A.1 SCAAP SA Framework ..... A1

## Appendices

- Appendix A Southend SCAAP SA Framework



This page is intentionally blank

# 1 Introduction

## 1.1 Background

1.1.1 Peter Brett Associates LLP (PBA) has been commissioned by Southend-on-Sea Borough Council (SBC) to undertake the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) of the Southend Central Area Action Plan (SCAAP). This report provides an Addendum to the Revised Proposed Submission SCAAP SA Report (September 2016), to consider whether post examination modifications now proposed to the SCAAP would affect previous SA conclusions and in particular would result in any new or different likely significant effects.

1.1.2 In line with statutory requirements, SA incorporating Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) has previously been undertaken and reported at all stages in the preparation of the SCAAP, namely:

- SA of Issues and Options – Town Centre and Seafront Area Action Plans (2007);
- SA of SCAAP Issues and Options (2010);
- SA of Proposed Submission SCAAP (2011);
- SA of SCAAP Preferred Approach (2015); and,
- SA of Revised Proposed Submission SCAAP (2016).

1.1.3 In each case, a full SA report and associated Non-Technical Summary were prepared by PBA to accompany the relevant iteration of the SCAAP. Both the SA report and the SCAAP were consulted on in tandem, with representations on both documents influencing the evolution of the SCAAP. Whilst this Addendum does not represent a full SA report (as it is only concerned with updating the Revised Proposed Submission SCAAP SA report where required), it has similarly been prepared to accompany public consultation on post-examination modifications to the SCAAP.

1.1.4 A draft of this Addendum was first provided to SBC on 3<sup>rd</sup> August 2017, following which revisions were made to the proposed modifications to address identified significant adverse effects on biodiversity interests. These revisions, which have been agreed for consultation with the Planning Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State to undertake the Examination of the SCAAP, result in no significant adverse effects now being predicted to result from the proposed modifications. The SA Addendum has been updated to respond to the revisions to the proposed modifications.

## 1.2 The SCAAP Sustainability Appraisal Framework

1.2.1 The SA of the emerging SCAAP has been underpinned by a Sustainability Framework, which comprises a suite of sustainability objectives and sub-objectives derived from analysis of relevant sustainability issues and the context of Southend. This SA Framework, provided in Appendix A (see Table A.1), has been used at each stage of the SA to identify and assess the significance of potential sustainability and environmental effects from the emerging SCAAP. The SA Framework has similarly been applied in the preparation of the Addendum to identify and assess the significance of any new or different effects from the proposed modifications (PMs) to the SCAAP.

## 2 Screening and Appraisal of Proposed Modifications

### 2.1 Introduction

2.1.1 This section presents a screening and appraisal of all proposed modifications (main and minor) against the SA Framework, detailed in Table 2.1 below. The purpose of this exercise is to determine whether each proposed modification (PM) would result in any new or different likely significant sustainability or environmental effects from those previously assessed within the SA of the Revised Proposed Submission SCAAP (September 2016).

2.1.2 The screening detailed in Table 2.1 includes the following information for each PM:

- PM (main or minor) and Revised Proposed Submission SCAAP reference numbers - to identify each modification and the affected component(s) of the SCAAP;
- Summary of PM - to describe what each modification would change within the Revised Proposed Submission SCAAP;
- Predicted Effects - consideration of what effects (in sustainability, environmental and wider terms) the PM would be likely to generate, taking account of the effects previously assessed within the SA of the Revised Proposed Submission SCAAP;
- Significance of Predicted Effects – consideration of whether the identified effect(s) of the PM would result in any new or different likely significant effect compared with those reported previously, in particular within the SA of the Revised Proposed Submission SCAAP.

2.1.3 The PMs are generally addressed in numerical order within Table 2.1, although where multiple PMs relate to the same substantive issue these are considered together for brevity. Where the screening reported in Table 2.1 identifies new or different likely significant effects, as well as any new uncertainties or policy interactions, any potential need for clarification and mitigation is considered further in section 3.

