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1. STATUS OF THE REPORT

Introduction

1.1. This report sets out the sustainability appraisal (SA) and strategic environmental assessment (SEA) of the Preferred Options for the Sutton Harbour Area Action Plan contained in Plymouth City Councils’ local development framework.

Previous Appraisals and Assessments

1.2. Plymouth City Council developed its initial ideas for Sutton Harbour 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.

1.3. The conclusions reached in reviewing the initial issues and options for Sutton Harbour in March 2005 and repeated in the Core Strategy Submission Draft SEA/SA (26 July 2006) are set below

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sutton Harbour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• In enhancing the water front and increasing access opportunities care needs to be taken to ensure that flood defences remain intact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Achieving mixed use communities is a positive approach to future planning. However, while increasing residential and commercial uses it is important to ensure that the design of housing stock and dwelling units meets the needs of a 21st century community and that the design of buildings is sensitive to the surrounding built environment. This includes retaining locally distinctive features and seeking to minimise energy consumption and waste generation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Proposals to enhance streetscapes, gateways and expand the tourism potential are positive opportunities to reinforce Sutton Harbour’s status as an important waterfront location. However impacts associated with late opening hours from leisure and entertainment facilities will have to be carefully handled to ensure that it does not impact on the quality of life of adjacent communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Whilst proposals to reconfigure the Lock Bridge with the new bridge structure will have a positive effect in improving the connectivity between both sides of Sutton Harbour, careful consideration should be given to the potential impacts it may have on shipping movements in and out of the Harbour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Although proposals to create new access routes and improve connectivity should encourage more pedestrian and cycle movements and reduce the need for car use, consideration should be given as to how tourists access Sutton Harbour. Opportunities should be explored as to how to link into the public transport system by bus and water taxi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Opportunities to increase tourism to the area could increase following further environmental improvements, an increase in mixed use and a review of the role of the Citadel. However, careful consideration should be given to the capacity of the area to absorb visitor numbers and the potential disturbance of tourists on local communities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. APPRAISAL OF THE PREFERRED OPTIONS FOR SUTTON HARBOUR AREA ACTION PLAN

Introduction

2.1. This chapter outlines the main findings of the appraisal of the preferred options of Sutton Harbour 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. 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. An appraisal of the Preferred Options was 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 Sutton Harbour Area Action Plan takes it starting point with a review of the vision and principles see Table 1. Overall the vision and principles adhere to the sustainability objectives; however from a brief review there are a number of issues which may potentially generate negative impacts. These include:

