

APPENDIX 8

Development Management in Birmingham
Development Plan Document

Sustainability Appraisal Post Adoption Statement

December 2021

1. Introduction

Background

- 1.1 The Development Management in Birmingham DPD (DMB) was adopted by the Council on 7 December 2021. This followed its submission to the Government in July 2020 in accordance with Regulation 22 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012¹ and the subsequent examination in public (EiP). Following consultation on Main Modifications (MMs)² in April 2021, the DMB Plan was found sound by the designated Planning Inspector in her report dated 30 September 2021.³
- 1.2 Wood Environment and Infrastructure Solutions UK Ltd. (Wood), formerly Amec Foster Wheeler, was commissioned by the Council to undertake a Sustainability Appraisal (SA) of the DMB. Wood appraised the environmental, social and economic performance of the emerging DMB policies and proposals and any reasonable alternatives and assembled the SA Reports.
- 1.3 This Post Adoption Statement (PAS) is the final output of the SA process. It describes the way in which the Council has taken environmental and sustainability considerations and any views of consultees into account in the adopted DMB and fulfils the plan and programme adoption requirements of Directive 2001/42/EC on the assessment of the effects of certain plans and programmes on the environment (the SEA Directive)⁴ and the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004.⁵

The Development Management in Birmingham DPD (DMB)

- 1.4 The DMB is part of Birmingham's Local Plan and provides detailed development management policies to support the delivery of the adopted Birmingham Development Plan. The DMB will apply to the whole City and will be a material consideration in the determination of planning applications. It will help deliver the BDP vision of Birmingham as "an enterprising, innovative and green City that has delivered sustainable growth meeting the needs of its population", with an emphasis on supporting growth and creating high quality places. The objectives of the DMB mirror those of the Birmingham Development Plan (BDP). The policies within the DMB reflect, and are in accordance with, the policies and guidance set out within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)⁶ and the strategic spatial objectives and policies in the BDP.
- 1.5 Work on the DMB commenced in 2015 and has been subject to an extensive process of consultation that has played an important role in helping to shape the policies in the plan. The Council has undertaken three key consultation exercises prior to its

¹ SI 2012 No. 767 The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012.

² https://www.birmingham.gov.uk/downloads/file/19564/schedule_of_main_modifications

³ Inspector's Report can be found at www.birmingham.gov.uk/DMB

⁴ <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/HTML/?uri=CELEX:32001L0042&from=EN>

⁵ SI 2004 No. 1633 The Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004.

⁶ <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-planning-policy-framework--2>

submission to the Minister for Housing Communities and Local Government in July 2020. The SA has been applied to all stages in the preparation of the DPD as set out in Table 1.1 below.

Table 1.1: DMB Stages and SA reports

Plan stage	Title	SA stage	Consultation period
Regulation 18	Development Management DPD (June 2015)	SA Scoping Report (December 2014) SA Scoping Report Update (May 2018)	7 September - October 2015 22 May 2018 – 29 June 2018
Regulation 18	Development Management in Birmingham Preferred Options Document (January 2019)	SA of the Development Management DPD Preferred Options Document (January 2019)	4 February - 29 March 2019
Regulation 19	Development Management in Birmingham Publication Document (October 2019)	Sustainability Appraisal of the Development Management DPD (October 2019)	9 January – 21 February 2020
Regulation 22	Development Management in Birmingham Publication Document (October 2019)	Addendum to the SA (May 2020)	-
Regulation 24 Consultation on main modifications	Main modifications (May 2021)	-	24 March - 5 May 2021

- 1.6 Following the conclusion of the Main Modifications (MM) and consideration of the final responses, the Council received the Inspector’s Report which concluded that, with the recommended MMs, the DMB satisfied the requirements of Section 20(5) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase 2004 Act and met the criteria for soundness in the NPPF. The DMB was subsequently adopted by the Council on 7 December 2021. Further information on the adopted Local Plan, including the Inspector’s Report, is available via the Council’s website: www.birmingham.gov.uk/DMB

The Requirement for Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment

- 1.7 Under Section 19(5) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, the Council is required to carry out a SA of the DMB to help guide the selection and development of policies and proposals in terms of their potential social, environmental and economic effects.

- 1.8 In undertaking the requirement for SA, local planning authorities must also incorporate the requirements of European Union Directive 2001/42/EC on the assessment of the effects of certain plans and programmes on the environment, referred to as the SEA Directive, and its transposing regulations the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 (statutory instrument 2004 No. 1633).
- 1.9 Paragraph 16 of the NPPF sets out that local plans should be prepared with the objective of contributing to the achievement of sustainable development.⁷ In this context, paragraph 32 of the NPPF reiterates the requirement for SA/SEA as it relates to local plan preparation:
- 1.10 *“Local plans and spatial development strategies should be informed throughout their preparation by a sustainability appraisal that meets the relevant legal requirements.⁸ This should demonstrate how the plan has addressed relevant economic, social and environmental objectives (including opportunities for net gains). Significant adverse impacts on these objectives should be avoided and, wherever possible, alternative options which reduce or eliminate such impacts should be pursued. Where significant adverse impacts are unavoidable, suitable mitigation measures should be proposed (or, where this is not possible, compensatory measures should be considered).”*
- 1.11 The SEA and SA processes can be undertaken together as a combined process, one which is advocated in National Planning Practice Guidance, which recommends SA and SEA be undertaken as a combined process. For the purpose of this statement, the integrated appraisal approach will be hereafter referred to as the Sustainability Appraisal (SA).

Habitats Regulations Assessment

- 1.12 Regulation 105 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (the ‘Habitats Regulations’) requires that competent authorities assess the potential impacts of land use plans on the Natura 2000 network of European protected sites⁹ to determine whether there will be any ‘likely significant effects’ (LSE) on any European site as a result of the plan’s implementation (either alone or ‘in combination’ with other plans or projects); and, if so, whether these effects will result in any adverse effects on that site’s integrity with reference to the site’s conservation

⁷ This is a legal requirement of local planning authorities exercising their plan-making functions (section 39(2) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act, 2004)

⁸ The reference to relevant legal requirements in the NPPF relates to Strategic Environmental Assessment

⁹ Strictly, ‘European sites’ are any Special Area of Conservation (SAC) from the point at which the European Commission and the UK Government agree the site as a ‘Site of Community Importance’ (SCI); any classified Special Protection Area (SPA); any candidate SAC (cSAC); and (exceptionally) any other site or area that the Commission believes should be considered as an SAC but which has not been identified by the Government. However, the term is also commonly used when referring to potential SPAs (pSPAs), to which the provisions of Article 4(4) of Directive 2009/147/EC (the ‘new wild birds directive’) are applied; and to possible SACs (pSACs) and listed Ramsar Sites, to which the provisions of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 are applied a matter of Government policy when considering development proposals that may affect them (NPPF para 176). ‘European site’ is therefore used in this report in its broadest sense, as an umbrella term for all of the above designated sites

objectives. The process by which the effects of a plan or programme on European sites are assessed is known as 'Habitats Regulations Assessment' (HRA).¹⁰

- 1.13 In accordance with the Habitats Regulations, what is commonly referred to as a HRA screening exercise was undertaken to identify the likely impacts of the Local Plan upon European sites, either alone or 'in combination' with other projects or plans, and to consider whether these impacts are likely to be significant. Where the possibility of significant effects could not be excluded, a more detailed Appropriate Assessment (AA) has been carried out to determine whether these effects would adversely affect the integrity of European sites.
- 1.14 The HRA screening exercise was reported separately from the SA of the DMB but importantly helped inform the appraisal process, particularly in respect of the potential effects of proposals on biodiversity.

