

## **Appendix E**

Central Park AAP Preferred Options document  
Consultation Response Form  
Sustainability Appraisal  
Sustainability Appraisal Response Form  
Notice of Proposal Matters  
Statement of Availability

## **Notice of Proposal Matters**

Plymouth City Council's Local Development Framework

### **Central Park Area Action Plan and Sutton Harbour Area Action Plan at Preferred Options Stage.**

In accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004, Regulation 26 Plymouth City Council has prepared preferred option consultation documents for Central Park Area Action Plan and Sutton Harbour Area Action Plan.

These documents are available for consultation for six weeks from 8 November 2006 to the 19 December 2006 at 5pm for people to make comments at Preferred Option Stage. All representation must be received within this time. Copies of the documents, response forms, Sustainability Appraisals and accompanying comment forms will be available to view at all locations stated in the Statement of Availability.

<b>Proposed title of Consultation Document:</b>	<b>Proposed subject Matter:</b>	<b>Geographical Coverage</b>
Central Park Preferred Options	The Preferred Options for change in the Central Park Area.	Central Park, Plymouth
Sutton Harbour Preferred Options	The Preferred Options for change in the Sutton Harbour Area.	Sutton Harbour, Plymouth

Representations should be sent

By post to:

Strategy Unit  
Planning and Regeneration Service  
Plymouth City Council  
Floor 8, The Civic Centre  
Plymouth  
PL1 2AA

By Email to:  
[ldf@plymouth.gov.uk](mailto:ldf@plymouth.gov.uk)

By Fax to:  
01752 304231

For any further information or if you would like any document to be available in brail, audio form or in any other language please contact the Strategy Unit, Planning and Regeneration, Plymouth City Council, Floor 8,Civic Centre, Plymouth, PL1 2AA

If you would like to be notified of further progress in developing this document please tick the relevant box below.

	<b>Request to be notified</b>
Central Park Area Action Plan	
Sutton Harbour Area Action Plan	

Name:  
Address:  
Postcode:  
Email address:  
Signature

Please return this form to: Strategy Unit, Planning and Regeneration,  
Plymouth City Council, Floor 8, The Civic Centre, Plymouth, PL1 2AA

Official use only: Date received

Official use only:

# Strategic Environmental Assessment/ Sustainability Appraisal Consultation for Central Park Area Action Plan Volume 2



## Response Form

<b>Your Name:</b>		<b>Organisation/Company/Individual represented: (if applicable)</b>	
Mr/Mrs/Ms/Miss/Other _____		_____	
If you are the respondent fill in box A. If you are an agent put <i>your</i> details in box A and those of your client in box B.			
<b>A Your Address</b>		<b>B Client Address if different from A</b>	
Post Code:		Post Code:	
Telephone No:		Telephone No:	
Fax No:		Fax No:	
E-mail:		E-mail:	
<b>Forms with out a name and address will not be treated as valid representations.</b>			
<b>Which part of the document do you wish to comment on?</b>			
<b>Is you comment in support of or objecting to that part of the document?</b>			
<b>Support</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Objection</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>What comment do you wish to make?</b> Please continue on a separate sheet or overleaf if you require more space.			

**DATA PROTECTION NOTICE:** Information given on this form will be used when addressing representations on the Sutton Harbour Area Action Plan. Please be aware that your representations, including personal details, will be made publicly available, including the council website.

**The consultation runs from 8 November – 19 December 2006**

**Forms must be completed and returned by 19 December at 5pm.**

**Please return your completed response form to:**

Strategy Unit  
Planning and Regeneration Service  
Plymouth City Council  
Civic Centre  
Plymouth  
Email: [ldf@plymouth.gov.uk](mailto:ldf@plymouth.gov.uk)

Tel 01752 305477  
Fax: 01752 304294  
Website: [www.plymouth.gov.uk/ldf](http://www.plymouth.gov.uk/ldf)

**If you would like this form in any other format telephone 01752 305477**

**SEA/SA**  
of  
**Preferred Options for**  
**CENTRAL PARK**  
**Area Action Plan**  
**Volume 2**

**Prepared for**  
**Plymouth City Council**

**By**

**Land Use Consultants**

**October 2006**

14 Great George Street  
Bristol BS1 5RH  
Tel: 01179 291 997  
Fax: 01179 291 998  
[luc@bristol.landuse.co.uk](mailto:luc@bristol.landuse.co.uk)

**Table of Contents**

- I. Status of the Report----- 3**
  - Introduction..... 3**
  - Previous Appraisals and Assessments ..... 3**
    - Central Park ----- 3
  
- 2. Appraisal of the Preferred Options for Central Park Area Action Plan ----- 5**
  - Introduction..... 5**
  - Appraisal of the Preferred Options for the AAP ..... 5**
    - Reviewing the SA Objectives against the Preferred Option Principles ----- 5
    - Appraisal of each Preferred Options ----- 6
  - Conclusions and Recommendations..... 20**
    - Conclusions: -----20
    - Recommendations: -----21

# I. STATUS OF THE REPORT

---

## Introduction

- I.1. This report sets out the sustainability appraisal (SA) and strategic environmental assessment (SEA) of the Preferred Options for the Central Park Area Action Plan contained in Plymouth City Councils' local development framework.

## Previous Appraisals and Assessments

- I.2. Plymouth City Council developed its initial ideas for Central Park as part of the overall studies leading to the Preferred Options for the Core Strategy. These outline proposals were assessed by the equivalent stage of the SEA/SA for the Core Strategy which was undertaken in June and July, 2005.
- I.3. The conclusions reached in the July 2005 SEA/SA are reproduced in the shaded box below.