Table 2.1 SA Screening of SCAAP Post Examination Proposed Modifications

PM Reference	SCAAP Reference	Summary of PM	Predicted Effects	New or Different Likely Significant Effects?
<b>Main Modifications</b>				
Main 1	Page 12, Paragraph 29	Addition of a new strategic objective for Southend Central Area, <i>“supporting the viability and vitality of the town centre, so that it remains the first preference for all forms of retail development and for other town centre users attracting large numbers of people and create an environment that encourages investment from Central Area”</i> .	These PMs would have beneficial effects on objectives regarding accessibility, community, employment and wealth creation through directing retail development to, supporting the vitality of, and encouraging investment within, Southend Town Centre.	<p>These PMs introduce a new component to the SCAAP (a new strategic objective) which has not previously been subject to SA, as well as amending existing policy criteria. New or different significant effects are therefore possible.</p> <p>These PMs would have beneficial effects on sustainability objectives EG1, EG2 and EG3. Given that the PM introduces a new component to the SCAAP (rather than building upon existing components) and directly contributes to the achievement of sustainability objectives, the PM is considered likely to result in significant beneficial effects on these objectives.</p>
Main 2	Page 20, Policy DS1.1	Paragraph amended to include text linking National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) to support for the town centre as the first preference for all forms of retail development.		
Main 3	Page 20, DS1.2	Additional text is added to the policy section to specify that new development, including retail, must not be detrimental to those living and working nearby (e.g. through excessive noise or disturbance).	This PM would have beneficial effects on objectives regarding health, safety, security and community through requiring development proposals to safeguard residential and general amenity from unacceptable impacts	<p>This PM introduces additional criteria to Policy DS1.2, with the potential to result in new or different significant effects.</p> <p>The SA of the Revised Proposed Submission SCAAP (September 2016) concluded that Policy DS1 as</p>

PM Reference	SCAAP Reference	Summary of PM	Predicted Effects	New or Different Likely Significant Effects?
		Sections are renumbered accordingly.		drafted was likely to contribute to the achievement of objectives including SP5, but no clear relationship was identified with objective SP4. The PM would directly safeguard health, safety and security, resulting in a potential new beneficial significant effect on objective SP4.
Main 4	Page 42, Paragraph 135	Amendments to the text to report an increased number of publicly available car parking spaces (2550 to 3142) to the south of the Central Area and to identify 2,562 of these spaces as being within key visitor car parks.	PMs Main 4 - 6 and 9 are intrinsically linked and must be appraised together. PMs Main 4 – 6 would themselves not have clear effects as they only amend supporting text rather than policy wording, although when considered with PM Main 9 there is the potential for effects to occur.  The substantive effect of these PMs would be to identify and safeguard against the net loss of key visitor parking, whilst clarifying that this specific level of protection does not apply to other existing parking. This would directly protect car access to amenities and shops for visitors. It would also potentially allow future reductions in the availability of public parking for non-visitor purposes (e.g. commuting), which could support economic growth, redevelopment, encourage more sustainable transport and the intensification of built form.	The Revised Proposed Submission SCAAP SA Report acknowledged that the SCAAP has the potential to deliver significant benefits from achieving a modal shift to more sustainable travel, including walking and cycling. Of relevance to these PMs, the Revised Proposed Submission SCAAP contained proposals to meet identified car parking needs whilst advocating a strategy of managing car parking to release land for development. These PMs would implement this strategy, resulting in potential socio-economic benefits through inward investment and new economic activities on suitable sites.
Main 5	Page 42, Paragraph 136	Amended paragraph to clarify there will be no net loss in key visitor car parking.		
Main 6	Page 43, Paragraph 136	New paragraph inserted to stipulate any development proposals on key visitor car parking areas to the south of the Central Area must not result in a net loss within key visitor car parks. Any planning applications are to be accompanied by a detailed transport assessment that include an analysis of the impact of additional parking demand generated by the	Any adverse effect on local car access to amenities and economic opportunities for non-visitors is countered by policy DS5, which includes safeguards to maintain parking at a level that supports the vitality and viability of the centre and does not undermine the ability to	The Revised Proposed Submission SCAAP SA Report concluded that Policy DS5 as drafted would have beneficial effects on sustainability objectives SP1, SP4, EP3, EP4, NR1