Purpose of this Post Adoption Statement

- 1.15 This PAS represents the conclusion of the SA process and fulfils the plan and programme adoption requirements of the SEA Directive and SEA Regulations. In accordance with Regulation 16 (4) of the SEA Regulations, this statement sets out the following:
- how environmental and sustainability considerations have been integrated into the DMB (**Section 2** of this document);
 - how the SA Reports have been taken into account (**Section 3**);
 - how opinions expressed in response to the consultation on the SA Reports have been taken into account (**Section 4**);
 - the reasons for choosing the Local Plan, as adopted, in the light of the other reasonable alternatives dealt with (**Section 5**); and
 - the measures that are to be taken to monitor the significant environmental and sustainability effects of the implementation of the Local Plan (**Section 6**).

¹⁰ 'Appropriate Assessment' has been historically used as an umbrella term to describe the process of assessment as a whole. The whole process is now more usually termed 'Habitats Regulations Assessment' (HRA), and 'Appropriate Assessment' is used to indicate a specific stage within the HRA.

2. How Environmental and Sustainability Considerations Have Been Integrated into the DMB

Environmental and Sustainability Considerations in the Local Plan

2.1 Environmental and wider sustainability considerations have been integral to the key decisions made in respect of the policies and proposals of the DMB. The integration of these considerations into the plan making process has principally been achieved through:

- the development of a comprehensive evidence base on topics including, *inter alia*, housing, employment, transport, green infrastructure, communities, and viability;
- continuous engagement with key stakeholders and the public on the emerging DMB and related environmental and sustainability matters;
- the consideration of national planning policy and the objectives of other plans and programmes;
- fulfilment of the Council's Duty to Cooperate; and
- ongoing assessment through SA (incorporating SEA) and HRA.

The Development Management in Birmingham DPD (DMB)

2.2 The DMB supports the delivery of the vision, strategic policies and spatial strategy set out in the BDP by providing detailed development management policies which will help guide development and planning decisions up to the year 2031.

2.3 This document contains 16 policies covering a range of topics and arranged in themes to reflect the structure of the BDP. The objectives of the DMB mirror those of the BDP which aim to provide for significant new growth in the most sustainable way, ensuring that the development of new homes is matched by the provision of opportunities for new employment, accessible local services and a high quality environment.

Table 2.1 DMB Policy Topics and Titles

Topic	Reference	Policy Title
Environment and Sustainability	DM1	Air Quality
	DM2	Amenity
	DM3	Land affected by contamination, instability and hazardous substances
	DM4	Landscaping and trees
	DM5	Light pollution
	DM6	Noise and vibration
Economy and network of centres	DM7	Advertisements
	DM8	Places of worship
	DM9	Day nurseries and early years provision
Homes and neighbourhoods	DM10	Standards for residential development
	DM11	Houses in multiple occupation

	DM12	Residential conversions and specialist accommodation
	DM13	Self and custom build housing
Connectivity	DM14	Transport access and safety
	DM15	Parking and servicing
	DM16	Telecommunications

Environmental and Sustainability Considerations in the Plan and SA process

- 2.4 To provide the context for the SA and in compliance with the SEA Directive, a review of other relevant plans and programmes was undertaken and the relevant aspects of the current state of the environment and its evolution without the DMB were considered; together, they informed the identification of a series of key sustainability issues. This information was initially set out in the 2014 Scoping Report which was subsequently updated in 2018 (and then in subsequent SA Reports) to reflect changes since the Scoping Report was published.
- 2.5 The key sustainability issues identified through the review of plans and programmes and analysis of baseline information informed were reflected in the SA objectives and guide questions that comprised the SA Framework used to appraise the DMB. The SA objectives are shown in **Table 2.2**. Broadly, the SA objectives replicate the BDP SA objectives which present the preferred sustainability outcome. The resulting SA Framework comprised 15 sustainability objectives that were used to determine whether the DMB would be likely to achieve each objective. The SA Framework was used to appraise the DMB Objectives and Development Management policies.
- 2.7 The SA process considered the contribution of the DMB towards each of the appraisal objectives, drawing on the baseline information (and its evolution) to predict the likely significant effects of the plan in line with government guidance. The process was iterative and involved the development and refinement of the DMB by testing the sustainability strengths and weaknesses of the emerging policy options.
- 2.8 The appraisal identified the likely changes to the baseline conditions as a result of the DMB's implementation. These effects were described (where possible) in terms of their extent, the timescale over which they could occur, whether the effects would be temporary or permanent, positive or negative, short, medium and/or long-term. Secondary, synergistic and cumulative effects were also considered.
- 2.9 The SA Reports put forward recommendations to avoid or minimise negative effects identified or to enhance potential positive effects. In this way, environmental and sustainability considerations were integrated into the DMB as it was developed.
- 2.10 In addition to the use of the SA framework to assess the potential effects of DMB objectives, options and policies as they were drafted, environmental and sustainability considerations were integrated into the DMB through close working between Wood and the Council officers drafting the plan. Early draft sections of the DMB, including draft policies, were sent to Wood for appraisal and the SA team engaged with Council officers during the process of carrying out the SA of the emerging DMB.

Table 2.2 Sustainability Objectives, Guide Questions and Indicators

SEA Directive Topic Area(s)	SEA Directive Topic Area(s)	Guide Questions	Indicators
Material assets	ENV1 To encourage development that optimises the use of previously developed land and buildings	Will the use of previously developed land be encouraged? Will development densities be maximised?	Proportion of new development on previously developed land Development densities achieved
Material assets	ENV2 To promote the application of high standards of design, construction and maintenance of buildings	Will development be encouraged to meet and where possible exceed standards for energy efficiency?	Proportion of developments meeting energy efficiency standards for design, construction and maintenance
Material assets	ENV3 To encourage the use of sustainable methods of transport and reduce the need to travel	Will development be encouraged to incorporate measures which promote sustainable transport? Will development help to reduce the need to travel?	Work place travel plans Measures to promote sustainable transport such as provision for cyclists
Landscape, cultural heritage, biodiversity, flora and fauna	ENV4 To encourage high quality development which protects and enhances Birmingham's cultural and natural heritage	Will development protect and where possible enhance the City's cultural and natural heritage?	Development affecting historic assets Development affecting natural assets including open space
Climatic factors	ENV5 To promote development which anticipates and responds to the challenges associated with climate change, particularly managing and reducing flood risk	Will development help to reduce flood risk? Will development take into account and actively mitigate climate change impacts?	Renewable energy installed Other measures installed such as SUDS Flooding events Approvals made contrary to EA advice
Water, air, material assets	ENV6 To promote development which makes best use of water resources, reduces pollution and encourages sustainable waste management	Will development incorporate water efficiency measures? Will development actively avoid creating additional pollution burdens?	Water use and technologies Changes in water quality Change to/within Air Quality Management Areas Noise complaints Sustainable waste Management
Population and human health	ECON1 To help improve the performance of the	Will development promote growth in key economic sectors? Will development	Employment creation by area and type Business start-ups