### Central Park

The proposals for the Central Park Area Action Plan appear broadly sustainable although, inevitably, some conflict of interest may arise

- The Issues and Options Paper *'suggests a move away from the incremental planning of fragmented spaces and uses towards a bold and exciting vision of "Destination Central Park" that re-interprets the historic Mawson Plan for the Park in a contemporary way'*.

The SEA/SA appraisal strongly supports the suggestion of an integrated approach to design but notes that there could be significant tensions between the concept of a regional centre of sporting and leisure excellence and the Park's role as a much needed local resource. Concerns are raised, in particular, by:

- The potential for substantial growth in car borne visitors and increased demand for parking (contrary to aims for the promotion of public transport) arising from the Life Centre concept with its plans for a stadium, swimming pool, ice rink, multi-sports hall and hotel/conference/exhibition facilities).
- Uncertainty over the level of support likely to be forthcoming for the development of really effective public transport links from the rest of the city.
- Issues of public safety arising from increased levels of use (although the corollary also applies in that increased levels of activity can sometimes reduce crime levels).
- Prospects for securing the required level of investment in the basic infrastructural improvements to the park, as listed under the options, since large scale projects like the Life Centre often absorb most of the available funds, leaving essential repairs and maintenance unattended.

The proposals to safeguard and enhance allotments are strongly in line with the overall commitment to sustainable development and should be given high priority. However, this should not be seen as compensation for 'any losses resulting from other park enhancement measures' but as a legitimate goal in its own right.

The concepts outlined in this leaflet are at too general a level to allow a full appraisal to take place and it is strongly recommended that the sketch design for the new vision of the park should be completed and published before the detailed consultation planned in September/October 2005.

- 1.2. These findings have been carried forward where relevant into the existing appraisal<sup>1</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> 3440.09/October 2006 AAPs/LUC SEA Central Park Area Action Plan Preferred Options 27.10.2006

## 2. APPRAISAL OF THE PREFERRED OPTIONS FOR CENTRAL PARK AREA ACTION PLAN

---

### Introduction

- 2.1. This chapter outlines the main findings of the appraisal of the preferred options of Central Park Area Action Plan. In reaching our conclusions, we have drawn on our analysis of the baseline situation, the characteristics of Plymouth and the sustainability issues it faces. In all instances, an explanation for our assessment has been provided, in the matrices set out in **Table 2**.

### Appraisal of the Preferred Options for the AAP

- 2.2. The appraisal of the Preferred Options has been split into two sections; firstly a review of the SA Objectives against the principles of the Area Action Plan and secondly a more detailed appraisal of the preferred options.

### Reviewing the SA Objectives against the Preferred Option Principles

- 2.3. The SEA/SA of the Preferred Options for Central Park Area Action Plan takes its starting point with a review of the vision and principles see **Table I**. Overall, the vision and principles adhere to the sustainability objectives. There are, however, a number of issues which may potentially generate negative impacts. These include:
- A reduction in the status of the park as a wildlife corridor, due to the level of new development and activity proposed. Although this issue is referred to in the objectives, measures should be taken to balance regenerating the areas with maintaining the site as a wildlife corridor.
  - Expansion of areas of impermeable surface area may increase rates of storm water runoff and measures should be put in place to compensate for loss of natural drainage.
  - The design and construction of buildings should seek to reduce energy consumption, water consumption, and also source materials locally and use where possible secondary materials.
  - The potential increase in waste produced on site as a result of increasing number of households, and increased levels of activity and provision of catering, should be addressed, with sustainable solutions put in place prior to development.
  - Proposals should seek to support local employment opportunities during construction and implementation.
  - The proposals aim to reduce car parking spaces in order to encourage people to rely less on the use of cars. However the extent to which people can be persuaded to give up the use of private cars will be determined in part by the degree of success in promoting public transport. If the public transport services are not available from the outset of the scheme, are too infrequent or fail to connect to critical destinations this effort to encourage a modal shift is likely to fail, leaving disgruntled residents with insufficient space for their vehicles. What contingency plans exist to deal with this situation?

<b>Table 1: Central Park AAP</b>		<b>SA Objectives and Principles</b>	
<b>SA Objectives</b>		<b>Central Park Principles</b>	
BIODIVERSITY – Biodiversity and landscape are properly valued, conserved and enhanced		TO CREATE A LANDMARK REGIONAL LIFE CENTRE – a complex of high quality design and innovative technology	
POLLUTION – Pollution is limited to levels which do not damage natural systems		TO CREATE A PARK WITH DESIRABLE, HIGH QUALITY, VIBRANT SPACES – a park that can be used by the whole Plymouth community whilst also safeguarding its value as an important wildlife corridor	
CLIMATE CHANGE – Emissions contributing to climate change are reduced and adaptation measures are in place		TO CREATE A SAFE AND WELL-CONNECTED PARK – well connected with its surrounding neighbourhoods and the City Centre	
RESOURCES – Demands on natural resources are managed so that they are used as efficiently as possible		TO PROVIDE HIGH QUALITY PUBLIC AND SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT FACILITIES- serving the park and new facilities	
ENERGY – Efficient use of energy		TO IMPROVE THE RELATIONSHIP OF THE CITY AND ITS SURROUNDINGS -To improve and strengthen the relationship between the park and surrounding city in a sustainable manner	
WASTE – Waste is minimised and, wherever possible, eliminated		TO IMPROVE PUBLIC FACILITIES - to improve the range and quality of public facilities available to park users.	
ECONOMY – A diverse and thriving economy			
WORK AND INCOMES – Everyone has access to satisfying and fairly paid work and unpaid work is valued			
LOCAL NEEDS – Wherever possible, local needs are met locally so support local economies			
HEALTH & WELL-BEING – Promoting everyone’s physical and mental wellbeing			
LEARNING – Everyone has access to lifelong learning, training opportunities, skills and knowledge			
SAFETY – Everyone is able to live without fear of crime or persecution			
DISTINCTIVENESS AND CULTURAL HERITAGE – Diversity and local distinctiveness and cultural heritage are valued, protected and celebrated			
LEISURE – Opportunities for culture, leisure and recreation are provided widely			
TRANSPORT AND ACCESS – Offering inclusive access to all service, including access for those without a car			
BASIC NEEDS, EQUALITY AND DIVERSITY – Ensuring community cohesion, tolerance, understanding and equality of opportunity			
DEMOCRACY – All sections of the community are empowered to participate in decision making			

