

# Sustainability Assessment

## Assessing the effects of the neighbourhood plan

---

Assessment of effects criteria:

Symbol	Significance of effect	Description
✓✓	Significant positive effect	Option would have a significant positive effect in its current form as it would help resolve an existing issue or maximise opportunities, leading to significant benefits.
✓	Positive effect	Option would have a positive effect.
?	Effects uncertain	Effect of option is uncertain.
0	Neutral effect	Option would have a neutral effect.
×	Negative effect	Option would have a negative effect.
××	Significant negative effect	The option would have a significant negative effect as it would substantially exacerbate existing problems with mitigation problematic. Consider rejecting option.
Note: assessment of some objectives for a given option may be considered to be positive or negative but with some uncertainties, in which case a symbol such as '+ / ?' or '0 / ?' may be used.		

In the tables below, each policy option is graded against each of the four SEA objectives – giving an assessment of effect (e.g. ✓) and comments on the nature of effect; justification and evidence; and suggested mitigation.

## Policy Area 1: Development framework

1. Development Framework Policy Options	SEA Objectives				Summary – evidence and justification
	1. Natural Environment	2. Planning & Development	3. Transport & safer movement	4. Facilities & Services	
<b>A. Define village envelopes for Freshford and Limpley Stoke, Local Green Spaces and draw up a Village Design Statement</b>	✓	✓✓	✓	✓	Option A will lead to positive effects against each SEA objective. Defining the area of the existing built environment in each settlement will help to direct limited infill development to the most sustainable locations – in combination with a Village Design Statement which will define locally distinctive design expectations. Identifying Local Green Spaces that meet the NPPF criteria will add weight to the protection and enhancement of these areas.
<b>B. Define Local Green Spaces around the villages where development will be avoided</b>	✓✓	××	0	××	Option B will safeguard the natural environment between and within the two villages but not support sustainable development in line with NPPF 70.
<b>C. Define one large envelope around both settlements</b>	××	✓	✓	✓	Option C will focus sustainable development but the resultant agglomeration would result in the loss of the distinctive nature of the two rural villages in contravention of NPPF 80. It may also result in the potential loss of important historic, recreational and environmental land in contravention of NPPF 77.
<b>D. Use a Housing Development Boundary (HDB) instead of envelopes</b>	×	××	×	×	Option D will result in unrestricted development in Limpley Stoke as a result of the presumption of development in HDB's as defined by the Wiltshire Core Strategy. This is in contravention of Green Belt policy and NPPF 80 which aims to preserve the special character of towns and villages in the Green Belt.
	Option D will have no impact on Local Green Spaces but will encourage higher density development in Limpley Stoke which will degrade its natural environment.	Option D, using the HDB definition in the Wiltshire Core Strategy, will result in the presumption of development within this boundary. The loss of control over the style and size of development will change to the unique character and nature of Limpley Stoke which is in the Green Belt and CAONB.	Option D will skew new development in Limpley Stoke and away from the community hub to which safer movement is being planned.	Option D will encourage the development of new facilities and services in Limpley Stoke through the presumption of development. Development is likely to get skewed away from the village hub in Freshford, where the development opportunities within an HDB, as defined by the Bath and North East Somerset's draft Core Strategy, is more limited.	