SEA Directive Topic Area(s)	SEA Directive Topic Area(s)	Guide Questions	Indicators
	local and City-wide economy to provide opportunity for all	contribute to encouraging a culture of enterprise and innovation?	
Population and human health	ECON2 To help promote the vitality of local centres	Will development contribute to the maintenance and enhancement of the vitality of local centres?	Local centre health checks
Population and human health	ECON3 To promote the regeneration of areas across the City through appropriate development	Will development contribute to regeneration of areas of the City most in need?	Location and type of development
Population and human health	ECON4 To encourage investment in learning and skills development	Will development contribute to investment in learning and skills?	Local initiatives to promote skills development
Population and human health	SOC1 To help ensure equitable access to community services and facilities	Will development help to promote equitable access to services?	Accessibility indices of key facilities
Population and human health	SOC2 To help provide decent and affordable housing for all, of the right quantity type, tenure and affordability to meet local needs	Will development help to promote access to a range of housing types which meet the needs of residents?	Development types and spatial distribution
Population and human health	SOC3 To encourage development which promotes health and well-being	Will development help to promote a healthier, more active population?	Activity levels by area and sector of the population
Population and human health	SOC4 To encourage development which helps to reduce crime, the fear of crime and antisocial behaviour	Will development help to discourage crime?	Crime levels by area and type
Population and human health	SOC5 To enable communities to influence the decisions that affect their neighbourhoods and quality of life	Will public participation be encouraged as part of the planning of new development?	Participation in consultations

3. How the SA Report Has Been Taken into Account by the Council

Overview

- 3.1 The development of the DMB has been iterative. SA has played an integral role in this iterative process with each of the plan stages having been accompanied by a SA Report in order to help inform the DMB and fully integrate environmental and sustainability considerations into decision making. **Table 1.1** presents a summary of the key stages in the development of the DMB, the associated SA work undertaken and the key conclusions of the appraisal.

How the Findings of the SA Have Been Taken into Account by the Council

- 3.2 Through the SA, mitigation measures were made concerning the emerging plan policies and these were set out in the SA Reports prepared in support of the Regulation 18 and 19 versions of the DMB. Council officers preparing the DMB took the SA findings and recommendations into account while making changes to the DMB.
- 3.3 No suggestions for the amendment of policy wording were made. This reflected the positive scores, the absence of negative effects and the intention to use the policies in combination with the policies of the BDP. The results of the SA of the DM policies indicate that there are likely to be largely positive or significantly positive effects resulting from implementation of the policies.
- 3.4 More generally, the Development Management policies represent the lowest tier in a hierarchy of planning policies, adding local detail to implement the broader principles of policies within the NPPF and the BDP. As such they specifically address local issues and are designed to mitigate potential adverse effects associated with development.
- 3.5 No significant negative effects, either associated with specific sustainability objectives or cumulatively, were identified. This contrasts with the scores attributed to the absence of a policy which are typically significantly negative, reflecting the clear need to systematically control development and the likely consequences of the absence of such a policy framework which is to the benefit of applicants, residents and the City as a whole.
- 3.6 No additional recommendations were identified following a review of the proposed modifications. The recommendations are summarised in Table 3.2 together with the how the SA report was taken into account in the DMB.

Table 3.2 Summary of the Recommendations from the SA and how the DMB has responded

Recommendation/ comment	How the DMB responded
Ensure that, wherever possible, the specific criteria against which the policy will be implemented and monitored are included.	This was considered through the development of the monitoring framework for the DMB.
For each policy, provide further detail against the cited BDP policies on how these will work together.	Reference to specific BDP policies was added.
Set out more clearly which matters are covered by the BDP and which by the Development Management DPD. Fully reference BCC strategies on various topics relating to specific policies.	The relationship with the BDP was clarified in the DMB. Full reference to BCC strategies was added where relevant.
Set out a summary table of how the policies will be monitored, indicating where this can be covered by the existing Authority Monitoring Report. Some	This was addressed through the monitoring framework for the DMB.

4. How Opinions Expressed During Consultation Have Been Taken into Account

4.1 The development of the DMB has been informed by extensive, ongoing engagement and public consultation, in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012.

4.2 On submission of the Local Plan to the Secretary of State, the Council published a Statement of Consultation¹¹ which set out the consultation undertaken during the preparation and publication of the DMB, a summary of the main issues raised and details of how the comments received have been taken into account. This is summarised in the following subsections.

Consultation on the DMB

Development Management Development Plan Document Consultation (Regulation 18) (June 2015)

4.3 Following scoping of the Sustainability Appraisal Report (12 December 2014 – 22 January 2015) comprising a review of existing policies and guidance, analysis of the evidence base, and internal consultation - work on preparing an initial consultation document commenced. An initial consultation document – ‘Development Management DPD Consultation Document’ – was approved for consultation by the Council’s Cabinet Member for Transport, Development and the Economy on 27 July 2015. The document set out the broad topics to be covered in the DMB and informed readers that future consultations would follow that will set out the detailed policies and seek comments on these.

4.4 During the 6-week consultation period, a total of 26 individuals and organisations responded, generating 91 comments/representations. A precis of the main issues raised in the Consultation Statement (Regulation 22). This includes a summary of the Council responses indicating how the comments were taken into account in the next stage of the plan. The full schedule of the representations, including the Council’s detailed response to each comment is included as Appendix 1 in the Consultation Statement Appendices. All the comments received, and the Council’s responses were reported to, and approved, at the Council’s Cabinet meeting of 22 January 2019.

Development Management in Birmingham Preferred Options Consultation (Regulation 18) (January 2019)

4.5 Given the time that had elapsed between the SA Scoping Report (December 2014) and the subsequent stage in the preparation of the DMB, the Council re-consulted the statutory bodies on the scope of the SA report between 22 May 2018 – 29 June 2018 (5 weeks). The main changes to the SA report were updates to the evidence base, updated DMB objectives (which were proposed to be consistent with the now adopted BDP objectives) and an updated review of relevant policies and

¹¹ https://www.birmingham.gov.uk/downloads/file/16783/csd7_consultation_statement_regulation_22

programmes. The responses of the statutory bodies to the updated SA report were included in the SA of the Preferred Options Document.