### **Appraisal of each Preferred Options**

- 2.4. In order to predict and assess the significance of the preferred options, the probability, duration, frequency and reversibility of the effect were determined. In making the assessment, the following issues were considered:

**Timescale:** are the potential effects short, medium or long term and are they temporary or permanent?

**Magnitude, scale and likelihood of occurrence:** What is the scale of the effect, minor, moderate or major considering the geographical area and size of population likely to be affected and where it will occur.

**Significance:** Will the effect of the preferred option have a positive, negative, uncertain or neutral effect.

**Cumulative/secondary and synergistic effects:** Identification of potential cumulative, secondary and synergistic effects through implementing development following the policies in the plan.

**Mitigation:** Measures where possible will consider how the effect can be avoided through conditions or changes in the way in which it is implemented. Measures will consider alternatives, the refinement of the policy, additional policies or policy criteria to reduce the impact and/or supplementary planning guidance. Where there are proposals mitigation measures can be more specific.

<b>SA CRITERIA (In Columns across)</b>	1. Biodiversity	2. Pollution	3. Climate Change	4. Resources	5. Energy	6. Waste	7. Economy	8. Work and Incomes	9. Local Needs	10. Health & Well-Being	11. Learning	12. Safety	13. Distinctiveness & Cultural Heritage	14. Leisure	15. Transport and Access	16. Basic Needs, Equality and Diversity	17. Democracy
<b>POLICIES, ALTERNATIVES &amp; PREFERRED OPTIONS (Below)</b>																	
<b>Preferred Development Options:</b>  <b>Preferred Option I: The Life Centre.</b> <i>To develop an integrated state-of-the-art active leisure facilities in a single complex, delivering economies of scale and a strong link with health, arts, education and culture, and with Plymouth Argyle Football Club.</i>	X ?	?	X ?	?	?	?	✓	✓	✓	✓✓	✓	✓	✓?	✓✓	✓	✓	0
<i>Uses within the Life Centre include: Facilities for dry indoor sports, an Olympic sized swimming pool, hockey sized ice rink, health facilities with consultation rooms, regional centre of excellence for dance and music, replacement or additional facilities for Peverell library and sports and leisure retailing with healthy eating outlets.</i>																	
<b>Alternative option A</b> <i>nature of the Life Centre- improve or redevelop the existing swimming pool on its existing site and add new facilities to it to compose a new Life Centre.</i>	?	?	?	?	?	?	✓	✓	✓	✓	?	✓	✓?	✓	✓	✓	0
<b>Alternative option B</b> <i>An alternative relating to the mix of uses to support the viability of the Life Centre would be the introduction of residential development as an integral part of the scheme.</i>	X ?	?	X ?	?	?	?	✓	✓	✓	✓✓	✓ ?	✓?	✓?	✓	✓	✓?	0
<b>Alternative option C</b> <i>In relation to design</i>	X ?	?	X ?	?	?	?	✓	✓	✓ ?	✓	✓	✓?	✓?	✓	✓	✓?	0

<b>SA CRITERIA</b> <b>(In Columns across)</b>  <b>POLICIES,</b> <b>ALTERNATIVES &amp;</b> <b>PREFERRED</b> <b>OPTIONS (Below)</b>	1. Biodiversity	2. Pollution	3. Climate Change	4. Resources	5. Energy	6. Waste	7. Economy	8. Work and Incomes	9. Local Needs	10. Health & Well-Being	11. Learning	12. Safety	13. Distinctiveness & Cultural Heritage	14. Leisure	15. Transport and Access	16. Basic Needs, Equality and Diversity	17. Democracy
<i>alternatives, the preferred design concept provides for open views of the Life Centre and Plymouth Argyle's stadium in a parkland setting.</i>																	
<b>Preferred Option 2:</b> <b>An improved parkland</b> <i>To create a quality environment and unique identity for Central Park, befitting a premier city destination.</i>	✓ ✓	✓	✓	0	✓	0	✓	0	✓ ?	✓ ✓	0	✓	✓?	✓	✓	0	0
<i>This will include a multi-functional space associated with the Life Centre (flexible to hold range of events and performances); protecting, enhancing and interpretation of key landscape features, habitats, local history and views; management outcomes that favour improved biodiversity. Improvements to allotment facilities and replacement allotments for those displaced, improved surfaces, lighting, street furniture signage and interpretation, vegetation management too increase daylight levels and improve and enhance safety and views and routes through park and safeguarding of playing fields.</i>																	
<b>Preferred Option 3:</b> <b>A well connected park</b> <i>To create a network of safe, direct, convenient and understandable routes linking the neighbourhoods to the park and the city centre.</i>	? X	✓	✓	0	✓	0	✓	0	✓	✓ ✓	0	✓ ✓	✓?	✓	✓ ✓	✓?	0
<i>The network will include: safe connected routes that link up with surrounding neighbourhoods and city centre, distinctive park entrances, consideration of public transport connections, appropriate street lighting, distinctive and clear signage and to provide a means to negotiate the steep valley between the city centre and Central Park.</i>																	
<b>Preferred Option 4:</b> <b>A Transport Interchange</b> <i>To develop in conjunction with the Life Centre proposals a</i>	X ?	✓	?	✓	✓	X ?	✓	✓	✓	✓ ✓	0	✓?	✓?	✓?	✓ ✓	✓?	0