PM Reference	SCAAP Reference	Summary of PM	Predicted Effects	New or Different Likely Significant Effects?
		proposed development on key visitor car parks. Paragraphs renumbered as appropriate.	accommodate visitor trips, and also includes a requirement for proposals to have regard to Policy DM15 of the adopted Southend DMD. This sets out car parking standards and requirements for sustainable transport measures, Transport Assessments and Travel Plans.	and EG1, with uncertain or no effects predicted on other objectives. The safeguarding of key visitor car parks through these PMs would directly protect the accessibility of the Southend Central Area for visitors, with consequential socio-economic benefits. This would enhance previously predicted beneficial effects on objectives SP1 and EG1 but would not generate new or different significant effects. Assuming that Policy DS5 in conjunction with Policy 15 of the adopted DMD ensures appropriate provision of car parking (for all purposes), travel plans and sustainable transport measures, no adverse effects are predicted as a result of these PMs. In summary, no new or different significant effects are predicted as a result of these PMs.
Main 9	Page 45, DS5.2.b	This PM would implement PMs 4 – 6 in policy terms by setting out revised policy criteria to safeguard key visitor car parking. The PM would have the effect of only safeguarding key visitor, not all, public parking.		
Main 7	Page 43, After Main 6	Table added to list all key visitor car parks within the area defined by Map 4, includes both the parking spaces within the individual car parks and cumulative total	This PM would itself have no clear effects.	None predicted.
Main 8	Page 42, After Main 7	Inclusion of a new map (Map 4) that identifies 10 minute walking distance isochromes from the	This PM would itself have no clear effects.	None predicted.

PM Reference	SCAAP Reference	Summary of PM	Predicted Effects	New or Different Likely Significant Effects?
		foreshore within which policy DS5.2.b is operational. Updated numbering of sequent maps as appropriate.		
Main 10	Page 71, PA7.3.ii	Clarification on the area referred to as the Opportunity Site.	This PM would itself have no clear effects.	None predicted.
Main 11	Page 72, Section 5.9 Aims, Paragraph 3	Aim is amended to highlight the inclusion of car parking management in the approach to development.	This would emphasise the need to manage parking when developing the Central Seafront Policy Area, to contribute to the vitality and viability of the seafront. This aligns with efforts to support economic growth, inward investment and intensification of built form, whilst protecting access for visitors.	This PM introduces an additional aim for the Central Seafront Policy Area. The PM merely adds a cross-reference to policy requirements introduced through PMs 4 - 6 and 9, which themselves are not considered likely to generate new or different significant effects on any sustainability objectives. In consequence no significant effects are therefore predicted from this PM.
Main 12	Page 74, Section CS1.1.f	Amended policy criteria to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- insert a requirement to protect designated sites from adverse effects; and,</li> <li>- amend the requirement to maintain foreshore views, to instead require foreshore views not to be adversely impacted by development.</li> </ul>	The introduction of a requirement within Policy CS1 to protect European and nationally designated sites against adverse effects would directly contribute to the protection and enhancement of biodiversity and geological interests. However, this mirrors existing requirements detailed within Policy CS2 - Nature Conservation and Biodiversity and would therefore have no additional effect. The PM would also retain protection against adverse impacts on foreshore reviews, resulting in no	The Revised Proposed Submission SCAAP SA Report concluded that the SCAAP as drafted was likely to be beneficial in protecting the national environment. Given that the proposed new criteria in Policy CS1 mirrors existing criteria in policy CS2 and would retain protection of foreshore views, this PM is not considered likely to result in any new or significant effects.