- 4.6 As a consequence of the modified policies in the adopted BDP and the time that had elapsed between the two stages, the Council reviewed the initial Consultation Document taking into account not only the comments received in 2015 but also updated national planning policy and guidance and the now modified adopted BDP policies.
- 4.7 The Preferred Options Document was prepared having regard also to the Sustainability Appraisal (including consideration of alternative options) of the proposed policies in the DMB.
- 4.8 The key differences between the 2015 Development Management Consultation Document and the 2019 Preferred Options Document were:
- The objectives - the Preferred Options Document proposed objectives that were consistent with the adopted BDP objectives;
 - The policy list - the list of policies in the Preferred Options Document was streamlined and restructured. Some policies in the 2015 Consultation Document were not taken forward into the Preferred Options Document as originally 'drafted' for reasons set out in the Preferred Options Document. The most common reason was that they would be covered by a combination of a 'new' or 'amended' policy proposed in the Preferred Options Document and adopted BDP policy (see Appendix 3: Policies in Stage 1 Regulation 18 Consultation not included in Preferred Options Document and justification, Preferred Options Document, January 2019).
- 4.9 The Preferred Options consultation document was prepared in accordance with Regulation 18 of the Regulations and made available for public consultation between 4 February and 29 March 2019 (a period of 8 weeks).
- 4.10 During the 8-week consultation period, a total 69 respondents commented on the Preferred Options Consultation Document, generating 650 individual comments/representations. A precis of the main issues raised is contained in the Consultation Statement (Regulation 22). This includes a summary of the Council's response to each comment/ representation. A full schedule of the representations, including the Council's detailed response to each comment raised is included as Appendix 2 in the Consultation Statement Appendices. The representations and the suggested Council response were reported to the Council's Cabinet meeting of 29 October 2019, and subsequently approved.

Development Management in Birmingham Publication Document (Regulation 19) (October 2019)

- 4.11 The Publication version of the DMB took full account of all representations received at the Preferred Options stage. Appendix 3 of the Consultation Statement Appendices sets out the Council's detailed response to each representation and the action taken, where necessary, through the preparation of the Publication version. The Publication version also took into account relevant findings from new evidence

base reports such as the Financial Viability Assessment of the DMB, changes to Government policy and guidance, and Sustainability Appraisal of the DMB. The Publication version DMB was approved for consultation by Cabinet on 29 October 2019 and reported to and discussed at Planning Committee on 13 February 2020.

- 4.12 The Publication DMB was prepared in accordance with Regulation 19 of the Regulations and made available for public consultation between 9 January – 21 February 2020 (6 weeks). During the 6-week consultation period, a total 32 respondents commented on the Publication DMB, generating 122 individual comments/representations. An overview of the results is provided in the Consultation Statement (Regulation 22). This includes a summary of the Council's response to each comment/ representation. A full schedule of the representations, including the Council's detailed response to each comment raised is included as Appendix 3 in the Consultation Statement Appendices.

Submission of the Development Management in Birmingham Publication Document (Regulation 22)

- 4.13 On 17 July 2020 Birmingham City Council submitted the Development Management in Birmingham Publication Document to the Secretary of State. An addendum to the SA Report (May 2020) was produced to accompany the submitted plan.

Consultation on Main Modifications

- 4.14 The MMs were published for consultation between 24 March 2021 and 5 May April 2021 (6 weeks). The MMs were screened for their significance to the SA. All the MMs were considered not to affect the assessment of policy within the SA. (Appendix 1)

Consultation on the SA

- 4.15 At each stage of the DMB's development, an SA Report was published alongside the DMB for consultation. The SEA Regulations require the SEA Adoption Statement to summarise how any opinions expressed by the public and the consultation bodies in relation the SEA have been taken into account.
- 4.16 The Local Plan consultation stages and responses received relating to the SA documents are summarised below.

SA Scoping (2014 and 2018)

- 4.17 The first Scoping Report was subject to consultation between 12 December 2014 – 22 January 2015 (5 weeks). A total of 4 responses were received to the first consultation from the statutory SEA consultation bodies and the Equality and Human Rights Commission.
- 4.18 Due to the time that had elapsed between the SA Scoping Report (December 2014) and the subsequent stage in the preparation of the DMB, the Council re-consulted the statutory bodies on the scope of the SA report between 22 May 2018 – 29 June 2018 (5 weeks).

- 4.19 The statutory bodies' responses to the 2014 scoping exercise were summarised and addressed within the updated SA Scoping Report 2018. The main changes to the SA report were updates to the evidence base, updated DMB objectives (which were proposed to be consistent with the BDP objectives) and an updated review of relevant policies and programmes.
- 4.20 Responses related to various aspects of the Scoping Report and resulted in amendments to the SA Framework. Appendix D of the SA of the DMB Publication Document¹² contains a schedule of the consultation responses received on the Scoping Report, the Council's response and the subsequent action taken.

Preferred Options (2019)

- 4.21 An SA of the Preferred Options Document accompanied the Preferred Options Document and was open to public consultation 4 February - 29 March 2019 (8 weeks). The Council received 4 comments in relation to the SA of the Regulation 18 draft DMB. St. Modwen commented that the policy on residential standards had not been considered in the Sustainability Appraisal. Natural England noted a drafting error in reference to the HRA. Historic England welcomes the attention to safeguarding cultural heritage in the SA. The Council for British Archaeology noted that Table 2.1 in the SA report should include the documents - Archaeology Strategy SPG and Regeneration through Conservation SPG. Appendix F of SA of the DMB Publication Document¹³ contains a schedule of the consultation responses received and how they were addressed in the SA.

Publication version (2019)

- 4.22 A SA of the Publication DMB was undertaken and accompanied the Publication DMB which open for public consultation between 9 January – 21 February 2020 (6 weeks). One comment was raised on the SA by Pegasus Group that the introduction of the revised thresholds for M4(2) dwellings within new developments did not appear to be addressed in the Sustainability Appraisal. Appendix G of SA of the DMB Publication Document¹⁴ contains a schedule of the consultation responses received and how they have been addressed in the SA. The revised threshold for the Part M4(2) was subsequently assessed through an addendum to the Sustainability Appraisal submitted with the DMB.
- 4.23 Following receipt and consideration of the consultation responses on the Publication DMB Document, the Council identified a number of proposed minor changes. An Addendum to the SA (May 2020) was prepared in order to update the appraisal where necessary, taking into account the proposed minor modifications. This

¹²

https://www.birmingham.gov.uk/downloads/file/16789/csd9_sustainability_appraisal_of_the_publication_dmb_oct_2019

¹³

https://www.birmingham.gov.uk/downloads/file/16789/csd9_sustainability_appraisal_of_the_publication_dmb_oct_2019

¹⁴

https://www.birmingham.gov.uk/downloads/file/16789/csd9_sustainability_appraisal_of_the_publication_dmb_oct_2019

ensured that all the likely significant effects of the DMB (as proposed to be modified) had been identified, described and evaluated. This Addendum has also considered proposed changes made by the Council to the DMB following consultation on the Publication version. The SA Report was updated to reflect the changes but there were no impacts on the findings of the SA.

Main Modifications (2021)

4.24 The MMs were published for consultation between 24 March 2021 and 5 May April 2021 (6 weeks). The MMs were screened for their significance to the SA. All the MMs were considered not to affect the assessment of policy within the SA.

4.25 The Inspector concluded that:

“The Council carried out a sustainability appraisal of the Plan, prepared a report of the findings of the appraisal and published the report along with the Plan and other submission documents under regulation 19. The appraisal was reviewed to assess the main modifications. The SA is considered adequate.”