- A need to ensure a balanced mix of housing types and tenures (including affordable housing) to prevent high value water front properties changing the social mix of the area. Proposals should restrict the purchase of second homes and ensure properties are appropriate for families, particularly where homes are above ground level.
- There is potential for disturbance to the numerous planned residential developments in the vicinity of leisure facilities with late opening hour licences.
- The design and construction of buildings should seek to reduce energy consumption, water consumption, source materials locally and use where possible secondary materials.
- Proposals should seek to support local employment opportunities during construction and implementation.
- When considering reducing car parking, the proposal is reliant on encouraging people to make a modal shift. Can this be achieved and if not what measures need to be taken to respond to rising levels of traffic and congestion? Public transport services must be frequent enough and widely available to encourage a modal shift in the behaviour of residents, and serve tourists needs.
- Numerous assessments are planned to address the effect of any development on the historic environment measures should ensure that any potential damage is avoided.
- Proposals need to refer to the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment which identifies the need for an assessment of flood risk and the impact on the marine environment, including details of proposed mitigation measures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA Objectives</th>
<th>Sutton Harbour Principles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BIODIVERSITY – Biodiversity and landscape are properly valued, conserved and enhanced</td>
<td>MIXED-USE REGENERATION - Promote the positive mixed-use regeneration of disused or under-used land and buildings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLLUTION – Pollution is limited to levels which do not damage natural systems</td>
<td>CONSERVE AND ENHANCE THE SPECIAL HISTORIC CHARACTER OF THE BARBICAN – Conserve and enhance Bretonside and Coxside for future generations - capitalising on historic assets while respecting the character of existing communities, uses, buildings and structures that make the area distinctive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLIMATE CHANGE – Emissions contributing to climate change are reduced and adaptation measures are in place</td>
<td>A SAFE, HIGH-QUALITY ENVIRONMENT THAT CAPITALISES ON THE WATERFRONT SETTING - This should include a linked network of attractive public spaces including a vibrant, publicly and visually accessible waterfront – enlivened with entertainment, leisure and cultural uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESOURCES – Demands on natural resources are managed so that they are used as efficiently as possible</td>
<td>ENHANCED NEIGHBOURHOOD CENTRES – Enhanced neighbourhood centres for the Barbican, Bretonside and Coxside with local services, activities and amenities that meet the needs of local people, employees, businesses, visitors and the wider community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENERGY – Efficient use of energy</td>
<td>MIXED-USE URBAN VILLAGE - A high-quality mixed-use new urban village to the east and west of Sutton Road, Coxside – including a balanced mixture of housing types and tenures and opportunities to live, work, shop and socialise locally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASTE – Waste is minimised and, wherever possible, eliminated</td>
<td>GOOD CYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN CONNECTIVITY - An area that is easy to walk and cycle to and through – connecting effectively to surrounding neighbourhoods and the city centre, with excellent access to public transport (including the proposed eastern corridor High Quality Public Transport link and enhanced water transport links).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECONOMY – A diverse and thriving economy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORK AND INCOMES – Everyone has access to satisfying and fairly paid work and unpaid work is valued</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCAL NEEDS – Wherever possible, local needs are met locally so support local economies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEALTH &amp; WELL-BEING – Promoting everyone’s physical and mental wellbeing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEARNING – Everyone has access to lifelong learning, training opportunities, skills and knowledge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAFETY – Everyone is able to live without fear of crime or persecution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISTINCTIVENESS AND CULTURAL HERITAGE – Diversity and local distinctiveness and cultural heritage are valued, protected and celebrated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEISURE – Opportunities for culture, leisure and recreation are provided widely</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSPORT AND ACCESS – Offering inclusive access to all service, including access for those without a car</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BASIC NEEDS, EQUALITY AND DIVERSITY – Ensuring community cohesion, tolerance, understanding and equality of opportunity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEMOCRACY – All sections of the community are empowered to participate in decision making</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preferred Development Options: The Barbican</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preferred Option 1: Commercial Wharf, Phoenix Wharf, Elphinstone and Lambhay Hill Car Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To comprehensively redevelop these prominent waterfront sites in an integrated way for predominately cultural and retail facilities, including mix of uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mix of uses include: public open space, arts and cultural facilities, cafes, restaurants and small scale shops, small scale marine related employment uses and craft workshops, leisure and tourism related uses, residential use above ground floor.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preferred Development Options: Exchange Street Car Park</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preferred Option 2: Exchange Street Car Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To redevelop this site as a waterfront open space including public access along the water's edge and a small-scale high-quality café / restaurant pavilion or kiosk.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preferred Development Options: Sutton Jetty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preferred Option 3: Sutton Jetty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To comprehensively redevelop the site with a mix of uses including: Residential, marine related uses, cafes, restaurants and small-scale shops and public open space.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preferred Development Options: Bretonside and Exeter Street</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preferred Option 4: Bretonside Coach Station and environs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To comprehensively redevelop this important city gateway site. Development should make a major contribution to the City Centre’s sub-regional shopping</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preferred Development Options: The Barbican</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLICIES, ALTERNATIVES &amp; PREFERRED OPTIONS (Below)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role through the provision of appropriate comparison retail floor-space. It could also include a mix of other uses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mix of uses to include: Residential, employment, cafes, bars and restaurants, Leisure and tourism related uses and public open space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Preferred Option 5: North Quay House and Car Park**
To redevelop the under-used elements of this site with a range of uses that could include: Approximately 3350sq m office space above ground floor uses and small scale retail units, cafes and restaurants. | 0 | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | 0 | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ? | 0 | |
| **Preferred Option 6: 47-67 Exeter Street**
To redevelop these sites with a range of uses that could include office space, residential uses, retail units, cafes and restaurants: | 0 | ✓ | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | 0 | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | 0 | |
| Up to approximately 29,500sq m office space and up to approximately 420-740 residential units, above ground floor, and retail units, cafes and restaurants | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Preferred Option 7: Friary Park**
To comprehensively redevelop this key strategic site with a range of uses that could include: Residential uses above ground floor, A new primary school (including community uses), offices and small-scale retail units. | 0 | ✓ | ? | ? | ? | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ? | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ? | 0 | |
| **Preferred Option 8: Sutton Wharf / North Quay**
To reconfigure of the quayside car parking areas along Sutton Wharf and North Quay. | 0 | ✓ | ? | ? | ? | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | 0 | ? | 0 | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ? | ✓ | 0 | |
### SA CRITERIA