<b>E. Use an extended HDB in Freshford and an envelope in Limpley Stoke</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>x x</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	Option E could result in an inconsistent application of the Neighbourhood Plan within the designated area due to differences in the definition of permitted development between an HDB and an envelope. This would be contradict the rationale to develop a single plan between the two villages, as set out in section 1.1 of the plan, and the designation of the plan area as approved by Bath and North East Somerset Council and Wiltshire Council.
	Option E will have no impact on the natural environment.	Option E will result in an inconsistent application of the Neighbourhood Plan within the designated area due to differences in the definition of permitted development between an HDB in Freshford and an envelope in Limpley Stoke.	Option E will have no impact on safer movement through the villages	Option E will have no impact on facilities and services.	
<b>F. Restrict Local Green Spaces to the two village greens</b>	<b>x x</b>	<b>✓</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	Option F will not protect the Local Green Spaces between the two villages and will encourage agglomeration and the loss of the distinctive nature of the two rural villages. It would also fail to protect important historic, recreational and environmental land between the two villages.
	Option F will not protect the Local Green Spaces between the two villages and will encourage agglomeration and the loss of the distinctive nature of the two rural villages. It would also fail to protect important historic, recreational and environmental land between the two villages.	Option F will support sustainable development within and between the existing built up areas but will not prevent agglomeration between the two villages.	Option F will have no impact on safer movement through the villages	Option F will have no impact on facilities and services.	Option F will not protect the Local Green Spaces between the two villages and will encourage agglomeration and the loss of the distinctive nature of the two rural villages in contravention of NPPF 80. It would also fail to protect important historic, recreational and environmental land between the two villages in contravention of NPPF 77.
<b>G. Not have a Village Design Statement</b>	<b>x</b>	<b>x x</b>	<b>? / x</b>	<b>0</b>	Option G will not help guide the future development of any house extensions or new development to meet the needs of the village as defined in the Neighbourhood Plan. This policy is not supportive of F44 NPPF 60 and 61.
	Option G will not encourage development which is mindful of and sensitive to the physical and environmental context of sites in the Green Belt, the CAONB and, (where applicable) the Conservation area. It will also not encourage the sustainability of new developments.	Option G will not encourage development which promotes good quality architector and landscape which complements and reinforces the existing character of the rural landscape.	Option G will not require new developments to show adequate car parking consistent with the use of the development and prevent an exacerbation of car parking pressures in the village.	Option G will have no impact on facilities and services.	

### Option to be taken forward

Policy option A: Define village envelopes for Freshford and Limpley Stoke, Local Green Spaces and set out a Village Design Statement.

#### Policy area 1: Development Framework

In order to promote the quality of life of the villages in the Neighbourhood and to safeguard the Greenbelt and the landscape of the CAONB, any new infill development within the neighbourhood plan area shall:

- (i) Be contained within the Village Envelopes of Freshford and Limpley Stoke, as defined in Map 2:
- (ii) Avoid the Local Green Spaces (see section 3.2) which provide a buffer zone between the two villages as defined on Map 2; and
- (iii) Accord with the guidance set out in the Village Design Statement (see section 3.11)

#### Justification and evidence

1. NPPF
2. Green Belt
3. Wiltshire draft core strategy
4. Bath and North East Somerset draft core strategy
5. Cotswold Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty development plan
6. Development framework (see section 3 of NP)

7. Village Design Statement (see section 3.3 of NP)

8. Map 2 of NP

## Policy Area 2: Housing

2. Housing Policy Options	SEA Objectives				Summary – evidence and justification
	1. Natural Environment	2. Planning & Development	3. Transport & safer movement	4. Facilities & Services	
<p><b>A. This option would prioritise the development of 6-8 new units of affordable housing through the conversion of existing underutilised buildings and/ or the construction of new housing on brownfield sites and/ or infill sites within the village envelopes. Restrict a limited amount of new market housing, with preference given to 1-2 bedroom houses, to brownfield sites and/ or infill sites within the village envelopes. Request all planning applications demonstrate conformity to the Village Design Statement. Home adaptations or extensions which are demonstrably required to provide additional home working capacity will be supported.</b></p>	✓	✓✓	✓	✓	Option A will lead to positive effects against each SEA objective. It will encourage a limited amount of new housing to meet the identified affordable housing needs and improve the sustainability of the community's facilities and services. It will also limit new market housing to areas where the impact to the green belt will be minimised in line with NPPF 80 and encourage more home working. A preference for 1-2 bedroom market houses will help improve the sustainability of the community by supporting young families to move into the community and helping elderly residents remain in the community.
<p><b>B. Permit affordable housing anywhere in the Plan Area</b></p>	xx	0	? / x	? / x	Option B will not prioritise brownfield sites and/ or infill sites within the village envelopes which aims at protecting the distinctive natural environment within and between the villages. This might result in unnecessary development on green field sites within the Green Belt and the CAONB. If no brownfield/ infill site can be identified, this policy recognises the Rural Exceptions Site Policy and is consistent with limited infilling in villages, and limited affordable housing for local community needs set out in NPPF 89.
<p><b>C. Permit more than 6-8 units of affordable housing</b></p>	xx	x	? / x	? / x	Option C will not match the supply of affordable housing with the identified demand. It also does not recognise the limited sites for affordable housing in underutilised buildings and/ or on brownfield and infill sites. Building affordable housing in excess of the demonstrable demand will result in building on green fields resulting in a degradation of the natural environment.
<p><b>D. Permit market housing anywhere in the Plan Area</b></p>	xx	xx	x	x	Option D will contravene F13 the Green Belt and will be to the detriment of the natural environment, the character and sustainability of the two villages and the provision of adequate facilities and services.