5. The Reasons for Choosing the Local Plan as Adopted in the Light of the Other Reasonable Alternatives Considered

Overview

- 5.1 Text Article 5 (1) of the SEA Directive and SEA Regulation 12(2) require that “*an environmental report shall be prepared in which the likely significant effects on the environment of implementing the plan or programme, and reasonable alternatives taking into account the objectives and the geographical scope of the plan or programme, are identified, described and evaluated*”. Information to be provided includes “*an outline of the reasons for selecting the alternatives dealt with*” (SEA Directive Annex I (h) and SEA Regulations Schedule 2 (8)).
- 5.2 The European Commission guidance on the SEA Directive discusses possible interpretations of handling ‘reasonable alternatives’ as required by Article 5(1). It states that “*The alternatives chosen should be realistic. Part of the reason for studying alternatives is to find ways of reducing or avoiding the significant adverse effects of the proposed plan or programme*”.
- 5.3 The findings of the appraisal of the Preferred Options and reasonable alternatives were reported in the SA Report and subject to public consultation.

The Reasons for Choosing the Policies and for Rejecting Reasonable Alternatives

- 5.4 The SA of the Publication DMB Document describes the evolution of the development management policies, including the outcomes of the appraisal of associated preferred options and reasonable alternatives. **Table 5.1** of this Post Adoption Statement provides a summary of the options considered in the process. The SA of the Publication DMB Document sets out the reasons for selecting and rejecting the options considered.

Summary

- 5.5 Overall, the adopted DMB reflects the preferred options selected following the consideration of reasonable alternatives during each stage of its preparation, taking into account the evidence base, engagement and assessment including SA. The adopted DMB also reflects the Main Modifications put forward by the Inspector and appended in their final Report. The Main Modifications include changes to policy wording and supporting text. These are all deemed to be necessary to ensure that the DMB provides a sound and legally compliant plan for the City.
- 5.6 In the Council’s view, the DMB, as adopted, provides the framework for contributing to sustainable development across the City and offers significant opportunities to realise the Council’s vision for Birmingham. It reflects a rigorous process of evidence gathering, assessment, consultation and independent examination.

Table 5.1 Summary of results and the reasons for selecting/rejecting the Alternatives

Policy	Summary of Appraisal of the Proposed Policy	Alternatives Considered
Environment and Sustainability		
DM1 Air Quality	<p>A policy which clearly address environmental protection issues will help to reinforce existing regulatory regimes. The outcome is likely to be enhanced sustainability performance across most indicators, reflecting greater certainty for developers in respect of both minimum standards and good practice. No likely significant negative effects have been identified. The policy could benefit from the inclusion of examples of measures against which the policy will be implemented and measured.</p>	<p>No alternative has been identified to this policy - National policy requires planning to contribute towards compliance with relevant limit values or national objectives for pollutants and take into account local AQMA and Clean Air Zones (CAZ). Therefore, in order to comply with national policy it is considered necessary to set policy aimed at improving air quality and mitigating the impacts of development on air quality. Having no air quality policy will risk undermining the AQMA and CAZ and failure to deliver relevant actions within the City's Air Quality Action Plan, transport strategy and the objectives of the BDP in promoting sustainable development and helping to address climate change.</p>
DM2 Amenity	<p>Good design is important to securing sustainable development through balancing a wide variety of considerations. The detailed criteria within DM01 against which developments will be considered serve as a reference point against which specific proposals can be considered, thereby helping to ensure that development takes account of the specific matters which help to make the City and its neighbourhoods attractive and successful places to live. The specific requirements of DM02 complement the overarching principles set out in DM01. There are no suggested changes to the content of the policies arising from the appraisal. The option of developing a new policy to address design issues yields more positive sustainability outcomes than the reasonable alternatives presented.</p>	<p>No policy on amenity and rely instead on the NPPF and ad hoc considerations of proposals on a case by case basis.</p> <p>Reason for rejection: The Council believes the preferred approach will provide a more transparent, consistent and fairer basis for considering planning proposals than having no policy. To ensure the successful delivery of the BDP, amenity considerations are considered important. The NPPF is clear that planning should seek to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings.</p>

Policy	Summary of Appraisal of the Proposed Policy	Alternatives Considered
DM3 Land affected by Contamination, Instability and Hazardous Substances	<p>A policy which clearly addresses environmental protection issues will help to reinforce existing regulatory regimes. The outcome is likely to be enhanced sustainability performance across most indicators, reflecting greater certainty for developers in respect of both minimum standards and good practice. No likely significant negative effects have been identified. There are no suggested changes to the content of the policy arising from the appraisal.</p>	<p>No alternative to this policy has been identified - Environmental health legislation requires local authorities to identify contaminated land and ensure it is managed in an appropriate manner. The NPPF also stresses the need for policies to ensure that new development is compatible with its location. The NPPF makes clear that developers and landowners are responsible for securing safe development where a site is affected by contamination.</p>
DM4 Landscaping and Trees	<p>Trees and landscaping are fundamental to a high quality and ultimately sustainable environment, contributing aesthetically and functionally to the quality of life across the City. Specification of expectations for design and use of trees and landscaping as part of new development will ensure that, in combination with other policies, high quality design is realised, and wider sustainability enhancements are secured. There are no suggested changes to the content of the policy arising from the appraisal, other than cross-referencing Council Strategies relating to Green Infrastructure, for example.</p>	<p>No alternative to this policy has been identified - The NPPF and BDP provide strong support for protecting and enhancing valued landscapes. Local planning authorities are advised to set criteria-based policies against which proposals for any development on or affecting protected wildlife or landscape areas will be judged.</p>
DM5 Light Pollution	<p>A policy which clearly address environmental protection issues will help to reinforce existing regulatory regimes. The outcome is likely to be enhanced sustainability performance across most indicators, reflecting greater certainty for developers in respect of both minimum standards and good practice. No likely significant negative effects have been identified. There are no suggested changes to the content of the policies arising from the appraisal.</p>	<p>No alternative to this policy has been identified - The NPPF is clear that planning policy should limit the impact of light pollution from artificial light on local amenity, intrinsically dark landscapes and nature conservation. The draft policy provides a detailed approach for achieving this.</p>

Policy	Summary of Appraisal of the Proposed Policy	Alternatives Considered
DM6 Noise and Vibration	<p>A policy which clearly address environmental protection issues will help to reinforce existing regulatory regimes. The outcome is likely to be enhanced sustainability performance across most indicators, reflecting greater certainty for developers in respect of both minimum standards and good practice. No likely significant negative effects have been identified. There are no suggested changes to the content of the policies arising from the appraisal.</p>	<p>No alternative has been identified to this policy - National planning policy requires development to contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by preventing both new and existing development from contributing to or being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by unacceptable levels of soil, air, water or noise pollution or land instability. In addition, the BDP seeks to create well designed, healthy and safe environments. It is therefore considered necessary to include this policy.</p>
Economy and Network of Centres		
DM7 Advertisements	<p>A specific policy which clearly controls the siting and design of advertisements will provide an important reference point for ensuring that a range of sustainability benefits are secured, focused on enhancing economic development in the City whilst ensuring that residential amenity and City-wide amenity is protected. In all cases, the greater certainty and precision associated with an updated policy is likely to yield positive sustainability effects. No likely significant negative effects have been identified. There are no suggested changes to the content of the policy arising from the appraisal. The option of developing a new policy to address siting and design of these uses yields more positive sustainability outcomes than the reasonable alternatives presented.</p>	<p>No policy on advertisements</p> <p>Reasons for rejection: Not having a policy and relying upon applications being considered against the National Planning Policy Framework would not be favoured since there would be no safeguard against inappropriate advertisements and signs.</p>