(In Columns across)

**POLICIES, ALTERNATIVES & PREFERRED OPTIONS**

(Below)

|-----------------|--------------|-------------------|-------------|----------|---------|-----------|---------------------|--------------|------------------------|-------------|-----------|-------------------------------|-----------|--------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------|

Including: A reduction in the level of quayside car parking along Sutton Wharf / North Quay, an enhanced public realm waterfront spaces directly adjacent the quayside, the development of low-level pavilion and kiosk buildings of high-quality architectural design with active ground floor frontages and uses that contribute positively to activity along the quayside.

### Preferred Development Options: Coxside

**Preferred Option 9 – Sites East and West of Sutton Road**
To create an integrated, sustainable, new neighbourhood with a vibrant, publicly accessible, destination waterfront and a balanced mixture of uses.

![Checkboxes](checkbld)

Mix of uses will combine the following: Residential uses above active ground floor uses (approximately 1,060 units) with a variety of housing types and tenures, cafes, restaurants and shops, employment uses within the B1 Use Class Order, marine related industries, workshops and live/work units, and leisure and tourism related uses.

### Preferred Option 10: Barbican Car Park, Coxside
To retain public car parking to support the tourism and business needs of the area, but to remodel and extend the car park building so that it contributes more positively to the regeneration of Coxside with uses that add to the vibrancy of the vicinity.

![Checkboxes](checkbld)

Including: Leisure and tourism related uses, Small-scale retail units, cafes and restaurants, employment uses including workshops and live/work units, and residential uses (approximately 85-150 units).

### Preferred Option 11: Fish Market
To promote opportunities for enhancement of the Fish Market site.

![Checkboxes](checkbld)

Additional uses could include: The safeguarding of existing marine related employment use, the introduction of retail / restaurant / visitor centre uses to create a positive Lockyer’s Quay frontage and improve the area’s vitality and improved public access across the site to create a safe route from Lockyer’s Quay to the National Marine Aquarium west plaza, without compromising the fish market’s operational needs or health and safety requirements.

### Preferred Option 12: Lock Bridge
To enhance the Sutton Harbour Lock Bridge, including: Replacement remodelling of the

![Checkboxes](checkbld)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA CRITERIA</th>
<th>POLICIES, ALTERNATIVES &amp; PREFERRED OPTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(In Columns across)</td>
<td>(Below)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>existing bridge, a memorable, high-quality design to reflect the bridge’s important gateway role, improved pedestrian / cyclist access across the harbour, assessment of the impact on the marine environment and flood risk, with appropriate mitigation proposed.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Preferred Option 13: Queen Anne’s Battery</strong> TO safeguard and enhance the site for marine related employment uses, including: maximising site’s potential for marine related employment use, achieving safe public access to and along the site’s waterfront without compromising the site’s operational or health and safety requirements, with limited opportunities for cafes and restaurants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preferred Option 14: Teats Hill School</strong> TO see the building brought back into a viable use to safeguard its conservation and enhancement. Acceptable uses may include: Community uses, residential uses (approximately 25-45 units) offices, workshops and live/work units.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
supports the sustainability objective

Strongly supported the sustainability objective

Has no impact on the sustainability objective

Works against the sustainability objective

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 Barbican

2.6. Strengths: This option will have positive effects on the distinctive character of the area and cultural heritage, improve visitors’ experience with access to leisure and provision of housing, support employment opportunities and learning. The proposals should boost the image of Plymouth, attract more visitors and improve cultural opportunities. Increasing a 24 hour presence with active ground floor frontages should minimise concerns relating to safety. Overall this option supports most of the sustainability criteria.

2.7. Weaknesses: The social mix and make up of the community (relating to objective 16: basic needs) could be a cause for concern, given the prestigious waterfront location. By comparison with other areas, property prices could rise at a higher rate through purchases by more affluent incomers and second home owners. It is unclear if building materials and labour will be sourced locally and if they have been designed to minimise energy consumption and waste.