PM Reference	SCAAP Reference	Summary of PM	Predicted Effects	New or Different Likely Significant Effects?
			change in predicted effects on landscape character and visual amenity.	
Main 13	Page 75, CS1.3.d	Paragraph amended to highlight the need to ensure new lighting does not cause direct illumination of the foreshore or excessive glare when viewed from the foreshore.	This PM would help to protect visual amenity and the setting of heritage assets from light pollution.	This PM would strengthen the protection given to visual amenity and the setting of heritage assets within Policy CS1, but would not itself result in new or different significant effects.
Main 14	Page 77, Paragraph 200	Paragraph amended to list the conservation designations and ensure appropriate weighting to them as recognised sites.	This PM would itself have no clear effects.	None predicted.
Main 15	Page 78, Paragraph 205	Paragraph added to provide guidance to interpret the provisions of Policy CS2 regarding the protection afforded to Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). Text also added to set out the roles of non-statutory local nature reserves and local wildlife sites.	PMs Main 15 - 17 are intrinsically linked and must be appraised together.  These PMs align Policy CS2 and supporting text with the NPPF (2012) at paragraph 118. In doing so the PMs introduce clear policy tests where development proposals are likely to result in adverse impacts and/or significant harm to biodiversity interests including the foreshore designations. The PMs would therefore strengthen the protection of biodiversity interests whilst not unnecessarily restricting development.	These PMs were amended following the draft SA Addendum to ensure the avoidance of significant adverse effects on biodiversity interests and to align Policy CS2 with paragraph 118 of the NPPF (2012).  The clear policy tests introduced by these PMs would ensure that Policy CS2 and supporting text provides appropriate protection for biodiversity interests. This would enhance the effectiveness of the SCAAP but would not result in new or different significant effects from those previously assessed.
Main 16	Page 78, CS2.1.b	Criteria amended to set out revised policy tests for development proposals that would result in significant harm to the foreshore designations. In particular, the PM makes clear that development proposals must not undermine the special features, integrity or		

PM Reference	SCAAP Reference	Summary of PM	Predicted Effects	New or Different Likely Significant Effects?
Main 17	Page 78, CS2.1.c	<p>conservation objectives of the foreshore designations.</p> <p>Policy criteria amended to set out revised policy tests for development proposals that would result in adverse impacts on or significant harm to SSSIs. The amended criterion starts from a presumption that development adversely affecting a SSSI will not be permitted, unless certain criteria are met. The revised criterion builds upon criterion CS2 1.b (regarding the protection of all foreshore designations, including SSSIs) and aligns with paragraph 118 of the NPPF (2012).</p>		
Main 18	Page 80, CS3.2	Paragraph amended to narrow the scope of Policy CS3 to only apply to unacceptable impacts on named SSSIs, rather than to all biodiversity interests.	This PM would remove the consideration of unacceptable biodiversity impacts other than on SSSIs from Policy CS3. In isolation this may have an adverse effect on the protection of wider biodiversity interests outwith SSSIs, although Policy CS2 sets out criteria to protect all “ <i>foreshore designations</i> ”, including the non-statutory Southend Foreshore Local Nature Reserve and part of the Leigh National Nature Reserve, from significant harm. As Policy CS3 relates solely to development proposals in the Waterfront Area, the change introduced by this PM would, when read and applied together with	None predicted.