Policy	Summary of Appraisal of the Proposed Policy	Alternatives Considered
DM8 Places of Worship and other faith related community facilities	<p>Ensuring the appropriate location and design of these uses will help to ensure that sustainable development is promoted, particularly having regard to equitable access through public transport and sensitive design ensuring that impacts on local amenity are minimised. There are no suggested changes to the content of the policy arising from the appraisal. The option of developing a new policy to address siting and design of these uses yields more positive sustainability outcomes than the reasonable alternatives presented.</p>	<p>Retain the wording of existing policy in paragraphs 8.31 - 8.35 of the Saved Unitary Development Plan 2005 and Places for Worship and Faith-related Community and Educational Facilities SPD (2011)</p> <p>Reasons for rejection: This policy needs to be updated to reflect Policy TP21 of the BDP which states that the preferred location for community facilities (e.g. health centres, education and social services and religious buildings) is within the network of defined centres.</p> <p>No policy on places of worship and faith related community uses.</p> <p>Reasons for rejection: Birmingham has a diverse mix of faiths and cultures. A policy is required to ensure that development for places of worship and faith related community uses takes place in the appropriate locations and their impacts on the local area are managed.</p>
DM9 Day nurseries and early years provision	<p>A policy which ensures the consistent provision of educational facilities of various kinds across the City will help to ensure that there is equitable access (for example through sustainable locations) and in a fashion which maintains and enhances local amenity. The precise effects of the policy will have to be monitored to determine whether the policy objectives are being realised in practice. There are no suggested changes to the content of the policy arising from the appraisal. The option of developing a new policy to address education-related development issues yields more positive sustainability outcomes than the reasonable alternatives presented.</p>	<p>Retain existing UDP policy</p> <p>Reasons for rejection: The policy requires updating as it refers to out of date policies. The existing policy does not reflect the Policy TP21 in the BDP which states that the preferred location for community facilities (e.g. health centres, education and social services and religious buildings) is within the network of defined centres.</p> <p>No policy on day nurseries and childcare provision</p> <p>Reasons for rejection: Without a policy on the development of day nurseries and childcare provision, development may result in adverse impacts on the vitality of local centres, residential amenity and character of an area.</p>

Homes and Neighbourhoods

Policy	Summary of Appraisal of the Proposed Policy	Alternatives Considered
DM10 Standards for Residential Development	<p>This policy will yield a range of sustainability benefits, associated with ensuring that there is high quality residential development throughout the City. No likely significant negative effects have been identified. There are no suggested changes to the content of the policies arising from the appraisal. The option of developing new policy to address residential design matters yields more positive sustainability outcomes than the reasonable alternatives presented.</p>	<p>Retain existing UDP policy in paragraph 8.39-8.44 of the Saved Unitary Development Plan regarding house extensions. There is no existing policy on housing technical standards for internal space, outdoor amenity space or accessible and adaptable housing.</p> <p>Reasons for rejection: The policy requires updating to achieve good standards of amenity for the occupiers of new residential buildings and protect the amenity of nearby occupiers and residents. The general thrust of the existing policy regarding residential extensions is taken forward into the new policy.</p> <p>No minimum space standards or policy on separation distances, outdoor amenity space and accessible and adaptable housing.</p> <p>Reasons for rejection: Having no such policy would risk developments not achieving a reasonable level of amenity therefore impacting on quality of life. Minimum space standards will help to ensure that there is sufficient space, privacy and storage facilities to ensure the long- term sustainability and usability of homes. DM9 is consistent with the NPPF requires local planning authorities to seek to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings.</p>

Policy	Summary of Appraisal of the Proposed Policy	Alternatives Considered
DM11 Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMO)	<p>The sustainability effects of a clear policy which seeks to control Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMO) is likely be positive, reflecting the potential issues associated with them. The sustainability effects relate to ensuring that local amenity and design quality is appropriately protected, whilst providing for the needs of those in need. No likely significant negative effects have been identified. There are no suggested changes to the content of the policy arising from the appraisal. The option of developing a new policy to address siting and design of these uses yields more positive sustainability outcomes than the reasonable alternatives presented.</p>	<p>Retain existing UDP policy</p> <p>Reasons for rejection: This policy requires updating as it refers to out of date UDP policies, but the main thrust of the policy remains unchanged in DM11.</p> <p>No policy on HMO</p> <p>Reasons for rejection: Without a HMO policy, development could result in concentrations of HMOs which can lead to a number of negative impacts on local communities, for example more frequent noise nuisance, depopulation of neighbourhoods during academic vacations, and increased pressure on parking due to higher population densities.</p> <p>Less prescriptive policy</p> <p>Reasons for rejection: Defining cumulative impact by using a threshold against which applications will be assessed will aid in transparency and consistency in decision-making.</p>
DM12 Residential conversions and specialist accommodation	<p>Promoting sensitive residential conversions and the development of appropriate specialist accommodation is likely to result in significant positive effects through the provision of appropriate accommodation for those in particular need. The option of having no specific policy could result in some minor adverse effects relating to social indicators.</p>	<p>No policy on Residential Conversions</p> <p>Reasons for rejection: Without a policy on residential conversions and specialist accommodation there are likely to be a range of negative effects relating to poor quality living environments and negatives impacts on local amenity arising from over-concentrations of such uses.</p>

Policy	Summary of Appraisal of the Proposed Policy	Alternatives Considered
DM13 Self and Custom-build Housing	Promoting self- and custom-build housing through a specific policy is likely to yield positive sustainability effects City-wide with no adverse effects identified. There are no suggested changes to the content of the policy arising from the appraisal. The option of having no specific policy could result in some minor adverse effects relating to social indicators.	<p>No policy on self and custom build housing.</p> <p>Reasons for rejection: The Council wishes to take a proactive approach to supporting individuals or groups of individuals that wish to build their own homes as a more affordable means by which to access home ownership. It is also a duty upon local authorities to have regard to the Self and Custom Build Register in carrying out their planning, housing, land disposal and regeneration functions.</p>
Connectivity		
DM14 Highway Safety and Access	Ensuring that there is a rounded approach to transport planning across the City should yield a broad range of sustainability benefits, notably in respect on enhancing the City's economic performance through ensuring more efficient and effective movement. In turn and more broadly, the well-being of residents is enhanced through the greater opportunities for efficient travel within the City. No likely significant negative effects have been identified. There are no suggested changes to the content of the policy arising from the appraisal.	<p>No alternative to this policy has been identified - the NPPF requires development to provide for safe and suitable access to the site for all users. It states that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.</p>
DM15 Parking and Servicing	Ensuring that there is a rounded approach to transport planning across the City should yield a broad range of sustainability benefits, notably in respect on enhancing the City's economic performance through ensuring more efficient and effective movement. In turn and more broadly, the well-being of residents is enhanced through the greater opportunities for efficient travel within the City. No likely significant negative effects have been identified. There are no suggested changes to the content of the policy arising from the appraisal. The option of developing new policy to address siting and design of these uses yields more positive sustainability outcomes than the reasonable alternatives presented.	<p>No policy</p> <p>Reasons for rejection: National policy makes clear that parking standards should be determined at the local level in response to local circumstances. The proposed policy supports the implementation of the BDP in developing a sustainable, high quality, integrated transport system. It is considered essential that appropriate parking is provided to contribute to traffic reduction and ensure safety, inclusive development and manage any impact on amenity.</p>