<b>SA CRITERIA</b> <b>(In Columns across)</b>  <b>POLICIES,</b> <b>ALTERNATIVES &amp;</b> <b>PREFERRED</b> <b>OPTIONS (Below)</b>	1. Biodiversity	2. Pollution	3. Climate Change	4. Resources	5. Energy	6. Waste	7. Economy	8. Work and Incomes	9. Local Needs	10. Health & Well-Being	11. Learning	12. Safety	13. Distinctiveness & Cultural Heritage	14. Leisure	15. Transport and Access	16. Basic Needs, Equality and Diversity	17. Democracy
<i>new public transport interchange.</i>																	
<i>The interchange is to include: covered facilities for passenger waiting, key information on public transport, Life Centre and Central Park, new highway approach and minimum car parking, secure cycle storage, healthy eating retailing.</i>																	
<b>Preferred Option 5:</b> <b>The City Bus Site and Milehouse Road Junction</b> <i>To comprehensively redevelop these key strategic sites for a range of uses that could include residential dwellings, retail floor space and employment office space.</i>	?	✓ ?	?	?	✓ ?	?	✓	✓	✓ ?	✓	✓	✓ ?	✓ ?	?	✓ ?	✓	0
<i>The uses could include: 195-250 residential dwellings including affordable and built to “lifetime homes” standard, 500-700sqm retail floor space, 700-900 sqm of employment office space.</i>																	
<b>Preferred Option 6:</b> <b>Peverell Park Road, Outland Road Corner</b> <i>To comprehensively redevelop this prominent corner site with a mixed use development including dwellings, retail floor space and car parking.</i>	?	?	?	?	?	?	✓	✓	✓ ?	✓	✓	✓ ?	✓ ?	?	✓ ?	?	0
<i>Mixed use development will include: 15-20 dwellings, 700 sqm retail floor space and car parking.</i>																	
<b>Preferred Option 7:</b> <b>Pennycomequick</b> <i>To develop this site and improve the edge of city and the park with, between 125 to 200 residential dwelling, including 37 to 60</i>	X ?	?	?	✓	?	?	✓	✓	✓ ?	✓	?	✓ ?	✓	?	✓ ?	?	0

<b>SA CRITERIA (In Columns across)</b>	1. Biodiversity	2. Pollution	3. Climate Change	4. Resources	5. Energy	6. Waste	7. Economy	8. Work and Incomes	9. Local Needs	10. Health & Well-Being	11. Learning	12. Safety	13. Distinctiveness & Cultural Heritage	14. Leisure	15. Transport and Access	16. Basic Needs, Equality and Diversity	17. Democracy
<b>POLICIES, ALTERNATIVES &amp; PREFERRED OPTIONS (Below)</b>																	
<i>affordable homes and 25 to 40 built to “lifetime homes” standard.</i>																	
<b>Preferred Option 8: A park with improved facilities</b> <i>To create a park that has engaging facilities, supporting uses and the public’s experience of Central Park, including a-g.</i>	?	0	0	✓	?	?	?	0	✓	✓✓	✓	?	✓	✓✓	✓	?	0
<i>This will include: providing new sports changing facilities, where appropriate in multifunctional structures, the reuse of vacant and disused park buildings, an educational route interpreting social history, possible public use of the ground floor of Pounds House for café use, rationalising the park’s depot on its current site, improved surfaces, drainage, lighting, street furniture, signage and interpretation, improved children’s play.</i>																	

### Symbols employed in Table

- ✓ Supports the sustainability objective
- ✓✓ Strongly supported the sustainability objective
- 0 Has no impact on the sustainability objective
- X Works against the sustainability objective
- XX Works strongly against the sustainability objective
- ? Has an unknown or uncertain effect on the sustainability objective