PM Reference	SCAAP Reference	Summary of PM	Predicted Effects	New or Different Likely Significant Effects?
			Policy CS2, have no clear effect on biodiversity interests.	
Main 19	Page 84, PA8.4.ii (Opportunity Site PA8.2)	Paragraph amended to require the proposed tenure and affordability of proposed new accommodation on Opportunity Site PA8.2 not to “ <i>preclude existing residents displaced by the redevelopment from being permanent occupiers in the new scheme</i> ”.	This PM would provide a partial safeguard against potential displacement of existing residents by redevelopment proposals, resulting in a beneficial effect on housing provision to meet identified needs.	The SA Report for the Revised Proposed SCAAP previously assessed Opportunity Site PA8.2 as having a beneficial effect on sustainability objectives including SP2, but not SP5. By seeking to accommodate existing residents, the PM would continue to meet housing needs whilst enhancing community cohesion. The PM therefore has the potential to generate a new beneficial significant effect on SP5.
Main 20	Page 86, PA9.2 Second line	Paragraph amended to remove sentence stipulating that the redevelopment of Opportunity Site (PA9.2): Guildford Road should incorporate amenity open space, urban greening and sustainability measures.	This PM would remove the specific policy requirement to incorporate amenity open space, urban greening and sustainability measures within the redevelopment of Opportunity Site (PA9.2): Guildford Road, although policy PA9 (criterion 2c) still promotes streetscape and landscape design improvements, including urban greening and tree planting, and sustainability related policies within the Southend DMD would also continue to apply.	<p>This PM is intended to reduce duplication and amounts only to a change in emphasis rather than altering any policy tests. No new or different significant effects are therefore predicted.</p> <p>Whilst the PM would remove the onus to provide amenity open space, urban greening and sustainability measures, it is in relation to one opportunity site only and other policy requirements (including within SCAAP policy PA9 and in the adopted DMD) to protect biodiversity interests and provide greenspace would continue to apply. In this</p>

PM Reference	SCAAP Reference	Summary of PM	Predicted Effects	New or Different Likely Significant Effects?
				context the PM is not itself considered likely to generate new or different significant effects from those previously assessed.
Main 21	Page 94, Implementing and Monitoring Table: Policy DS5	Paragraph amended to introduce monitoring of car parking provision.	This PM would support the successful implementation of PMs 4 – 6 and 9 in order to deliver a managed approach to car parking in the Central Area. However, as this PM is restricted to setting out monitoring arrangements it would not itself result in any sustainability or environmental effects.	None predicted as this PM only relates to monitoring arrangements.
Main 22	Page 11, Following Appendix 8	New appendix showing publically available paid for Parking to the South of the Central Area.	This PM would itself have no clear effects.	None predicted.
<b>Minor Modifications</b>				
Minor 1	Page 7, Paragraph 7	Footnote added to provide the title of work referenced in the paragraph.	This PM would itself have no clear effects.	None predicted.
Minor 2	Page 8, Context and Issues for the Southend Central Area	Paragraph amended to clarify how the SCAAP could maximise Southend's potential as a visitor destination and resort.	This PM would itself have no clear effects.	None predicted.
Minor 3	Page 11, Paragraph 24	Paragraph amended to remove text that the SA Report is available for comment.	This PM would itself have no clear effects.	None predicted.
Minor 4	Page 14, Paragraph 32	Paragraph amended to include text that identifying the need for	This PM would itself have no clear effects.	None predicted.

PM Reference	SCAAP Reference	Summary of PM	Predicted Effects	New or Different Likely Significant Effects?
		policy areas to protect and enhance heritage assets.		
Minor 5	Page 17, Paragraph 43	Paragraph amended to improve readability. Sentence added to highlight the importance of effective promotion and marketing of the town centre to potential new investors.	This PM would itself have no clear effects. The existing text already identified the importance of the retail sector to Southend Town Centre and the need to enhance vitality.	None predicted.
Minor 6	Page 18, Paragraph 48	Paragraph amended to include tourism and well as leisure uses of the central seafront area.	This PM would itself have no clear effects.	None predicted.
Minor 7	Page 19, Paragraph 55	Correction of reference to Policy DS1.3(a)	This PM would itself have no clear effects.	None predicted.
Minor 8	Page 19, Paragraph 56	Correction of reference to Policy DS1.3(a)	This PM would itself have no clear effects.	None predicted.
Minor 9	Page 20, Paragraph DS1.2	Sentence added to include the Council's intention to promote the town centre.	This PM would itself have no clear effects.	None predicted.
Minor 10	Page 21, Policy DS1.7	Grammar correction.	This PM would itself have no clear effects.	None predicted.
Minor 11	Page 21, Policy Linkages	KP1 added as a policy relevant to Core Strategy DPD. Southend Central AAP is amended to include objective 12.	This PM would itself have no clear effects.	None predicted.
Minor 12	Page 23, Paragraph 58	Text added to note the potential for growth of the tourism sector.	This PM would itself have no clear effects. The Revised Proposed Submission SCAAP already emphasised the importance of the tourism	None predicted.