Policy	Summary of Appraisal of the Proposed Policy	Alternatives Considered
DM16 Telecommunications	Ensuring that the City has an up-to-date telecommunications infrastructure will ensure sustainability benefits across a range of objectives, notably the contribution to the City’s economic performance, creating opportunities for travel reduction and ensuring that all residents have equitable access to high quality services that enable them to fulfil their economic and social potential. No likely significant negative effects have been identified. There are no suggested changes to the content of the policy arising from the appraisal. The option of developing new policy to address telecommunications siting matters yields more positive sustainability outcomes than the reasonable alternatives presented.	No policy Reasons for rejection: policy supports the implementation of the Policy TP46 Digital Communications of the BDP. The Council supports well- designed and located high quality communications infrastructure and this policy is intended to facilitate provision in line with this aspiration.

6. Monitoring

Overview

- 6.1 The SEA Regulations (17 (1)) set out that *“The responsible authority shall monitor the significant environmental effects of the implementation of each plan or programme with the purpose of identifying any unforeseen adverse effects at an early stage and being able to undertake appropriate remedial action”*. The Regulations are clear that it is not necessary to monitor everything. Instead, monitoring should focus on significant effects.
- 6.2 Government guidance¹⁵ states that details for monitoring the significant effects of implementing a local plan must be included in the SA report, the Post Adoption Statement or in the local plan itself. The guidance also states that the monitoring results should be reported in the local planning authority’s monitoring report. Monitoring the adopted Local Plan for sustainability effects can help to answer questions such as:
- Were the SA’s predictions of sustainability effects accurate?
 - Is the DMB contributing to the achievement of desired SA objectives?
 - Are mitigation measures performing as well as expected?
 - Are there any adverse effects? Are these within acceptable limits, or is remedial action desirable?

The DMB Monitoring Framework

¹⁵ MHCLG (2015) Planning Practice Guidance: Strategic Environmental Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal, Paragraph: 025 Reference ID: 11-025-20140306

- 6.3 Monitoring of the DMB's implementation will focus on:
- significant sustainability effects that may give rise to irreversible damage, with a view to identifying trends before such damage occurs;
 - significant effects where uncertainty was identified in the SA and where monitoring would enable preventative or mitigation measures to be undertaken; and
 - where there is the potential for effects on sensitive environmental receptors.
- 6.4 **Appendix 2** sets out a framework for monitoring the likely significant effects of implementing the adopted DMB. These reflect the indicators proposed within the monitoring framework for the DMB itself as the data collected will also be relevant to understanding sustainability effects in many instances. The monitoring table was previously presented in the Publication SA Report but has now been updated to reflect the final set of monitoring indicators included in the adopted DMB where relevant.
- 6.5 The MMs included changes to the Monitoring Framework and these were screened to assess the extent to which proposed indicators aligned with the SA objectives. The Monitoring Framework is provided at **Appendix 2** of this PAS and it is concluded that the monitoring framework provides the basis for meeting monitoring requirements for the DMB associated with the SA.
- 6.6 As noted above, the SA monitoring process will be nested within the DMB monitoring process. It is envisaged that there will be an ongoing programme of monitoring, which will be reported on an annual basis in the Council's Authority Monitoring Reports (AMRs). The AMRs will be available to view on the Council's website and will be used to monitor the implementation of the DMB. Monitoring will also identify unexpected outcomes which will allow the Council to take appropriate action.

Appendix 1 - Implications of the Main Modifications for the Sustainability Appraisal

Ref	Policy and/ or paragraph number	Subject to Sustainability Appraisal	Reason
MM1	Policy DM1 Air Quality Paragraph 2.7	No	All modifications set out as part of MM1 are for clarification purposes. The changes are therefore not expected to affect the assessment of the policy within the SA.
MM2	Policy DM2 Amenity Paragraph 2.20	No	The Policy itself is not subject to any direct modification apart from the addition of a footnote to cross reference with Policy DM10. The addition to paragraph 2.20 of the supporting text to the policy is for clarification. Neither change is expected to affect the assessment of Policy DM2 within the SA.
MM3	Policy DM3 Land affected by contamination, instability and hazardous substances	No	MM3 provides clarity to the application of the policy and is unlikely to change the result of the SA.
MM4	Policy DM4 Landscaping and trees Paragraph 2.37 Paragraph 2.39	No	Modifications to Policy DM4 provide clarification as to how the Policy is to be applied as well as providing additional references to documents for clarification. These changes are not expected to result in changes to the SA.
MM5	Policy DM6 Noise and vibration Paragraph 2.52	No	All modifications set out as part of MM5 relating to Policy DM6 are for clarification purposes. The changes are unlikely to affect the assessment of the policy within the SA.
MM6	Policy DM8 Places of worship and faith related community uses Paragraph 3.10	No	MM6 provides clarification on the application of the policy and is not expected to have any implications on the SA.
MM7	Policy DM9 Day nurseries and early years provision Paragraph 3.18 Paragraph 3.19 Paragraph 3.20	No	All modifications set out as part of MM7 relating to Policy DM9 are for clarification purposes. The changes are therefore not anticipated to affect the assessment of the policy within the SA.
MM8	Policy DM10 Standards for residential development Paragraph 4.5 Paragraph 4.11	No	The changes proposed in MM8 relate to clarifications to Policy DM10 in terms of its application. As such, the changes are unlikely to affect the assessment of the policy within the SA.

Appendix 1 - Implications of the Main Modifications for the Sustainability Appraisal			
Ref	Policy and/ or paragraph number	Subject to Sustainability Appraisal	Reason
MM9	Policy DM13 Self and custom build housing	No	The modifications set out as part of MM9 are for clarification purposes. The changes are not expected to affect the assessment of the policy within the SA.
MM10	Policy DM14 Transport Access and Safety New paragraph 5.10	No	The modifications set out as part of MM10 are for clarification purposes. The changes are unlikely to affect the assessment of the policy within the SA.
MM11	Policy DM15 Parking and Servicing Paragraph 5.14 (formerly 5.13) Paragraph 5.15 (formerly 5.14) Paragraph 5.16 (formerly 5.15)	No	The modifications set out as part of MM11 are for clarification purposes. The changes are not expected to affect the assessment of the policy within the SA.
MM12	Appendix 2: Monitoring Framework	No	The modifications set out in MM12 relate to changes to the monitoring indicators. These are not expected to affect the assessment of the policies themselves in the SA.