<b>E. Permit unlimited amounts of market housing</b>	<b>xx</b>	<b>xx</b>	<b>x</b>	<b>x</b>	Option E will contravene NPPF policy for the Green Belt and will be to the detriment of the natural environment, the character and sustainability of the two villages and the provision of adequate facilities and services.
	Option E will place pressure on the local ecosystem and the rich biodiversity of the existing diverse habitat.	Option E will result in a significant amount of new market housing being built in the two villages given their desirable location. This will encourage higher density housing, agglomeration and the loss of the distinctive nature of the two rural villages.	Option E is likely to result in substantial development throughout the Plan Area which will place pressure on the narrow roads and limited car parking in the community.	Option E is likely to result in a significant increase in the number of houses and the population of the villages. This will place extra stress on existing village facilities and services.	
<b>F. Not give a preference to 1-2 bedroom market housing</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>x</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	Option F will result in larger 3-5 bedroom market houses being built in the community because of the small number of available plots and the increased profitability of building larger market housing. It will not redress the shortage of 1-2 bedroom housing in the community. It will not help make the community more sustainable by increasing the affordability of market housing for young families to move to the community nor increase the practicality for for elderly residents to remain in the community.
	Option F will result in a larger plot size for market housing.	Option F will result in larger 3-5 bedroom market houses being built in the community because of the small number of available plots and the increased profitability of building larger market housing. It will not redress the shortage of 1-2 bedroom housing in the community. It will not help make the community more sustainable by increasing the affordability of market housing for young families to move to the community nor increase the practicality for for elderly residents to remain in the community.	Option F will have no impact on safer movement through the villages	Option F will have little impact on local facilities and services.	
<b>G. Not have a Village Design Statement</b>	<b>x</b>	<b>xx</b>	<b>? / x</b>	<b>0</b>	Option G will not help guide the future development of any house extensions or new development to meet the needs of the village as defined in the Neighbourhood Plan. This policy option is not in alignment with NPPF 60 and 61.
	Option G will not encourage development which is sensitive to the physical and environmental context of sites in the Green Belt, the CAONB and, (where applicable) the Conservation area. It will also not encourage the sustainability of new developments.	Option G will not encourage development which promotes good quality architector and landscape which complements and reinforces the existing character of the rural landscape.	Option G will not require new developments to show adequate car parking consistent with the use of the development and prevent an exacerbation of car parking pressures in the village.	Option G will have no impact on facilities and services.	
<b>H. Not request a questionnaire from applicants on the Village Design Statement</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>x</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	Option H will not encourage applicants to read the Village Design Statement and conform extensions and new developments to meet the needs of the village as defined in the Neighbourhood Plan. This policy option is not in alignment with NPPF 60 and 61.
	Option H will have no impact on the natural environment.	Option H will not encourage applicants to read the Village Design Statement and ensure compliance withit. This will not promote good quality architector and landscape which complements and reinforces the existing character of the rural landscape.	Option H will have no impact on transport and safer movement.	Option H will have no impact on facilities and services.	
<b>I. Not support home adaptations or extensions which are demonstrably required to provide additional home working capacity.</b>	<b>0?</b>	<b>x</b>	<b>x</b>	<b>x</b>	Option I will not encourage home working which increases the sustainability of the community's facilities and services and reduces peak traffic and public transport movement.
	Option I will have little impact on the natural environment although there may be a small reduction in demand for extensions/ garden offices within existing curtilages.	Option I will support not a small increase in extensions/ garden offices.	Option I will not reduce peak rush hour traffic.	Option I will not encourage more home working and will not encourage greater use of village facilities for meetings/ business support.	