### Key Findings

2.5. Below is a brief review of the findings based on each option see **Table 2** above for a summary of findings.

### **Option 1: The Life Centre**

- 2.6. **Strengths:** This proposal will have a positive effect on the local communities' quality of life, health and wellbeing through the provision of outdoor sports and leisure uses both formal and informal, and exposing people to arts, education and culture (objectives 9, 10, 14). The proposal should lead to an increase in economic growth in the area and should generate new employment and training opportunities (objectives 7, 8, 11). High quality design should encourage sustainable resource use and make a positive contribution to distinctiveness and cultural heritage by improving it overall (objectives 4, 5, 13). Improvements in the transport infrastructure, through a transport interchange and footpath/cycleway connections should make the development more widely accessible, and help to improve personal safety (objectives 12, 15).
- 2.7. **Weaknesses:** There are potential negative impacts on biodiversity and on the area's role as a wildlife corridor, due to the likely increase in visitor numbers, noise and light, particularly during construction (objective 1). Increasing activity (particularly the addition of a hotel) and the provision of catering also has the potential to generate increasing amounts of waste (objective 6). If the total impermeable surface area is to increase, measures should be taken to reduce rates of storm runoff through Sustainable Urban Drainage systems. Increased energy use could also have potential negative impacts through increased emissions in relation to long term climate change (objective 3). There are uncertainties associated with additional land take and the effects on pollution (objectives 2, 5).
- 2.8. **Timescale:** Short to long term.
- 2.9. **Likelihood:** Strengths are likely to be high and weaknesses uncertain.
- 2.10. **Recommendations for mitigation of adverse effects and/or enhance or positive effects:** Care needs to be taken to ensure that proposals reduce negative impacts through careful design and monitoring (using trees to create barriers to sound and light, for example, to reduce the effects on wildlife to the east of the proposed site). Proposals should include provisions to limit waste production and for sustainable management where it is produced. The nature of the hotel (and patrons it would attract for example) should be suitable to the location. Sustainable Urban Drainage System should be followed in the design of the works.

### **Alternative A: The nature of the life centre**

**Strengths:** The swimming pool would be redeveloped, providing a better facility for users and there would be fewer adverse effects on the surrounding environment in terms of nature and biodiversity from a smaller overall footprint (objectives 1, 9). As such there would be positive effects on health and well-being and meeting local leisure needs, as well as providing jobs and contributing to the local economy (objectives 8, 10, 11, 14). It is assumed that given close proximity of the site to a transport interchange and good footpaths and cycle routes, there will be positive effects on transport, access and safety (objectives 12, 15). It is also assumed that the new build will be of a high quality design that will enhance local distinctiveness (objective 13).

**Weaknesses:** Opportunities for combining new uses and maximising economic growth and employment opportunities would be limited compared to the Preferred Option (4, 7, 8). In addition, key benefits such as state of the arts facilities, economies of scale, energy efficiency and enhanced facilities management would not be delivered.

**Timescale:** short to long term.

**Likelihood:** High.

**Alternative B: The mix of uses to support the life centre**

**Strengths:** An integrated complex with residential use and leisure use would generate positive effects on meeting local needs, improving health and well-being, and employment although not to the same extent as the preferred option (objectives 8, 9, 14). It is assumed that given the sites close proximity to a transport interchange and good footpaths and cycle routes, there will be positive effects on sustainable transport and access, and that the new build will be of a high quality design (objectives 12, 13, 15).

**Weaknesses:** The proposal would result in a larger overall footprint resulting in the loss of open space and therefore there would also be negative impacts on biodiversity (objective 1). Whilst this proposal for residential development, could have a positive effect on people's quality of life (located within Central Park), development lies away from other residential areas and other services and facilities, and could if developed set a precedent for further residential development to be located within the Park. There are uncertainties over increased resource and energy use and increased waste and pollution from the larger scale development (objectives 2, 4, 5, 6) and whether the market focus of residential development will include a proportion of affordable housing to meet local needs (9).

**Timescale:** Medium to long term.

**Likelihood:** Uncertain.

**Alternative C: The design of the life centre**

**Strengths: Open views to the site would create a strong sense of destination.** This alternative seeks to increase the extent of mixed use recreational, leisure and residential development and potentially integrate development with residential development to the north of Outland Road. This proposal could generate positive effects on economic growth, employment, health and well-being health and cultural heritage and distinctiveness through the creation of strong visual feature acting as a landmark and assisting in orientation (objectives 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13). It is assumed that given the sites close proximity to a transport interchange and good footpaths and cycle routes, there will be positive effects on transport and access (objective 15).

**Weaknesses:** This proposal would result in a higher number of residential properties compared to Alternative B. Whilst a more integrated community would be created with mixed use development it could set a precedent for further

residential development to be located within the Park. This alternative would result in the highest landtake out of all options and could have negative effects on biodiversity and be likely to contribute to increased emissions in relation to long term climate change (objectives 1, 3). Uncertainties exist over the market focus of residential development and whether it will include a proportion of affordable housing, and on use of resources and waste management (objectives 4, 6).

**Timescale:** Medium to long term

**Likelihood:** Uncertain

- 2.11. **Consideration of alternative options:** Three alternative options were considered, improving or redeveloping the swimming pool on its existing site with additional new facilities (alternative A), introducing residential development (alternative B) or providing for mixed use development with open views in a parkland setting (alternative C). Whilst the SEA/SA supports the preferred option, it is important to ensure that the focus of the Central Park does not lie solely on the development of the Life Centre, but also on the surroundings, which could suffer from a lack of investment and consequential management if this proposal was to overrun in costs. Care also needs to be taken to ensure that this development does not set of precedent for further accommodation, resulting in the further increase in the overall footprint of the facilities, car parking spaces and erode from the open character of the Park overall.

