

**THE ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT OF PLANS AND
PROGRAMMES REGULATIONS 2004
REGULATION 9 SCREENING DETERMINATION:
Crich Neighbourhood Plan**

THE ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT OF PLANS AND PROGRAMMES REGULATIONS 2004

REGULATION 9 SCREENING DETERMINATION: Crich Neighbourhood Plan

Regulation 9 of The Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 requires that the responsible authority determines whether or not a plan is 'likely to have significant environmental effects' and if a Strategic Environmental Assessment is required (SEA).

Amber Valley Borough Council being the responsible authority has determined, after consideration of the draft Crich Neighbourhood Plan and following consultation with the Environment Agency, Historic England and Natural England (responses appended), that the Plan does not require a SEA.

Reasons for the Decision

Annex I of the SEA Directive identifies a number of potential aspects of the environment which may require consideration in relation to significant effects. These issues may include (but are not limited to): "biodiversity, population, human health, fauna, flora, soil, water, air, climatic factors, material assets, cultural heritage including architectural and archaeological heritage, landscape and the interrelationship between the above factors". The following discussion considers any relevant issues in relation to each of these aspects of the Neighbourhood Plan environment and how they might be affected as a result of the proposed policies of the Neighbourhood Plan.

(a) biodiversity, flora and fauna;

The nearest European site lies to the north west of the parish, some 4 miles distant (Gang Mine Special Area for Conservation). Slightly further to the North West is the Peak District Dales (SAC) some 5 miles away. Given the distance from the parish boundary, the nature of the designation and the contents of the plan (no growth as such is determined) it is concluded that there are no likely significant effects on European sites.

The Plan is not likely to have significant adverse effects upon biodiversity. Draft Policy NP9 ought to ensure that the protection of ecological networks is taken into consideration in development proposals.

(b) population;

The population of the Crich ward in the 2011 census was 2,401. It is considered that the Plan would not therefore affect a significant number of people.

The Plan does not plan to meet any particular level of need (which has not been identified at a local level), nor does it identify sites where this might be suitable. Therefore, effects upon population and housing are difficult to establish at this level.

The draft Plan sets out policies to protect areas of landscape, local amenity value and cultural heritage. Although this does not preclude development coming forward, it could act as a constraint to housing delivery. Despite this, housing could still be delivered through the emerging Local Plan.

(c) human health;

There is one GP in the plan area. No development is proposed in the plan area, and so effects on service use and quality cannot be directly associated with the draft Plan. However, the plan policies will exert a degree of control over development, which could influence future levels of housing.

The draft Plan seeks to avoid the loss of greenfield land and landscape, as well as protecting settlement and landscape character. All these factors are positive contributors to health. The draft Plan does not set out to encourage large scale growth, and so it can be assumed that the Plan's direct effects on the capacity of health facilities are limited.

Overall the draft Plan is likely to have positive implications for health, with a focus on protecting and enhancing community facilities and environmental quality. Therefore, no adverse significant effects would be envisaged.

(f) soil;

The large majority of land within the plan area is classified as Grade 4 agricultural land, and so development would not be anticipated to have significant effects on soil resources.

(g) water;

The Plan does not allocate land for development, nor does it include specific policies concerning water resources. Therefore, although development has the potential to affect water quality, this would not be attributable to the draft Plan (and ought to be managed through existing and emerging Local Plan policies given that there are no critical issues identified).

(h) air;

Given the rural nature of the Plan area, air quality is not a critical issue. Furthermore, the plan does not allocate land for redevelopment nor set a specific level of growth to be achieved. Therefore, substantial changes to air quality are not likely to occur within the Plan area or elsewhere (as a result of the draft Plan).

(i) Climatic Factors;

The majority of land within the plan area is classified as being within Flood Zone 1 (low risk). Development would therefore be expected to be acceptable in terms of flood risk.

(j) material assets;

There are a number of buildings and facilities in the Plan area which have been identified through community consultation as being locally important. Certain buildings / facilities have been established in draft Policy for their protection (unless circumstances dictate that this is not reasonable).

This policy approach ought to have positive (but not significant) effects on the 'material assets' of the Plan area.

(k) cultural heritage, including architectural and archaeological heritage;

Development presents the potential for effects upon heritage assets and their settings in the Plan area. However, no development as such is

proposed, and the approach to managing effects upon cultural heritage is positive. Therefore, adverse effects would be unlikely to arise as a result of the draft Plan. The draft policies could have positive effects on heritage, but these are not likely to be significant, as they do not preclude development from occurring.

(l) Sustainable Transport

The Plan is unlikely to have a significant effect on patterns of travel, as the rural nature of the settlements is a strong characteristic. The draft Plan also promotes car parking where appropriate, which acknowledges that substantial modal shift is unlikely to occur.

(m) Landscape

As no development is proposed as part of the draft Plan, direct effects are unlikely to occur. However, given the protective nature of the policies concerning landscape character, the draft Plan is expected to have positive, rather than adverse effects.