2.8. Timescale: medium to long term.

2.9. Likelihood: likely.

2.10. Recommendations for mitigation of adverse effects and/or enhance or positive effects: A mix of housing tenures, with affordable housing, should be planned to prevent social exclusion. The design on developments should include the sourcing of local materials and labour, a reduction in energy and water consumption, and waste minimisation.

2.11. Alternative options considered: Two alternative options were mentioned at issues and options state, either retaining Lambhay hill Car park or no development at all. The SEA/SA considers that this is the most appropriate option to carry forward as it would increase activity both day and night within the area, improve concerns over security through a 24 hour presence and result in a high quality design.
Option 2: Exchange Street Car Park

2.12. **Strengths:** This option seeks to create a waterfront open space, with a small pavilion to house a small scale café and restaurant. It will generate positive effects on the townscape character of the area (objective 16), maintain views across the harbour and of the estuary, and increase public enjoyment. The proposals will provide much needed play space within the area addressing objective 14 leisure. There are potential positive effects associated with improved pedestrian links and the provision of an open play space, on healthier lifestyles and as well as improvements in people’s quality of life (objective 10).

2.13. **Weaknesses:**
Uncertainties are associated with whether the proposal will inhibit development elsewhere and whether, through a reduction in development on site, sufficient funding will be available to achieve a high quality space and long term maintenance. There are also uncertainties associated with whether the small café /kiosk will be designed to reduce energy consumption and minimise waste generation.

2.14. **Timescale:** medium term to long term.

2.15. **Likelihood:** Strengths are likely whereas weaknesses are uncertain.

2.16. **Recommendations for mitigation of adverse effects and/or enhance or positive effects:** New public open space must be sensitively designed to reduce fear of crime with lighting in key locations and integrated into the surrounding townscape. The design of high quality safe/restaurant pavilion /kiosk should seek to minimise natural resource and energy consumption, minimise waste and ensure that where possible materials are reused/recycled. The special historic character of the harbour should be maintained through sensitive design.

2.17. **Alternative options considered:** Two options were suggested at issues and options stage for the Exchange Street. These included with maintaining the site as a surface level car park or mixed-use redevelopment of the site. The SEA/SA considers that neither of these options would result in the visual integration of the site with the remainder of the harbour or redress the requirement for open space and particularly play areas within Sutton Harbour.

Option 3: Sutton Jetty

2.18. **Strengths:** Positive potential effects from this proposal are associated with improved pedestrian links along the waterfront walkway (objective 15), with users no longer being diverted inland. The creation of walkways, changing the mode of transport and restrictions of parking should also have positive indirect effects on health and improve people’s quality of life (objective 10). There are also positive effects from a mix of uses to improve visitor experience objective 14), the creation of a 24 hour presence reducing any potential concerns relating to security (objective 12), the creation of employment opportunities and providing support to the local economy (objective 7 and 8).
2.19. **Weaknesses:** The listed harbour wall may be damaged during or as a result of construction (objective 13). Uncertainties exist over the potential mix and make up of the community, given the waterfront location and that comparatively property prices may be substantially higher than elsewhere, driven by demand of a prestigious waterfront location and the purchase of second homes (objective 16). It is unclear if building materials and labour will be sourced locally and if they have been designed to minimise energy consumption and waste (objective 5 and 6). A modal shift in transport is no guaranteed and this may result in congestion (objective 15).

2.20. **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.

2.21. **Likelihood:** Strengths are likely whereas weaknesses are uncertain.

2.22. **Recommendations for mitigation of adverse effects and/or enhance or positive effects:** A mix of housing tenures, with affordable housing, should be planned to minimise social exclusion. New public open space must be sensitively designed to reduce fear of crime with lighting in key locations and integrated into the surrounding townscape. The design of developments should include the sourcing of local materials and labour, a reduction in energy and water consumption, and waste minimisation.

2.23. **Alternative options considered:** No options were considered apart from a do nothing approach. The SEASA considers that the preferred option is appropriate subject to the sensitive handling of the listed harbour wall.

**Option 4: Bretonside Coach Station and environs**

2.24. **Strengths:** The role of this local centre and ‘gateway’ will be improved with positive economic effects on different types of land use ranging from light industry through to leisure and tourism related uses (objective 7 and 8). Improvements in tree planting and the use of public art should generate strong positive effects on objective 13 as well as reducing crime through the clear direct and visible routes and a 24 hour presence created by different land uses including housing (objective 12). Improvements in the public transport system will generate a strong positive correlation with sustainable transport objective (objective 15). This option also proposes to support and encourage a modal shift in transport, by reducing or eliminating parking spaces, which should also have a positive effect on climate change (objective 3). There are also positive effects on the economy, work and incomes, learning as well as reducing air pollution (objectives 7, 8, 11 and 2).