## Option to be taken forward

Policy option A: Prioritise the development of 6-8 new units of affordable housing through the conversion of existing underutilised buildings and/ or the construction of new housing on brownfield sites and/ or infill sites within the village envelopes. Restrict a limited amount of new market housing, with preference given to 1-2 bedroom houses, to brownfield sites and/ or infill sites within the village envelopes. Request all planning applications demonstrate conformity to the Village Design Statement.

### Policy area 2: Housing:

#### (2a) Affordable Housing Policy

The preferred option for the development of 6-8 new units of affordable housing will be through the conversion of existing underused buildings and/ or the construction of new houses on brown field sites within the Neighbourhood Plan Area and/or to infill sites (see definition below) within the Village Envelopes. The provision of affordable housing will to meet the identified needs of people with a local connection (see section 4.27 of the NP).

#### Rural Exceptions Site Policy

Existing Planning Policy permits residential development of 100% affordable housing on land outside the scope of housing policies if it meets a particular demonstrable need for local affordable housing and cannot be met in any other way. This Rural Exceptions Site Policy will only be invoked if affordable housing need cannot be met under the Affordable Housing Policy.

#### (2b) Market Housing Policy

This Policy recognises that Planning permission has been granted for 21 units of housing on the brownfield site of Freshford Mill.

A limited number of new market housing will be restricted to brown field sites within the Neighbourhood Plan Area and/or to infill sites (see definition below) within the Village Envelopes.

To replenish an imbalance to the existing market-housing stock, which is hampering the sustainability of the community by limiting opportunities for young families to move into the villages and for elderly residents to remain therein, preference will be given to the provision of 1-2 bedroom housing.

Home adaptations or extensions which are demonstrably required to provide additional home working capacity will be supported.

### Infill Definition

Infill is defined as the filling of a small gap within the village envelopes that is large enough for not more than a few dwellings and generally only one dwelling. It must be consistent with the goals of the Neighbourhood Plan and must be in line with the approach set out in Planning Policy Guidance 2 on the Green Belt which maintains a presumption against inappropriate development.

### (2c) Planning Questionnaire

All planning applicants within the Neighbourhood Plan Area will be requested by the Parish Councils to complete a questionnaire confirming they have read and considered the Village Design Statement (see Appendix E1) together with an explanation on how their application conforms to it.

### Planning Applications Process

This Housing Policy contemplates a modest growth of development within clearly defined areas within the two villages. It does not alter the fact that, as now, every planning application will need to fulfil existing planning law requirements and that the two Parish Councils and private individuals may continue to support, object or make representation. Any housing development that exceeds a modest level of provision will need to demonstrate how it will be of positive benefit to the character of the landscape and of benefit to the community.