PM Reference	SCAAP Reference	Summary of PM	Predicted Effects	New or Different Likely Significant Effects?
			sector to the local economy, employment and future economic growth.	
Minor 13	Page 24, Policy Linkages	Updates cross-references between objectives and policies.	This PM would itself have no clear effects.	None predicted.
Minor 14	Page 25, Paragraph 72	Correction to number of dwellings identified.	This PM would itself have no clear effects.	None predicted.
Minor 15	Page 26, Table 1	Correction to figures of new Residential Development in Clifftown and total figures for the table.	This PM would itself have no clear effects.	None predicted.
Minor 16	Page 27, Policy Linkages	Updates cross-references	This PM would itself have no clear effects.	None predicted.
Minor 17	Page 28, Paragraph 84	Text amended with minor word changes to improve readability. Sentence added to clarify the contribution of heritage assets to the south.	This PM would itself have no clear effects. The Revised Proposed Submission SCAAP already identified the importance of heritage assets.	None predicted.
Minor 18	Page 29, Paragraph 87	Paragraph amended to strengthen the importance of and insert a new criteria protecting the setting of Conservation Areas.	This PM makes clear a need to consider effects from development proposals on the setting of Conservation Areas, resulting in a potential beneficial effect on the preservation and protection of heritage assets. However, this PM to supporting text would not alter policies within the SCAAP or add to the protections provided by policy DM5.	As this PM would only clarify supporting text rather than alter policy criteria, no new or different significant effects are predicted.
Minor 19	Page 30, Policy Linkages	Updates cross-references	This PM would itself have no clear effects.	None predicted.

PM Reference	SCAAP Reference	Summary of PM	Predicted Effects	New or Different Likely Significant Effects?
Minor 20	Page 31, Policy 99	Place names added to give recognitions to viewpoints.	This PM would itself have no clear effects.	None predicted.
Minor 21	Page 34, Table 3	Table amended to include "Better Queensway (Queensway Policy Area)" as a potential location for new landmark buildings.	This PM would provide policy support for an additional landmark building, which would improve urban design quality.	The Revised Proposed Submission SCAAP SA Report already identified beneficial effects from the SCAAP on urban design quality and sustainability objective EP3. The PM would strengthen this effect but would not result in any new or different significant effects.
Minor 22	Page 34, Policy Linkages	Updates cross-references	This PM would itself have no clear effects.	None predicted.
Minor 23	Page 35, Table 4	"OS (PA4.1): Better Queensway" added to table in column titled "Potential Landmarks within".	This PM would provide policy support for an additional landmark building, which would improve urban design quality.	The Revised Proposed Submission SCAAP SA Report already identified beneficial effects from the SCAAP on urban design quality and sustainability objective EP3. The PM would strengthen this effect but would not result in any new or different significant effects.
Minor 24	Page 36, Paragraph 111	Text amended to include the Thames Estuary 2100 Plan to the approach to hold the existing line of flood defence.	This PM would itself have no clear effects.	None predicted.
Minor 25	Page 37, Paragraph 113	Delete repeated text.	This PM would itself have no clear effects.	None predicted.
Minor 26	Page 38, Paragraph 38	Paragraph amended to reference up to date guidance on Sustainable Drainage Systems.	This PM would itself have no clear effects.	None predicted.