2.25. **Weaknesses:** Acquisition of homes by more affluent incomers or second home owners could result in an adverse change in the community structure if a range of housing is not available (objective 16). There could be disturbance from late opening hours of leisure relating uses impacting on adjacent residents (objective 10). Proposals for a transport interchange may result in increased levels of noise and air pollution, and may pose a safety issue for sensitive receptors such as residents and school children if adequate mitigation measures are not in place to minimise effects.
(objective 10). It is unclear if building materials and labour will be sourced locally and if they have been designed to minimise energy consumption and waste (objective 5 and 6).

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

2.27. **Likelihood:** Strengths are likely whereas weaknesses are uncertain.

2.28. **Recommendations for mitigation of adverse effects and/or enhance or positive effects:** The design of development should seek to minimise natural resource and energy consumption, minimise waste and ensure that where possible materials are reused/recycled. Materials and labour should be sourced locally where possible. A mix of housing tenures, with affordable housing, should be planned to reduce exclusion.

2.29. **Alternative options considered:** Two alternatives were considered for the Bretonside Bus and Coach station these including relocating the coast station near the railway station of the 2002 development proposals which was a mixed use proposal put forward in 2002. The SEA/SA considers that the preferred option is the more suitable proposal reducing a reliance on the car and integrating development sensitively with existing historic buildings.

**Option 5: North Quay House and Car Park**

2.30. **Strengths:** This option should have a strong positive impact on objective 12 distinctiveness and cultural heritage, repairing the historic townscape, and improving strategic communication and sustainable transport links (enhancing the subway and adding to pedestrian links); objective 15. The site, through the provision of mixed uses should create a 24 hour presence (objective 12) improve visitor experience and people’s sense of well being, (objectives 10 and 14).

2.31. **Weaknesses:** The effect on economy is uncertain and will depend on the types of employment offered and its appropriateness (objective 7 and 8).

2.32. **Timescale:** Short to long term.

2.33. **Likelihood:** Likely.

2.34. **Recommendations for mitigation of adverse effects and/or enhance or positive effects:** Employment uses should be planned to ensure appropriateness to demand and skills in the locality and to ensure that in migration does no occur, encouraging the use of cars for travel.

2.35. **Alternative options considered:** No alternative options were considered.

**Option 6: 47-67 Exeter Street**

2.36. **Strengths:** This option should enliven streets and improve safety through the creation of a 24 hour presence (objective 12). Development will complement the historic environment and townscape character strongly supporting objective 13, and
the reduction in parking should reduce air pollution (objective 2). Improvements in subway and pedestrian links connecting harbour to centre should address sustainable transport objectives and have a positive effect on people’s health and quality of life (objective 10 and 15). There will also be positive effects on the economy and employment opportunities (objective 7 and 8) and leisure (objective 14).

2.37. **Weaknesses:** Acquisition by more affluent incomers or second home owners could result in an adverse change in the social structure of the area if a range of house prices are not available (objective 16 basic needs).

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

2.39. **Likelihood:** Strengths likely, weaknesses unlikely.

2.40. **Recommendations for mitigation of adverse effects and/or enhance or positive effects:** A mix of housing tenures, with affordable housing, should be planned to diversify the community structure. The design of development should seek to minimise natural resource and energy consumption, minimise waste and ensure that where possible materials are reused/recycled. Materials and labour should be sourced locally where possible.

2.41. **Alternative options considered:** No alternative options were considered.

**Option 7: Friary Park**

2.42. **Strengths:** The proposal is generally compatible with the sustainability objectives. The option aims to reduce parking and proposes a future High Quality Public Transport system or similar public transport route, therefore strongly supporting objective 15. If the proposal is effective it should lead to a stabilisation/reduction in vehicular movements and have a positive effect on air quality and communities' health and quality of life (objective 2,10). In addition, proposals seek to generate links across to key areas which should overcome issues associated with safety and exclusion (objective 12). Proposals integrating the site with adjacent streets will have a positive effect on distinctiveness and cultural heritage (objective 13). Provision for education, retail, leisure, employment and open space should impact positively on objectives 7, 8 and 14 as well as on local needs (objective 9), through the provision of “small scale retail units which serve the new community.”