### **Option 2: An Improved Parkland**

- 2.12. **Strengths:** This proposal takes a holistic approach to improve the general fabric of the park with overall positive impacts through enhanced biodiversity and landscape and a safer aesthetic park for visitors/users, with recreational grounds maintained (objectives 1, 13). It would also offer positive benefits for health and well being through leisure and recreation opportunities, (objectives 10, 14).
- 2.13. **Weaknesses:** The broad concepts for the Park are encouraging, but (with the increased density of population within the city centre which is promoted in the vision and is welcomed in terms of overall sustainability) it is essential that the highest level of investment is made in enhancing the character of the city's principal park (objectives 7, 8). Greater emphasis needs to be given to refurbishment of the park in line with the Mawson concepts, and to identifying the necessary funding. The creation of high quality open space is as important if not more important than creating new sporting facilities and requires an equivalent budget.
- 2.14. **Timescale:** long term
- 2.15. **Likelihood:** High.
- 2.16. **Recommendations for mitigation of adverse effects and/or enhance or positive effects:** Manage lighting levels to create a balance between safety and adverse impacts on wildlife from excessive light. Develop a fully costed landscape master plan that will deliver the overall aspirations for the Park and its surrounding communities.

- 2.17. **Consideration of alternative options:** No appropriate options were considered apart from reducing a programme of improvements which would diminish the Parks' overall image further.

### **Option 3: A well connected park**

- 2.18. **Strengths:** Positive potential effects from this proposal are associated with measures to improve connectivity to the park, with a network of safe pedestrian, and cycle routes and prominent entrances to the park, with clear signage and sustainable design solutions (objectives 12, 15). This should also benefit leisure users and indirectly the local economy (objectives 7 and 14). Indirect effects also relate to healthier lifestyles and therefore improvements in people's well being and quality of life and a positive contribution to personal safety and meeting the needs of local people (objectives 9, 10, 12).
- 2.19. **Weaknesses:** Potential negative impacts on biodiversity and landscape through recreational pressure and disturbance from increased levels of lighting (objective 1).
- 2.20. **Timescale:** Medium to long term
- 2.21. **Likelihood:** Strengths are likely to be certain, with weaknesses uncertain.
- 2.22. **Recommendations for mitigation of adverse effects and/or enhance or positive effects:** Care needs to be taken through design and monitoring to assess the capacity of the site and ensure measures are taken to protect nature conservation interest. Signage should be appropriate to its surroundings and lighting should be kept to a safe minimum.
- 2.23. **Consideration of alternative options:** An alternative route option was put forward by allotment holders bordering Peverell Park Road to the east of Centre Park in order to retain existing allotment plots. Whilst the SEA/SA considers that the preferred option is more appropriate since it provides a direct route and links an existing network of paths, local community concerns should be considered and alternative plots should be provided with the same facilities as existing holders.

### **Option 4: A transport interchange**

- 2.24. **Strengths:** The proposal is generally compatible with the sustainability objectives in seeking to introduce alternative transport solutions. It will have a positive effect in promoting public transport and access, adopting sustainable energy efficient solutions and making the park and leisure facilities more accessible (objectives 12, 14, 15). It will also have positive effects in relation to provision of key information about the site and public transport (objectives 15, 16). Additional emphasis has been given in the Central Park AAP to this issue in the light of earlier comments from the SA/SEA.
- 2.25. **Weaknesses:** If a modal switch cannot be encouraged for visitors, significant negative impacts will result, generated from an increase in vehicular movements and traffic congestion and not enough parking spaces (objectives 5, 15). In terms of inclusiveness, some potential users may also be disadvantaged if car parking is reduced and adequate public transport is not provided (e.g. disabled visitors or those

who do not fall within the catchment of public transport services – objectives 10, 16). There are some potential negative impacts on biodiversity as a result of the transport interchange being in close proximity to an area important as a wildlife corridor (objective 1). Refreshments and retailing, together with an increase in visitor numbers are likely to lead to an increase in waste produced (objective 6).

2.26. **Timescale:** Medium to long term.

2.27. **Likelihood:** Uncertain.

2.28. **Recommendations for mitigation of adverse effects and/or enhance or positive effects:** Measures need to be put in place to ensure public transport provision is adequate to encourage its use over car use and not exclude certain users. Provision for a limited number of disabled parking spaces may also be appropriate. Roads need to be able to accommodate possible congestion if there is not an immediate reduction in car use. The covered waiting facility for passengers should be located in as central and visible an area as possible for increased safety and to discourage vandalism. If waste management is addressed in the design of the interchange, any impacts could be minimised, with sustainable solutions in place.

2.29. **Consideration of alternative options:** Two alternative options were considered by the Council. These included the retention of a park and ride facility following the completion of the Western Park and Ride at Saltash and no interchange at all. The SEA/SA considers that the Preferred Option is more suitable. It will generate a 24 hour presence overcoming issues of safety, build on other proposals to improve sustainable transport connections and minimise traffic congestion and air pollution close to residential areas.

#### **Option 5: The City Bus Site and Milehouse Road Junction**

2.30. **Strengths:** This option has positive effects in terms of improving the relationship between the park and its surrounding neighbourhoods, by removing a busy road intersection, making it more accessible (objective 9), and should have a positive effect on improving road safety for pedestrians and cyclists (objective 12). The mixed use of the dwellings planned should contribute positively in making maximum use of the site and could help to maximise energy and resource use (objectives 4, 5). This option could also help to meet local needs and ensure inclusiveness by catering for differing financial and design needs (objective 9). The proposal could also generate limited employment opportunities (objectives 7, 8), and should contribute to local distinctiveness through a high quality redevelopment scheme (objective 13).

