

South Tees Area Supplementary Planning Document

Strategic Environmental Assessment Post Adoption Statement

On behalf of **Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council and The South Tees Development Corporation**



Project Ref: 42308 | Rev: B | Date: June 2018



Document Control Sheet

Project Name: South Tees Masterplan Support

Project Ref: 42308

Report Title: Strategic Environmental Assessment Post Adoption Statement

Doc Ref: 42308r003i2

Date: June 2018

	Name	Position	Signature	Date
Prepared by:	Caroline Dinnage	Graduate Environmental Planner	CD	23.05.2018
Reviewed by:	Duncan Smart	Senior Planner	DS	08.06.2018
Approved by:	Elaine Richmond	Environmental Director	ER	11/06.2018
For and on behalf of Peter Brett Associates LLP				

Revision	Date	Description	Prepared	Reviewed	Approved
B	15.06.2018	Minor amendments to respond to client comments	DS	ER	ER

This report has been prepared by Peter Brett Associates LLP ('PBA') on behalf of its client to whom this report is addressed ('Client') in connection with the project described in this report and takes into account the Client's particular instructions and requirements. This report was prepared in accordance with the professional services appointment under which PBA was appointed by its Client. This report is not intended for and should not be relied on by any third party (i.e. parties other than the Client). PBA accepts no duty or responsibility (including in negligence) to any party other than the Client and disclaims all liability of any nature whatsoever to any such party in respect of this report.

© Peter Brett Associates LLP 2018

Contents

1	Introduction	1
1.1	Context	1
1.2	Overview of the SPD	1
1.3	Overview of the SEA Process for the SPD	2
1.4	Structure of this Report	3
2	How environmental considerations have been integrated into the SPD.....	5
2.1	Introduction	5
2.2	Environmental considerations of relevance to the SPD	5
2.3	SEA Framework	9
2.4	SEA Reporting and Outputs	10
3	How SEA reporting has been taken into account in the SPD.....	11
3.1	Overview.....	11
3.2	SEA Reporting.....	11
3.3	SEA Assessment Matrices and Scoring.....	12
3.4	SEA Mitigation and Enhancement Recommendations	13
4	How the opinions raised during consultation have been taken into account	15
4.1	Overview.....	15
4.2	Consultation Opportunities	15
4.3	Impact of SEA Related Consultation Responses on the SPD	15
5	Reasons for choosing the SPD as adopted, in light of other alternatives dealt with	16
5.1	Overview.....	16
5.2	Reasonable Alternatives Considered	16
5.3	Rationale for adoption of the SPD as prepared	19
6	South Tees Area SPD Monitoring Framework	20
6.1	Monitoring Requirements	20
6.2	SPD Monitoring Framework	20
7	Conclusion.....	36

Tables

Table 1.1 South Tees Master Plan SPD Key Facts.....	1
Table 2:1 Key Sustainability Issues Identified in Relation to the SPD	6
Table 2:2 Iterations of SPD SEA Reports and Consultations	10
Table 3.1: SEA Reporting for the South Tees Area SPD.....	11
Table 3.1 SEA Compatibility Assessment Scoring	12
Table 3.2 SEA Scoring System to Establish Likely Significant Effects from Proposed Development Principles ...	13
Table 5:1 Assessment of Alternative Redevelopment Scenarios	17
Table 6.1: South Tees Area SPD Monitoring Framework.....	21
Table A.1 SPD SEA Framework.....	37
Table B.1 Summary of PBA Reviews of the Emerging SPD.....	42
Table B.2 Schedule of Development Principle Mitigation and Enhancement Recommendations	56
Table C.1: Response to SEA Screening and Scoping Consultation Comments.....	63

Appendices

- Appendix A SEA Framework
- Appendix B SEA Mitigation and Enhancement Recommendations
- Appendix C SPD Response to SEA Screening and Scoping Consultation Comments