2.43. **Weaknesses:** If a modal switch cannot be encouraged for the new communities, significant negative impacts will result, generated from an increase in vehicular movements and traffic congestion. Uncertainties exist over the demand/need for a new school and whether this facility will be fully utilised (objective 11). Insufficient provision of affordable housing may lead to an imbalance on the community structure (objective 16). Uncertainties are associated with waste and energy generation and whether new proposals will be designed to respond to sustainability objectives.

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

2.45. **Likelihood:** Strengths likely, weaknesses uncertain.
2.46. **Recommendations for mitigation of adverse effects and/or enhance or positive effects:** It is essential that the infrastructure is in place to encourage a modal shift at the outset of the development, and ensure that links to Exeter Street, Beaumont Park and elsewhere are sited in a convenient and safe location. Detailed consideration should be given to the siting of the school, to overcome any potential concerns associated with safety. A mix of housing tenures, with affordable housing, should be planned to prevent social exclusion. Labour and material should be sourced locally and all new development should be designed to minimise energy consumption and waste generation. The need for a school should be determined.

2.47. **Alternative options considered:** The extension of existing retail warehouses was an alternative option considered. However the SEA/SA agrees that the preferred option is more suitable given the proximity of the site to Sutton Harbour, Exeter Street and the City Centre.

**Option 8: Sutton Wharf / North Quay**

2.48. **Strengths:** This option should enhance the environment (objective 13), improve visitor experience on the waterfront and improve connections with the eastern side of the harbour (objective 14 and 16). A reduction in car parking should have a positive visual effect on the area as well as potential reduce impacts associated with air pollution (objective 2). Proposals should enliven the area increasing activity and overcoming any negative perceptions relating to security (objective 12). This proposal will also support the economy and generate employment (objective 7 and 8).

2.49. **Weaknesses:** The proximity of public transport links may be deemed too far by some users, this in addition to reduced parking may exclude certain users and lead to congestion especially if people continue to attempt to access the area by car (objective 15).

2.50. **Timescale:** Short term to long term.

2.51. **Likelihood:** Likely.

2.52. **Recommendations for mitigation of adverse effects and/or enhance or positive effects:** Public transport links should be improved to service the site.

2.53. **Alternative options considered:** The alternative option considered the retention of the existing quayside car parking. The SEA/SA considers that the preferred option is the most sustainable and would improve the overall quality of the environment, integrate the site with remaining developments along the harbour and have a positive effect on wellbeing.

**Option 9: Sites East and West of Sutton Road**

2.54. **Strengths:** A variety of housing types and tenures should ensure a balanced mix of occupants and social structure (objective 16). This option should also have positive benefits on distinctiveness and cultural heritage, education, leisure, the economy and
generate work (objective 13, 11, 14, 10, 7 and 8). Positive effects will be generated in terms of sustainable transport through a reduction in car parking levels and the creation of new improved routes for pedestrians and cyclists (objective 15) as well as reduce air pollution (objective 2). The creation of a mix of land uses, improvements in open space and connectivity should overcome concerns over safety and create a 24 hour presence (objective 12). The provision of live work units will also generate a positive effect on objective 9, local needs.

2.55. **Weaknesses:** There may be potential conflicts between the marine industry and residential areas resulting from odour and disturbance and between entertainment/leisure uses and residents, resulting from disturbance through late hour openings (objective 10). Uncertainties are associated with the potential impact of marine industries on flood risk (objective 3), as well as potential impacts on energy consumption and waste generation from new development (objective 5 and 6).

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

2.57. **Likelihood:** Likely.

2.58. **Recommendations for mitigation of adverse effects and/or enhance or positive effects:** Detailed consideration should be given to the proximity of adjacent land uses where there are potential conflicts of use and to potential impacts of marine industries associated with flood risk.

2.59. **Alternative options considered:** Three alternatives were considered for Sutton Harbour East. These included an urban layout, the retention of Shipwrights Arms and Salt Quay House or limiting building heights to 5-7 storeys. Whilst the SEA/SA considers that the preferred option is more suitable, opportunities should be explored to relocate the Shipwright Arms and Salt Quay house elsewhere and there is a need to ensure that buildings of heights above 7 storeys are sensitively integrated into surroundings, potential effects associated with wind tunnel and loss of light are minimised.