2.31. **Weaknesses:** If a modal switch cannot be encouraged for visitors, significant negative impacts will result, generated from an increase in vehicular movements and traffic congestion and not enough parking spaces for residents (objectives 2, 15). The development may encourage in-migration, if so it is not certain if appropriate employment opportunities will exist to meet local needs (objectives 7, 8, 9). There are uncertainties associated with impacts on biodiversity, waste and long term climate change impacts (1, 3, 6).

- 2.32. **Timescale:** Medium to long term (over the next 5-20 years) due to the time take for development briefs to be prepared, proposals to come forward and construction to occur.
- 2.33. **Likelihood:** Uncertain
- 2.34. **Recommendations for mitigation of adverse effects and/or enhance or positive effects:** There may need to be provision of some communal, chargeable parking spaces for residents, who despite not using their vehicles on a regular basis, will still require parking facilities. A limited number of spaces could also be provided to discourage disruptive, illegal, parking by visitors making use of the retail facilities. There could be some requirement, in plans, for retail and office employment space planned to be appropriate to the area and accommodate the retail and employment needs of residents. The development should be constructed sustainably to minimise water consumption and ensure that where possible materials are reused/recycled and sourced locally. The relocation of the bus depot should not compromise the functioning of the public transport network.
- 2.35. **Consideration of alternative options:** An alternative proposal is to deliver a comprehensive residential development solely on the Bus Depot. The SEA/SA considers that the Preferred Option is more suitable based on the opportunity to strengthen links between the Park and adjacent neighbourhoods through footpaths and cycleways as well as visually, extending open space corridors from the Park through Stoke.

**Option 6: Peverell Park road, Outland road corner**

- 2.36. **Strengths:** This proposal presents a holistic approach and is generally considered to be positive against sustainability objectives. The proposal would repair the poor relationship between the park and the neighbourhood of Peverell thereby improving access, and health and safety of pedestrians and cyclists (objectives 10, 15). It would increase the sites importance and value as a local centre, and add to sustainable transport priorities (objectives 9 and 15). The safety of the area would also be improved as result of increasing natural surveillance and a combination of uses in the main complex (objective 12).
- 2.37. **Weaknesses:** Potential issues are associated with an increase in surface areas of impermeable surfaces. This may lead to increased flood risk (objective 3). Increasing numbers of visitors and vehicles may have some negative effects on the wildlife and on the near by historic Pound House site (objective 1). If adequate public transport services are not in place (and encouraged by the existence of a car park) congestion may result leading to increased pollution (objective 2). The housing planned needs to be suitable to the needs of the area (objective 9). Expensive housing may alter the dynamics of site in a negative way. A factor which may add to this is the selection of inappropriate retail uses. They both have the potential to create exclusion. The design of development should seek to minimise water consumption and ensure that where possible materials are reused/recycled and sourced locally (objectives 4, 5).

- 2.38. **Timescale:** Medium to long term (over the next 5-20 years) due to the time take for development briefs to be prepared, proposals to come forward and construction to occur and for patterns of use to develop.
- 2.39. **Likelihood:** Likely
- 2.40. **Recommendations for mitigation of adverse effects and/or enhance or positive effects:** A Sustainable Urban Drainage system needs to be put in place to ensure that there are no adverse impacts on the sites surrounding Peverell. Public transport should be designed to be appropriate to service the areas around the site from which visitors may originate. Housing type and retail type should be appropriate to the area and not create exclusion. The site should contain noise and light as far as possible, using design and screening by trees. The development should be constructed sustainably.
- 2.41. **Consideration of alternative options:** Three different alternatives were considered for Peverell Park Road. Alternative A was prepared in consultation with allotment holders and sought to minimise loss of allotments and resolve car parking requirements, B sought to build on Option A with proposed residential areas and improved pedestrian links, and alternative C responded further to car parking and safety/security issues. The SEA/SA considers that the Preferred Option is the most preferable. It provides a strong pedestrian route to the Park and defines the edge of the Park; creating a gateway feature. If the preferred option is carried forward further allotment plots need to be provided to compensate for the loss of existing plots.

#### **Option 7: Pennycomequick**

- 2.42. **Strengths:** This proposal will have potential benefits on maximising use of disused land and improving the aesthetics of the area with better landscaping and a more prominent entrance to the park contributing to the built environment and local distinctiveness (objective 13). It will improve the connectivity of existing and new houses with the park, which should consequently improve the sense of surveillance and safety and increase the feeling of well being (objectives 10, 12, 15).
- 2.43. **Weaknesses:** During the construction phase there will be localised dust and air pollution (objective 2). It is uncertain whether the development will seek to use sustainable sources of building materials or where the work force will be sourced from (objectives 4, 5, 8). If a modal switch cannot be encouraged for the new households, significant negative impacts could result generated from an increase in vehicular movements, traffic congestion and inappropriate and illegal parking (objective 15). The existing households facing the park may feel an unwelcome sense of enclosure due to the new development (although this would be minimal as few houses have windows facing the park). An increasing number of households could lead to an increase the amount of waste generated (objective 6).
- 2.44. **Timescale:** Medium to long term due to the time take for development briefs to be prepared, proposals to come forward and construction to occur and travel pattern to develop.