Conclusion

After having given consideration to the anticipated scope of the Crich Neighbourhood Plan, and the relevant environmental issues locally, it is concluded that the potential for significant effects to arise as a result of the Plan is likely to be limited, and / or mostly positive in nature. Consequently, it is considered that a formal SEA is not required.

It is also concluded that the plan will have no likely significant effects on European sites and therefore a Habitat Regulation Assessment is not required.

Further Information

A copy of this determination has been sent to the Consultation Bodies and made available on the Council's website at www.ambervalley.gov.uk

It will also be available on request during normal office hours at:

Amber Valley Borough Council
Town Hall
Market Place

Ripley
Derbyshire
DE5 3BT

If you require any further information, then please contact the Local Plans Team by e-mail: ldf@ambervalley.gov.uk or by calling 01773 841583.

Date: 31 March 2017

Date: 14 March 2017
Our ref: 209579



Rachel Coates
Amber Valley Borough Council

BY EMAIL ONLY

Hombeam House
Crewe Business Park
Electra Way
Crewe
Cheshire
CW1 6GJ

T 0300 060 3900

Dear Rachel

Planning consultation: Crich Neighbourhood Development Plan - SEA Screening Opinion Consultation

Thank you for your consultation on the above dated 09 February 2017

Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development.

Strategic Environmental Assessment Screening

We welcome the production of this SEA Screening report. Natural England notes and concurs with the screening outcome i.e. that no SEA is required.

Further guidance on deciding whether the proposals are likely to have significant environmental effects and the requirements for consulting Natural England on SEA are set out in the [National Planning Practice Guidance](#).

We would be happy to comment further should the need arise but if in the meantime you have any queries please do not hesitate to contact us.

For any queries relating to the specific advice in this letter only please contact Felicity Bingham on 02082 256387. For any new consultations, or to provide further information on this consultation please send your correspondences to consultations@naturalengland.org.uk.

We really value your feedback to help us improve the service we offer. We have attached a feedback form to this letter and welcome any comments you might have about our service

Yours sincerely

Felicity Bingham
Sustainable Development Advisor
East Midlands Team
felicity.bingham@naturalengland.org.uk

Ms. Rachael Coates - Principal Community Planning Officer
Amber Valley Borough Council
PO Box 18
Ripley
Derbyshire
DE5 3SZ

Our ref: LT/2006/000231/OR-05/IS1-L01
Your ref:

Date: 09 February 2017

Dear Ms. Coates

Crich Neighbourhood Plan SEA Screening

Thank you for consulting the Environment Agency on the Crich Neighbourhood Plan SEA Screening consultation.

The Environment Agency has no comment to add to this screening proposal.

Yours sincerely

Mr Joseph Drewry
Planning Advisor

Direct dial 02030 253277
Direct e-mail joe.drewry@environment-agency.gov.uk



Historic England

EAST MIDLANDS OFFICE

Ms Rachael Coates
Amber Valley Borough Council
Town Hall
Ripley
Derbyshire
DE5 3SZ

Direct Dial: 01604 735460

Our ref: PL00065360

15 March 2017

Dear Ms Coates

RE: CRICH NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN - SCREENING OPINION REQUEST

Thank you for your consultation in relation to the Crich Neighbourhood Plan SEA Screening Report.

For the purposes of consultations on SEA Screening Opinions, Historic England confines its advice to the question, "Is it likely to have a significant effect on the environment?" in respect of our area of concern, cultural heritage. Our comments are based on the information supplied with the screening request.

On the basis of the information supplied, including that set out in the draft plan in which no new development sites are allocated, and in the context of the criteria set out in Schedule 1 of the Environmental Assessment Regulations [Annex II of 'SEA' Directive], Historic England is of the view that the preparation of a Strategic Environmental Assessment is not likely to be required.

The views of the other statutory consultation bodies should be taken into account before the overall decision on the need for a SEA is made. If a decision is made to undertake a SEA, please note that Historic England has published guidance on Sustainability Appraisal / Strategic Environmental Assessment and the Historic Environment that is relevant to both local and neighbourhood planning and available at:

<https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/sustainability-appraisal-and-strategic-environmental-assessment-advice-note-8/>

Should it be concluded that, overall, a SEA will be required for the Plan, Historic England would be pleased to discuss the scope of the assessment in relation to the historic environment in due course.

I hope that this information is of use to you at this time. Should you have any queries, please do not hesitate to contact me.



2nd Floor, WINDSOR HOUSE, CLIFTONVILLE, NORTHAMPTON, NN1 5BE

Telephone 01604 735460
HistoricEngland.org.uk



Historic England is subject to the Freedom of Information Act, 2000 (FOIA) and Environmental Information Regulations 2004 (EIR). All information held by the organisation will be accessible in response to an information request, unless one of the exemptions in the FOIA or EIR applies.

Rosamund Worrall
Historic Environment Planning Adviser
Rosamund.worrall@historicengland.org.uk