### Justification and evidence

1. NPPF
2. Green Belt
3. Wiltshire draft core strategy
4. Bath and North East Somerset draft core strategy
5. Cotswold Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty development plan
6. Affordable housing needs surveys
7. Development framework (see section 3 of NP)
8. Village Design Statement (see section 3.3 of NP)
9. Map 2 of NP

## Policy Area 3: Local Green Spaces

3. Local Green Spaces	SEA Objectives				Summary – evidence and justification
	1. Natural Environment	2. Planning & Development	3. Transport & safer movement	4. Facilities & Services	
<p><b>Option A: Designate the King George V play park as a village green. Designate the two village greens, the Freshford play park and the environmentally sensitive fields between the two villages (see Map 1) as Local Green Spaces.</b></p>	✓✓	✓	✓	<b>0</b>	Option A will lead to positive or neutral effects against each SEA objective. It will provide extra protection against development for small areas of environmentally sensitive and historically important land within or adjacent to the community whilst allowing sustainable development within existing brown field sites and infill areas.
<p><b>Option A will provide extra protection against development for small areas of environmentally sensitive and historically important land within or adjacent to the community whilst allowing sustainable development within existing brown field sites and infill areas.</b></p>		Option A will not impact the scope for limited and sustainable development on brown field and infill development	Option A will protect the strategic green spaces and footpaths between the two settlements.	Option A will have little impact on the community's facilities and services.	Option A will lead to positive or neutral effects against each SEA objective. It will provide extra protection against development for small areas of environmentally sensitive and historically important land within or adjacent to the community whilst allowing sustainable development within existing brown field sites and infill areas in accordance with the provisions of NPPF 77.
<p><b>B. Not designate any Local Green Spaces</b></p>	××	✓	? / ×	<b>0</b>	Option B will be more permissible for development. However, these spaces are integral to the character of these rural villages and residents have expressed a strong desire to provide added protection to these sites as a counterbalance to the development goals of the NP.
<p><b>Option B assumes the Local Green Spaces are already protected under Green Belt legislation, although affordable housing could still be built on these sites under the Rural Exceptions Site Policy. These spaces are integral to the character of these rural villages and residents have expressed a strong desire to provide added protection to these sites as a counterbalance to the development goals of the NP.</b></p>		Option B will be more permissible for development, albeit within the constraints of the existing Green Belt policies.	Option B will not protect the strategic green spaces and footpaths between the two settlements.	Option B will have little impact on the community's facilities and services.	Option B will be more permissible for development. However, these spaces are integral to the character of these rural villages and residents have expressed a strong desire to provide added protection to these sites as a counterbalance to the development goals of the NP. The NP runs the risk of not attracting the support of the community should this option be selected.
<p><b>C. Designate all the fields around and within the villages as Local Green Spaces</b></p>	✓✓	××	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	Option C would provide added protection to the ecologically sensitive land within and between the two villages but would constrain modest development and undermine the sustainability of the community.
<p><b>Option C will provide extra protection for the ecologically sensitive fields and woodlands within and surrounding the two villages.</b></p>		Option C will constrain modest development and undermine the sustainability of the community.	Option C will have little impact on transport and safer movement in the community.	Option C will have little impact on the community's facilities and services.	Option C would provide added protection to the ecologically sensitive land within and between the two villages but would constrain modest development and undermine the sustainability of the community.
<p><b>D. Don't designate the King George V play park as a village green</b></p>	×	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	Option D will not provide added protection to this important land in the centre of Limpley Stoke, nor will it ensure the two village centres have equal protection against development. The purpose of this NP is to have consistent policies within the two villages.
<p><b>Option D assumes the land is already protected as a community owned asset. However this land is in the heart of the community, contains valuable ecological assets and provides recreation space for the children in the community. The community are keen for an added layer of protection for this land which is consistent with the Tynning land in Freshford.</b></p>		Option D will have little impact on planning and development.	Option D will have little impact on transport and safer movement in the community.	Option D will have little impact on the community's facilities and services.	Option D will not provide added protection to this important land in the centre of Limpley Stoke, nor will it ensure the two village centres have equal protection against development. The purpose of this NP is to have consistent policies within the two villages.
<p><b>E. Don't designate the village greens as Local Green Spaces</b></p>	××	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	Option E will not provide added protection to these important green spaces in the centre of Limpley Stoke and Freshford. The NP runs the risk of not attracting the support of the community should this option be selected.
<p><b>Option E assumes the village greens are already protected from development. However these small sites are in the heart of the community, contain valuable ecological assets and are important to the rural character of the two villages. Residents are very keen on an added layer of protection to these unique sites.</b></p>		Option E will have little impact on planning and development.	Option E will have little impact on transport and safer movement in the community.	Option E will have little impact on the community's facilities and services.	Option E will not provide added protection to these important green spaces in the centre of Limpley Stoke and Freshford. The NP runs the risk of not attracting the support of the community should this option be selected.