Appendix 2 – Monitoring Framework					
Policy	DMB Monitoring Indicator	Target	Trigger	Potential indicators suggested in the SA	Related SA Objective (s)
Policy DM1 Air Quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of applications approved contrary to the policy • Number of applications refused on air quality grounds and successfully defended at appeal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All relevant applications meet the policy requirements • All relevant appeal decisions uphold air quality impact as valid reason for refusal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10% of applications approved contrary to policy • 10% of appeals where inspector rejected air quality as a reason for refusal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AQ monitoring • Change within AQMA • Effects on human health and biodiversity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ENV2 • ENV4 • ENV6 • SOC3
Policy DM2 Amenity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of applications approved contrary to the policy • Number of applications refused on amenity grounds and successfully defended at appeal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All relevant applications meet the policy requirements • All relevant appeal decisions uphold loss of amenity as valid reason for refusal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10% of applications approved contrary to policy • 10% of appeals where inspector rejected amenity as reason for refusal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DM statistics applications refused as contrary to policy • Development affecting natural assets including open space • Effects on heritage assets and biodiversity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ENV2 • SOC2 • SOC3 • SOC4
Policy DM3 Land affected by Contamination and Hazardous substances	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of applications approved contrary to the policy • Number of applications refused on contamination grounds and successfully defended at appeal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All relevant applications meet the policy requirements • All relevant appeal decisions uphold risk of contamination as a valid reason for refusal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10% of applications approved contrary to policy • 10% of appeals where inspector rejected contamination as reason for refusal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DM statistics on applications with contamination/stability issues • Proportion of new development on previously developed land 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ENV1 • ENV6 • ECON3 • SCO3
Policy DM4 Landscaping and Trees	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ha/ sq. m. in loss of ancient woodland • Number of applications approved without tree replacement provision (where relevant) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No loss of ancient trees/ woodland • No applications approved without tree replacement provision (where relevant) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10% loss of ancient trees/ woodland • 10% of applications approved without tree replacement provision (where relevant) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BDP monitoring of city-greening • DM statistics on conditions attached to applications 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ENV2 • ENV4 • ENV5 • ENV6 • SOC3
Policy DM5 Light Pollution	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of applications approved contrary to the policy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All relevant applications meet the policy requirements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10% of applications approved contrary to policy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DM statistics on applications refused as contrary to policy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ENV4 • ENV6 • SOC3

Appendix 2 – Monitoring Framework					
Policy	DMB Monitoring Indicator	Target	Trigger	Potential indicators suggested in the SA	Related SA Objective (s)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of applications refused on light pollution grounds and successfully defended at appeal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All relevant appeal decisions uphold light pollution as a valid reason for refusal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10% of appeals where inspector rejected light pollution as reason for refusal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effects on heritage assets and biodiversity 	
Policy DM6 Noise and Vibration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of applications approved contrary to the policy • Number of applications refused on noise impact grounds and successfully defended at appeal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All relevant applications meet the policy requirements • All relevant appeal decisions uphold noise impact as a valid reason for refusal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10% of applications approved contrary to policy • 10% of appeals where inspector rejected noise impact as reason for refusal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DM statistics on applications refused as contrary to policy • Noise complaints • Effects on heritage assets and biodiversity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ENV6 • SOC3
Policy DM7 Advertisements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of applications approved contrary to the policy • Number of applications refused on this policy and successfully defended at appeal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All relevant applications meet the policy requirements • All relevant appeal decisions uphold the reason(s) for refusal related to the policy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10% of applications approved contrary to policy • 10% of appeals where inspector rejected the reason(s) for refusal related to the policy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DM statistics on applications refused as contrary to policy • Effects on heritage assets 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EN4 • ECON1
Policy DM8 Places of Worship	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of applications approved contrary to the policy • Percentage of applications refused on this policy and successfully defended at appeal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All relevant applications meet the policy requirements • All relevant appeal decisions uphold the reason(s) for refusal related to the policy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10% of applications approved contrary to policy • 10% of appeals where inspector rejected the reason(s) for refusal related to the policy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DM statistics on applications • Accessibility indices of key facilities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ENV3 • ECON2
Policy DM9 Day nurseries and early years provision	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of applications approved contrary to the policy • Percentage of applications refused on 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All relevant applications meet the policy requirements • All relevant appeal decisions uphold the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10% of applications approved contrary to policy • 10% of appeals where inspector rejected the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DM statistics on applications • Accessibility indices of key facilities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ENV3 • ECON2 • ECON4

Appendix 2 – Monitoring Framework					
Policy	DMB Monitoring Indicator	Target	Trigger	Potential indicators suggested in the SA	Related SA Objective (s)
	this policy and successfully defended at appeal	reason(s) for refusal related to the policy	reason(s) for refusal related to the policy		
Policy DM10 Standards for Residential Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of dwellings meeting NDSS. • Number of dwellings provided as accessible and adaptable • Number of applications refused on 45 Degree Code successfully defended at appeal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 100% of dwellings meet NDSS • 100% of development of 15 or more dwellings provide 30% accessible homes • All relevant appeals on 45 Degree Code policy successfully defended 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provision of NDSS compliant homes falls below 80% • Provision of accessible and adaptable homes falls below 80%. • 10% of appeals where inspector rejected 45 Degree Code policy as reason for refusal • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DM statistics on applications refused as contrary to policy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ENV2 • ENV3 • ENV4 • ECON3 • SOC2 • SOC3
Policy DM11 House in multiple occupation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New areas with over 10% concentration of HMOs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No new areas with over 10% concentration of HMOs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase in areas with over 10% concentration of HMOs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DM statistics on applications refused as contrary to policy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ENV1 • ECON3 • SOC2
Policy DM12 Residential conversions and specialist accommodation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of applications approved contrary to policy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All relevant applications to meet the policy requirements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10% of applications approved contrary to the policy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DM statistics on applications refused as contrary to policy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ENV2 • ENV3 • ECON3 • SOC2
Policy DM13 Self and custom build housing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Numbers of plots made available for self and custom build each year 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No specific target 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No specific trigger 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DM statistics on applications 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ENV2 • ECON3 • SOC2
Policy DM14 Highway and safety access	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of applications approved contrary to the policy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All relevant applications meet the policy requirements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10% of applications approved contrary to the policy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DM statistics on applications refused as contrary to policy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ENV3 • ECON3 • SOC1
Policy DM15 Parking and servicing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of applications approved contrary to the policy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All relevant applications meet the policy requirements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10% of applications approved contrary to the policy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DM statistics on applications refused as contrary to policy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ENV3 • ECON3 • SCO1

Appendix 2 – Monitoring Framework

Policy	DMB Monitoring Indicator	Target	Trigger	Potential indicators suggested in the SA	Related SA Objective (s)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of applications refused on this policy successfully defended at appeal 				
Policy DM16 Telecommunications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of applications approved contrary to the policy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All relevant applications meet the policy requirements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 10% of applications approved contrary to the policy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DM statistics on applications refused as contrary to policy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ENV45 ECON3