This page is intentionally blank

1 Introduction

1.1 Context

- 1.1.1 Peter Brett Associates LLP (PBA) has been commissioned by Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council (RCBC), acting in partnership with the South Tees Development Corporation (STDC), to undertake the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) of the South Tees Area Supplementary Planning Document ('the SPD'). This report provides a SEA Post Adoption Statement to explain how the SEA process and wider environmental considerations have informed the development of the SPD, which was formally adopted by RCBC on 24th May 2018.
- 1.1.2 This report responds to the information requirements specified in Regulation 16 of the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 as amended ('the SEA Regulations') and the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 as amended ('the Development Planning Regulations'). Read together, these regulations set out the core information and assessment requirements for undertaking a SEA of emerging plans and programmes.
- 1.1.3 A key element of this SEA Post Adoption Statement is the SPD Monitoring Framework provided in **Section 6**. This Framework will be used by RCBC and the STDC to monitor likely significant effects from the implementation of the SPD and to undertake periodic reviews of the document.

1.2 Overview of the SPD

- 1.2.1 The key facts relating to the South Tees Area SPD are detailed in **Table 1.1** below.

Table 1.1 South Tees Master Plan SPD Key Facts

Criteria	Details
Responsible Authorities	Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council, acting in partnership with the South Tees Development Corporation
SEA Assessor on behalf of the Responsible Authorities	Peter Brett Associates LLP (PBA)
Plan Title	South Tees Area SPD
Adoption Date	24 th May 2018
Plan Subject	Industrial led comprehensive regeneration of STDC industrial area
Reason for Plan	To steer the industrial led regeneration of the STDC area in accordance with the policy requirements of Redcar and Cleveland Local Plan (adopted 24 th May 2018).
Period covered by the Plan	Date of adoption (May 2018) to expiry of RCLP period (2032) unless revised at an earlier date. The approved Supplementary Planning Document will be kept under regular review by Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council and the South Tees Development Corporation.
Area covered by the Plan	The South Tees Development Corporation area, as defined by the South Tees Development Corporation (Establishment) Order 2017

Plan Purpose	To define a vision, objectives, spatial strategy and key development principles for the comprehensive regeneration of the South Tees Development Corporation area.
--------------	--

Context and Purpose of the South Tees Area SPD

- 1.2.2 The South Tees Site Company Ltd (STSC) and the STDC have been established to lead the comprehensive regeneration of approximately 1,800 hectares (ha) of industrial land on Teeside known as 'the STDC area'. This area has played host to steel and iron making industries for over 170 years and is centred upon the former landholdings of the former Sahaviriya Steel Industries (SSI), which went into liquidation in October 2015.
- 1.2.3 The purpose of the SPD is to define a clear vision, spatial strategy and set of requirements for development proposals within the STDC area. In doing so, the SPD seeks to guide inward investment, address the environmental legacy left by decades of heavy industry, optimise the use of existing infrastructure and underpin the transformation of the STDC area into a hotbed of new industry and enterprise for the Tees Valley.
- 1.2.4 The SPD directly supports the implementation of relevant policies from the adopted Redcar and Cleveland Local Plan (RCLP) (May 2018) within the STDC area. To achieve this, the SPD distils the main elements of the South Tees Area Background Study, which was prepared to provide a spatial masterplan to underpin the regeneration of the STDC area, into concise and formal planning policy guidance. Having been approved by Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council (RCBC) in May 2018, the SPD will now be a key material consideration in assessing future development proposals within the STDC Area. It will also be of relevance to the consideration of any compulsory purchase orders (CPO) which the STDC may seek to make on parcels of land within the STDC area that are not presently under their full control.