PM Reference	SCAAP Reference	Summary of PM	Predicted Effects	New or Different Likely Significant Effects?
Minor 27	Paragraph 38, Page 121	Minor grammar correction.	This PM would itself have no clear effects.	None predicted.
Minor 28	Page 40, Paragraph 124	Correction to map referencing number.	This PM would itself have no clear effects.	None predicted.
Minor 29	Page 41, Paragraph 129	Paragraph amended to include further benefits of improved signage – directing drivers to find the most appropriate car parking space. Updated map reference.	This PM would itself have no clear effects.	None predicted.
Minor 30	Page 47-48, Map 4 & Map 5	Maps updated to reflect key visitor car parks in Southend Central Area.	This PM would itself have no clear effects.	None predicted.
Minor 31	Page 52, Paragraph 153	Updated map reference.	This PM would itself have no clear effects.	None predicted.
Minor 32	Page 52 Paragraph 154	Minor grammar correction.	This PM would itself have no clear effects.	None predicted.
Minor 33	Page 54, Map 6	Updated map reference.	This PM would itself have no clear effects.	None predicted.
Minor 34	Page 56, PA1.4.d.i	Updates cross-references	This PM would itself have no clear effects.	None predicted.
Minor 35	Page 57, Policy Linkages	Updates cross-references	This PM would itself have no clear effects.	None predicted.
Minor 36	Page 57, London Road Policy Area: Aims	Paragraph amended to add “a street market” to list of opportunities for a pedestrian priority public space.	This PM would itself have no clear effects. The Revised Proposed Submission SCAAP already identified a range of suitable uses for the London Road Policy Area to protect accessibility and enhance vitality and the	None predicted.

PM Reference	SCAAP Reference	Summary of PM	Predicted Effects	New or Different Likely Significant Effects?
			provision of amenities. The PM would further contribute to this.	
Minor 37	Page 59, Policy Linkages	Updates cross-references	This PM would itself have no clear effects.	None predicted.
Minor 38	Page 61, Policy Linkages	DM8 and DM10 added as relevant policies to Development Management DPD. PA1 and PA2 added to relevant policies for Southend Central AAP.	This PM would itself have no clear effects.	None predicted.
Minor 39	Page 62, Paragraph 161	Removal of misplaced word "centre".	This PM would itself have no clear effects.	None predicted.
Minor 40	Page 64, Policy PA4.3	Change of table column heading "timescale for delivery" to "other potential use classes". Addition of A3 to this column.	This PM would itself have no clear effects.	None predicted.
Minor 41	Page 64, Policy Linkages	Updates cross-references	This PM would itself have no clear effects.	None predicted.
Minor 42	Page 68, PA6.1.B	Amended text to improve readability and phrasing of a reference to a policy document.	This PM would itself have no clear effects.	None predicted.
Minor 43	Page 68, PA6.3	Correction of numbering to sub-criteria.	This PM would itself have no clear effects.	None predicted.
Minor 44	Page 69, Policy Linkages	Updates cross-references	This PM would itself have no clear effects.	None predicted.

PM Reference	SCAAP Reference	Summary of PM	Predicted Effects	New or Different Likely Significant Effects?
Minor 45	Page 69, paragraph 183.	Paragraph amended to add further information about a surface level car park.	This PM would itself have no clear effects.	None predicted.
Minor 46	Page 72, Policy Linkages	Updates cross-references	This PM would itself have no clear effects.	None predicted.
Minor 47	Page 72, Central Seafront Policy Area: Aims	Identical to PM Main 11	As with PM Main 11, this PM would emphasise the need to manage parking when developing the Southend Central Area, in order to contribute to the vitality and viability of the seafront. This aligns with efforts to support economic growth, inward investment and intensification of built form, whilst protecting access for visitors.	The PM merely adds a cross-reference to policy requirements introduced through PMs 4 – 6, 9 and 11, which themselves are not considered likely to generate new or different significant effects on any sustainability objectives. In consequence no significant effects are therefore predicted from this PM.
Minor 48	Page 72, Paragraph 187	Text added to provide more information on the contribution of tourism to Central Seafront area and plans for the area's resort function.  New paragraph created with updated numbering to improve readability	This PM would itself have no clear effects.	None predicted.
Minor 49	Page 73, Paragraph 191	Text regarding the impact of Adventure Island on esplanade views removed	Whilst these PMs would remove the previously proposed requirement for boundary treatment changes at the Adventure Island site in order to enhance exterior views, they would not alter the current policy position and would have no clear effects.	None predicted.
Minor 51	Page 75, Paragraph CS1.3.f	Removal of policy criterion requiring the provision of a more permeable boundary to Adventure Island		