**Option 10: Barbican Car Park, Coxsie**

2.60. **Strengths:** This option should revitalise the site with a mix of uses including leisure, tourism, retail, employment and residential. There are positive benefits for the built environment, for employment and work, leisure, local need through the provision of live/work units and safety (with improved access and increased natural surveillance) supporting objectives 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14 and 15).

2.61. **Weaknesses:** The acquisition of properties by more affluent incomers or second home owners could result in a change in social structure if a range of house prices are not available (objective 16). This could adversely alter the social structure of the area. Conflicts of use relating to disturbance from late hour openings or noise/odour may be generated resulting from the juxtaposition of small scale retail units and leisure and tourism related uses with residential developments (objective 10). It is unclear if building materials and labour will be sourced locally and if they have been designed to minimise energy consumption and waste generation (objective 5 and 6). Uncertainties exist over the level of pollution which could be generated.
since car parking is retained, the impact on climate change since no consideration is given to flood risks and resources (objective 2, 3 and 4).

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

2.63. **Likelihood:** Strengths are likely with weaknesses being less certain.

2.64. **Recommendations for mitigation of adverse effects and/or enhance or positive effects:** Detailed consideration should be given to the proximity of adjacent land uses where there are potential conflicts of use. A mix of housing tenures, with affordable housing, should be planned to overcome an imbalance in community structure. Labour and material should be sourced locally and new development and conversions should seek to minimise energy consumption and waste.

2.65. **Alternative options considered:** No alternative option was considered.

**Option 11: Fish Market**

2.66. **Strengths:** This option should result in positive economic effects for the local economy, maximising the area’s potential for marine related employment use and plans should also improve the frontage and revitalise the area with the introduction of a mix of leisure and retail uses resulting on positive effects on objectives 7 and 8 and 14. The revitalisation of the area should have positive effects on the built environment, local distinctiveness and also benefit the neighbourhoods in close proximity to this side of the harbour (objective 13 and 16). Improvements in public access across the site should add to visitor experience, if issues relating to health and safety are overcome (objective 15).

2.67. **Weaknesses:** Uncertainties exist over the level of pollution which could be generated, the impact on climate change since no consideration is given to flood risks and whether there will be a decrease in energy consumption and waste generation (objective 2, 3, 5 and 6).

2.68. **Timescale:** Short term to long term.

2.69. **Likelihood:** Likely.

2.70. **Recommendations for mitigation of adverse effects and/or enhance or positive effects:** As referred to in the AAP, the operational needs of the fish market should not be compromised.

2.71. **Alternative options considered:** No alternative option was considered.

**Option 12: Lock Bridge**

2.72. **Strengths:** This option should improve the built environment and distinctiveness of the area through the creation of a high quality bridge, making improvements to an important gateway site of strategic importance (and also to the marine environment with potential impacts on flood risk, taken into consideration), thereby supporting objective 2 and 13. There should also be benefits for sustainable transport with
improvements to pedestrian and cyclist access across the harbour, with secondary benefits related to health (objective 10).

2.73. **Weaknesses**  If the restriction of boat movements are taken into consideration as mentioned in AAP, there should be no weaknesses in this option.

2.74. **Timescale:** medium to long term.

2.75. **Likelihood:** Likely.

2.76. **Recommendations for mitigation of adverse effects and/or enhance or positive effects:** As referred to in the APP, there should be careful consideration of the effect of any work, on boat movements.

2.77. **Alternative options considered:** No alternative option was considered.

**Option 13: Queen Anne’s Battery**

2.78. **Strengths:** This option should result in positive economic effects for the local economy, maximising the area’s potential for marine related employment use (objective 7 and 8). Community well being will also be addressed by ensuring safe access whilst not compromising the site’s operational requirements, with access to leisure facilities, cafes and restaurants along the waterfront (objectives 10 and 12). It is assumed that this option will have a positive effect on leisure and transport objective 14 and 15.

2.79. **Weaknesses:** Uncertainties exist over the level of pollution which could be generated, the impact on climate change since no consideration is given to flood risks and whether there will be a decrease in energy consumption and waste generation (objective 2, 3, 5 and 6). It is also uncertain whether this proposal will meet local need (objective 9).