<p><b>F. Don't designate the environmentally sensitive fields between the villages (see Map 1) as Local Green Spaces</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">x x</p> <p>Option F will not provide an added layer of protection for the green lungs of the community separating the two villages and containing the historically important site of the medieval village of Woodwick. Without this policy, there is the risk of agglomeration between the two villages which would detract from their rural character and distinctiveness.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">✓</p> <p>Option F will be more permissible for development, albeit within the constraints of the existing Green Belt policies.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>0</b></p> <p>Option F will have little impact on transport and safer movement in the community.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>0</b></p> <p>Option F will have little impact on the community's facilities and services.</p>	<p>Option F will not provide an added layer of protection for the green lungs of the community separating the two villages and containing the historically important site of the medieval village of Woodwick. Without this policy, there is the risk of agglomeration between the two villages which would detract from their rural character and distinctiveness and would contravene NPPF 79.</p>
--	--	---	---	---	--

### Option to be taken forward

Policy option A: Designate the King George V play park as a village green. Designate the two village greens, the Freshford play park and the environmentally sensitive fields between the two villages (see Map 1) as Local Green Spaces.

#### Policy area 3: Local Green Spaces:

The two village greens, known as the Tying and King George V Play Park, and the Freshford Play Park are limited in size, are located in the middle of the villages and are of particular importance to the community for recreation and peaceful reflection (see section 6). They will be safeguarded from development, other than in very special circumstances, in accordance with the provisions of Paragraph 77 of the NPPF.

The environmentally sensitive fields between the two villages, which include the historically important remains of the medieval village of Woodwick, are limited in size and are adjacent to the two villages. These will also be safeguarded from development to preserve the rural character of the villages and prevent incremental development which might merge them together, other than in very special circumstances in accordance with the provisions of Paragraph 77 of the NPPF.

#### Justification and evidence

1. NPPF
2. Green Belt
3. Wiltshire draft core strategy
4. Bath and North East Somerset draft core strategy
5. Cotswold Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty development plan
6. "Making Progress" village questionnaire results
7. Alan Dodge's book "Freshford – the history of a Somerset Village"

## Policy Area 4: Community Hub

4. Community hub	SEA Objectives				Summary – evidence and justification
	1. Natural Environment	2. Planning & Development	3. Transport & safer movement	4. Facilities & Services	
<b>A. Designate the area that includes the Galleries community shop and Freshford Memorial Hall as the centre, or hub, of the combined community.</b>	✓	✓	✓	✓✓	Option A will lead to positive effects against each SEA objective. It will acknowledge the area where the community shop, pre-school and Memorial Hall are co-located as the hub of the combined community where safe transport links already exist. It will also facilitate the planned redevelopment of the Memorial Hall and for other community facilities and assets, such as the surgery, to relocate here through the relaxation of planning constraints for such developments.
<b>B. Not designate a community hub</b>	? / x	? / x	x	x x	Option B meets none of the SEA objectives and will make it more difficult for the community to upgrade and develop new facilities and services to make the community more sustainable.
<b>C. Designate separate hubs for Limpley Stoke and Freshford</b>	x x	x	x	x	Option C meets none of the SEA objectives. This was the model for the community 20 years ago and the closure of village shops and services during this period is an indication of the failure of this business model. A single community hub, as exemplified by the Galleries community shop, is the most economic way of supporting existing and new community facilities and services.

**Option to be taken forward** Policy Option A. Designate the area that includes the Galleries community shop and Freshford Memorial Hall as the centre, or hub, of the combined community.