- 2.45. **Likelihood:** Strengths are likely to be certain, with weaknesses uncertain.
- 2.46. **Recommendations for mitigation of adverse effects and/or enhance or positive effects:** Limited parking provision should be made for car owners who may not be using their vehicles daily but require parking space. Public transport services should be frequent enough and have appropriate routes to encourage their use. The design of development should seek to minimise water consumption and ensure that where possible materials are reused/recycled and sourced locally and provision should be made to sustainably remove household waste once the residential units are in use.
- 2.47. **Consideration of alternative options:** Two options considered are either a do nothing based on local concerns over the loss of open space into the park or an alternative arrangement for Swarthmore allotments. The SEA/SA considers that the Preferred Option is preferable. It creates a strong physical and visual link to the corridor, overcomes concerns relating to safety along Jefferson Walk and creates a strong definition to the edge of the Park, as well as generating investment to support other proposals. In terms of Swathmore allotments; it is important to ensure that the trading hut is relocated and car parking is created for use by allotment holders.

**Option 8: A park with improved facilities**

- 2.48. **Strengths:** This option has positive effects in terms of making use of disused buildings and vacant land and improving the appearance of the area and enhancing local distinctiveness (objectives 4, 13). The use of multi-functional structures and increased lighting will also increase surveillance and safety (objective 12). It will also provide users with facilities that support children's play, sport and recreational activities which will indirectly increase health benefits (objectives 9, 10, 14). This option will also educate visitors through a planned educational route and the use of signage (objective 11).
- 2.49. **Weaknesses:** Public use of the Pound House would have to be carefully planned/managed not to put undue visitor pressure on the historic site and biodiversity interests (objectives 1,13).
- 2.50. **Timescale:** long term
- 2.51. **Likelihood:** Likely
- 2.52. **Recommendations for mitigation of adverse effects and/or enhance or positive effects:** Care needs to be taken to ensure that proposals reduce negative impacts through careful design and monitoring. Surveillance cameras should be placed in visible sites near the changing facilities, multiuse buildings etc to discourage vandalism and increase safety. Street furniture, lighting and signage should all be in keeping with the surrounding and no impact adversely on the wildlife in the area (undermining the role of the park as a wildlife corridor).
- 2.53. **Consideration of alternative options:** No appropriate options were considered apart from reducing a programme of improvements which would diminish the Parks' overall image further, as such the SEA/SA considers that the preferred option is more suitable alternative.

## Conclusions and Recommendations

### Conclusions:

- 2.54. The results of the SA indicate that whilst the AAP is generally positive there are a number of general issues which need to be addressed (specific issues are covered in the preceding paragraphs).
- 2.55. Like other Area Action Plans, Central Park will be reliant on future investment. Care needs to be taken to ensure adequate facilities and services are available to meet the needs of an increasing number of households, and that retail units, appropriate employment provision and a mix of housing tenures are always considered.
- 2.56. When considering reducing car parking, the proposal is reliant on encouraging people to make a modal shift. Development proposals are reliant on the success of the new (or improved) public transport system and services must be frequent enough and widely available to encourage a modal shift. This may not occur, at least immediately, and if not measures need to be in place to respond to rising levels of traffic and congestion. It is imperative in encouraging a modal switch that car parking provision is minimised but also that dual use is explored, with some provision made for residents.
- 2.57. Potential negative issues which are highlighted relate to the impact of the options wildlife and nature, hence biodiversity, with potential adverse effects on the sites role as a wildlife corridor. It is important to ensure that with an increase in population and visitor numbers, impacts are investigated and minimised or mitigated.
- 2.58. Development proposals that will result in a significant increase in impermeable surface area need to take account of any potential increase in flood risk either on site, or on surrounding sites.
- 2.59. The structure of existing communities and potential changes need to be carefully considered. The proposals raise a number of basic questions:
  - Will new residential development result in migration?
  - Will targets for affordable housing be achieved?
  - Will people living in the new development areas actually work there, or will there be working elsewhere in the City?
- 2.60. It is not clear whether design of houses and construction of buildings seek to reduce energy consumption, water consumption, and also source materials locally and use where possible secondary materials.
- 2.61. An increasing number of households, and increased levels of activity and provision of catering on and around the Park site, will inevitable result in an increase in waste production. This will need to be considered in plans and addressed.

2.62. The preferred option for Central Park appear to be in line with the sustainability criteria and consideration of the minor points above would ensure proposals are further still inline with sustainability objectives.

**Recommendations:**

2.63. The following recommendations are suggested ways of improving the AAP:

- Throughout the phasing of development, it is important to ensure that the community functions sustainability with adequate services, facilities and infrastructure to meet all needs.
- A detailed assessment of recreational carrying capacity based on the future population figures for the area needs to be undertaken in order to define limits beyond which the wildlife corridor or landscape will be suffer. Proposals must seek to mitigate any adverse effects.
- In line with PPG25, flood risk will need to be assessed when deciding on specific locations for development.
- Public transport infrastructure needs to be in place well in advance of new development occurring. It is important not only to influence this modal shift through residential development (i.e. minimising car parking provision for visitors but with adequate provision in place for residents) but also through the decisions of major employers. All new large scale businesses should be required to submit green travel plans and commit some level of contribution /investment where development is not adjacent to the bus network to improve footpath and cycle route links. A contingency plan needs to be available to ensure that if people cannot be encouraged to make a modal switch potential issues relating to traffic congestion and air pollution can be resolved.
- A Design Guide should be produced for all development on the re-use of construction and demolition materials on site, e.g. through planning conditions requiring developers to provide a demolition plan and cover efficient water and energy use, reuse and sourcing of local materials as part of the sustainable construction and design guidance. Design proposals should consider opportunities to support renewable energy and sustainable urban drainage schemes. This commitment should not just be reflected in residential dwellings but also for large businesses through environmental management policies.
- Opportunities should be explored to prepare development proposals with waste management plans in place.