2.80. **Timescale:** medium term to long term.

2.81. **Likelihood:** Likely.

2.82. **Recommendations for mitigation of adverse effects and/or enhance or positive effects:** No recommendations.

2.83. **Alternative options considered:** No alternative option was considered.

**Option 14: Teats Hill School**

2.84. **Strengths:** This option could have positive effects in terms of education provision for the community as well as offering a variety of other community services and the conservation of the historic environment and heritage of the area (objective 11, 13, 16). The built environment should be enhanced, making use of an existing building to house a number of uses and reuse of the building should have a positive effect on sustainable resource use (objective 4). There will be positive effects on the local
economy, employment opportunities and local need through the provision of live/work units (objective 7, 8 and 9).

2.85. **Weaknesses:** It is unclear if labour for the refurbishment will be sourced locally and whether the building can be converted to incorporate measures to minimise energy consumption and waste generation (objective 5 and 6). There may be conflicts of use associated with the live/work units and residential uses through disturbance and potential air pollution depending on the types of activities which are being proposed (objective 2 and 10). Uncertainties are also associated with objective 12 safety.

2.86. **Timescale:** short term to long term.

2.87. **Likelihood:** Likely.

2.88. **Recommendations for mitigation of adverse effects and/or enhance or positive effects:** Detailed consideration should be given to the proximity of adjacent land uses where there are potential conflicts of use. A mix of housing tenures, with affordable housing, should be planned. Labour should be sourced locally and opportunities explored to minimise energy consumption and waste generation if possible.

2.89. **Alternative options considered:** No alternative option was considered.

**Conclusions and Recommendations**

**Conclusions:**

2.90. 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).

2.91. Like other Area Action Plans, Sutton Harbour will be reliant on future investment. Care needs to be taken to ensure that throughout the phasing of development adequate facilities and services are available to meet the needs of the existing and changing community.

2.92. Proposals need to refer to the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment which identifies the need for an assessment of flood risk and the impact on the marine environment, including details of proposed mitigation measures.

2.93. Numerous assessments are planned to address the effect of any development on the historic environment measures should ensure that any potential damage is avoided.

2.94. 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.

2.95. The structure of existing communities and potential changes need to be carefully considered. The proposals raise a number of basic questions:

- Will targets for affordable housing be achieved?
- Will proposals result in a change in community structure through the purchase of second homes?
- Will people living in the new development areas actually work there, or will there be working elsewhere in the City?

9. Leisure facilities with late opening hour licences and industries/workshops in the vicinity of residential developments, have the potential to cause disturbance, careful consideration should therefore be given to the siting of adjacent land uses.

10. It is uncertain how local employment opportunities will be supported? Issues worth considering at this stage are:
- Will there be a significant level of in-migration on a daily basis from elsewhere in the City?
- Will the creation of an attractive high quality environment result in the displacement of existing businesses from elsewhere and what is the consequential effect on local employees?

2.96. It is unclear whether the design of residential developments and the construction/conversion of buildings will reduce energy consumption, water consumption, whether materials are sourced locally and if secondary materials are used.

2.97. Increasing the number of households and level of activity will inevitable result in an increase in waste production which needs to be considered in plans and addressed.

2.98. The preferred option for Sutton Harbour 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:

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

- Throughout the phasing of development, it is important to ensure that the impacts on the existing community are mitigated through the provision of adequate services, facilities and infrastructure to meet all needs.
- Each development proposal and Area Action Plan should not be considered in isolation. The LDF needs to recognise that depending on the timing of proposals, implementation and funding streams impacts may occur on adjacent land uses which need to be mitigated.
• A detailed assessment of educational need based on the future population figures for the area needs to be undertaken in order to determine whether additional facilities are required.

• Proposals need to refer to the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment which identifies the need for an assessment of flood risk and the impact on the marine environment. Plymouth City Council should work with the Environment Agency in establishing detailed mitigation measures.

• Public transport infrastructure needs to be in place in advance of new development occurring. It is important not only to influence this modal shift through residential development 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.

• Public transport services must be frequent enough and widely available to encourage a modal shift in the behaviour of residents, and to serve tourists needs.

• 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 covering the 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.

• Measures should ensure that any potential damage to the historic environment is avoided.

• Conflicts between different land uses should be minimised to avoid disturbance and potential impacts associated with air and noise pollution.