PM Reference	SCAAP Reference	Summary of PM	Predicted Effects	New or Different Likely Significant Effects?
Minor 50	Page 73, Paragraph 195	Paragraph amended with grammar corrections.	This PM would itself have no clear effects.	None predicted.
Minor 52	Page 77, Paragraph 199	Paragraph is amended to reflect correct terminology for conservation sites.	This PM would itself have no clear effects.	None predicted.
Minor 53	Page 86, Policy PA9.3.1.a	Text is amended to clarify location of residential buildings.	This PM would itself have no clear effects.	None predicted.
Minor 54	Page 87, Policy Linkages	Updates cross-references	This PM would itself have no clear effects.	None predicted.
Minor 55	Page 109, Appendix 6	Figures are updated in three columns; Other commitments to be delivered by 2021, Total New Dwellings, and Difference from Core Strategy (adjusted 2014 to 2021).	This PM would itself have no clear effects.	None predicted.
Minor 56	Page 111, Appendix 8	Updated numbering in reference to Policies.	This PM would itself have no clear effects.	None predicted.
Minor 57	Policies Map	Boundary of protected green space is amended to omit Pier West Café.	This PM would itself have no clear effects.	None predicted.

## 3 Predicted Significant Effects

### 3.1 Introduction

3.1.1 This section considers the substantive sustainability effects of the PMs identified in Section 2, summarises the predicted significant effects and considers the potential need for clarification or mitigation.

### 3.2 Predicted Significant Effects

3.2.1 As detailed in section 2, several of the PMs would work together to introduce substantive changes to the SCAAP with potential sustainability effects, namely:

- i. Clarification of key visitor car parks where no net loss of spaces will apply, whilst identifying all paid for publicly available car parking and setting out monitoring of all parking provision;
- ii. Identification of additional potential locations for new landmark buildings; and,
- iii. Enhancing the protection of environmental quality, heritage assets, biodiversity interests and environmental quality.

3.2.2 The screening and appraisal presented in Section 2 identifies that **new or different significant beneficial** effects<sup>1</sup> could arise from:

- PM Main 1 and 2 – on sustainability objectives EG1, EG2 and EG3;
- PM Main 4 – on sustainability objective SP4; and,
- PM Main 18 – on sustainability objective SP5.

3.2.3 The screening and appraisal presented in Section 2 indicates that no **new or different likely significant adverse effects** are predicted as a result of the PMs. No mitigation measures are therefore required under the terms of the SEA Regulations<sup>2</sup> to avoid significant adverse effects that would otherwise occur from the Revised Proposed Submission SCAAP as modified by the PMs.

### 3.3 Conclusion

3.3.1 In summary, the PMs are predicted to generate a small number of new or different likely significant beneficial effects compared to those assessed within the Revised Proposed Submission SCAAP SA Report (September 2016). A draft of this Addendum was first provided to SBC on 3<sup>rd</sup> August 2017, following which revisions were made to the proposed modifications to address identified significant adverse effects on biodiversity interests. These revisions, which have been agreed for consultation with the Planning Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State to undertake the Examination of the SCAAP, result in no significant adverse effects now being predicted to result from the proposed modifications.

---

<sup>1</sup> Compared with the beneficial significant effects identified within the Revised Proposed Submission SCAAP SA Report.

<sup>2</sup> The Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 as amended.

## Appendix A Southend SCAAP SA Framework

A.1.1 Table A.1 below sets out the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Framework which has been used at all stages of the SA for the emerging SCAAP.

Table A.1 SCAAP SA Framework

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

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

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

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