### Policy area 4: Community Hub:

Designate the area that includes the Galleries community shop and Freshford Memorial Hall as the centre, or hub, of the combined community. Development in this area, compatible with its role as the centre of the community service provision, will be permitted.

### Justification and evidence

1. NPPF
2. Green Belt
3. Wiltshire draft core strategy
4. Bath and North East Somerset draft core strategy
5. Cotswold Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty development plan

6. Freshord Memorial Hall development plan
7. Galleries community shop development plan

## Policy Area 5: Housing and Safer Transport

5. Transport and safer movement	SEA Objectives				Summary – evidence and justification
	1. Natural Environment	2. Planning & Development	3. Transport & safer movement	4. Facilities & Services	
<b>A. Introduce a 20mph zone to cover the residential areas of the two villages, construct "village gateways" at all entry points, improve access to public transport and improve pathways to the community hub.</b>	<b>0</b> Option A has minimal impact on the natural environment.	<b>0</b> Option A has minimal impact on planning and development.	✓✓ Option A will make movement within and between the villages safer and easier to undertake by residents and families walking to the school, the community hub and accessing public services.	✓ Option A will facilitate access to the village hub and the community facilities and services and reduce the pressure on limited car parking.	Option A will lead to positive effects against the transport and facilities SEA objectives. It will facilitate walking within and between the villages whilst facilitating access to the village hub and the community facilities and services and reduce the pressure on limited car parking in key community hotspots.
<b>B. Do none of the above.</b>	<b>0</b> Option B has no impact on the natural environment.	<b>0</b> Option B has no impact on planning and development.	×× Option A will not make movement within and between the villages safer and easier to undertake by residents and families walking to the school, the community hub and accessing public services.	× Option A will not facilitate access to the village hub and the community facilities and services and not reduce the pressure on limited car parking.	Option B removes all the benefits of Option A. It will allow drivers to continue to drive at excessive speeds through the community which will discourage walking and promote more car usage. There is already a shortage of car parking at key community facilities and these will come under even greater pressures.

### Option to be taken forward

Policy Option A. Introduce a 20mph zone to cover the residential areas of the two villages, construct "village gateways" at all entry points, improve access to public transport and improve pathways to the community hub.

### Policy area 5: Transport and safer movement:

Introduce a 20mph zone to cover the residential areas of the two villages, construct "village gateways" at all entry points and improve access to public transport and upgrade pathways to the community hub.

### Justification and evidence

1. NPPF
2. Green Belt
3. Wiltshire draft core strategy
4. Bath and North East Somerset draft core strategy
5. Cotswold Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty development plan
6. Freshford safer movement plan
7. Freshford school safe to travel plan

# Sustainability Environment Assessment

## Assessing the effects of the neighbourhood plan

---

Strategic Environment Assessment				
Environmental policy impact				
	Development framework	Housing	Local green spaces	Community hub
<b>Biodiversity</b>	Negligible	Negligible	Improvement	None
<b>Population</b>	Improvement	Improvement	Improvement	Improvement
<b>Human health</b>	None	None	Improvement	Improvement
<b>Fauna</b>	Improvement	Negligible	Improvement	None
<b>Flora</b>	Improvement	Negligible	Improvement	None
<b>Soil</b>	Negligible	Minimal	Improvement	None
<b>Water</b>	Improvement	Negligible	Improvement	None
<b>Air</b>	Improvement	Negligible	Improvement	None

<b>Climatic factors</b>	None	Negligible	Improvement	None
<b>Material assets</b>	None	Improvement	Negligible	Improvement
<b>Landscape</b>	Improvement	Minimal	Improvement	Negligible

**Mitigation requirements**

Impacts will be minimised where they occur by the following measures:

1. A presumption in favour of brownfield
2. Conservation of heritage resources in any development or redevelopment
3. Maintenance and enhancement of natural landscape (e.g. woodlands)