SPD Preparation Process

- 1.2.5 To be effective, the SPD needs to encapsulate the STDC's vision, key objectives and development strategy for the STDC area, whilst demonstrably aligning with relevant planning policy considerations including the RCLP. An initial draft of the SPD, structured around a series of key development principles which reflected the content of a Regeneration Master Plan developed by CH2M for the STDC, was published in October 2017.
- 1.2.6 After the close of an initial consultation at the end of November 2017, the initial draft SPD was reviewed by PBA and Lichfields LLP on behalf of RCBC and the STDC respectively. The review undertaken by PBA focused on recommending changes to improve the environmental performance of the emerging SPD, in particular to avoid the document from being likely to have either significant adverse effects on the environment or significant effects on European Sites. A redrafted version was produced by RCBC officers in January 2018, which was also reviewed by PBA from an SEA and HRA perspective. Further amendments were then made in response to this review by RCBC before the final draft SPD was produced. This final Consultation Draft SPD was then subject to a formal SEA, as reported within the South Tees Area SPD Environmental Report which was published for consultation alongside the Consultation Draft SPD from 26th March – 22nd April 2018.
- 1.2.7 By the close of the consultation period, 13 representations had been submitted to RCBC regarding the Consultation Draft SPD. To address these a suite of minor changes were incorporated into the final SPD, as presented to a meeting of RCBC on 24th May 2018. At this meeting, RCBC resolved to adopt the final SPD.

1.3 Overview of the SEA Process for the SPD

- 1.3.1 The Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 as amended ('the SEA Regulations') require Responsible Authorities, which includes public bodies such as

RCBC and the STDC, to assess the likely significant effects on the environment of implementing relevant plans or programmes, as defined within the SEA Regulations.

- 1.3.2 A SEA Screening and Scoping Report ((November 2017) was produced by PBA on behalf of RCBC to provide relevant information to enable the SEA Consultation Bodies¹ to:
- Consider the need for a formal SEA to be carried out in respect of the SPD; and,
 - Assuming that a formal SEA would be required, to form a view on the consultation period and scope/level of detail that would be appropriate for an Environmental Report (ER) to accompany the draft SPD for public consultation
- 1.3.3 Each of the SEA Consultation Bodies responded to the SEA Screening and Scoping Report, in all cases supporting the proposal to undertake a formal SEA of the SPD. An associated positive SEA Screening Determination was then published online by RCBC in early February 2018 to confirm that a SEA was being carried out.
- 1.3.4 Based on the outcomes of SEA Scoping and the information requirements specified in Schedule 2 of the SEA Regulations, an ER was prepared in March 2018 to identify and assess the likely significant effects on the environment of the Consultation Draft SPD. Prior to this point, PBA undertook two reviews of the emerging SPD to identify and seek to resolve uncertainties which, if left unchanged, could have resulted in significant adverse effects on the environment or otherwise undermined the implementation of the SPD as intended. In consequence, only a limited number of further recommended changes to the SPD were identified through preparing the ER, all of which were then incorporated into the Consultation Draft SPD.
- 1.3.5 The South Tees Area SPD ER and the Consultation Draft SPD were subject to public consultation from 26th March – 22nd April 2018, alongside the South Tees Area SPD HRA Report. Of the 13 representations received in respect of these documents, only 2 raised points directly related to the SEA, neither of which required substantive changes to be made to either the Consultation Draft SPD or the associated ER. A factual update note was produced by PBA in May 2018 to respond to the queries raised in these representations and to confirm that the suite of proposed minor changes to the Consultation Draft SPD would not affect the conclusions or continued validity of the South Tees Area SPD ER and HRA Report. These Reports were therefore presented to elected members alongside the final SPD at a meeting of RCBC on 24th May 2018, where the SPD was formally adopted.
- 1.3.6 Following the adoption of the SPD, the SEA Regulations require RCBC to prepare a statement setting out, amongst other matters, how environmental considerations and the SEA have been taken into account and how the likely significant effects on the environment of the document will be monitored. This SEA Post Adoption Statement fulfils these requirements.

1.4 Structure of this Report

- 1.4.1 Reflecting Article 9 of European Directive 2001/42/EC on the assessment of the effects of certain plans and programmes on the environment ('the SEA Directive'), Regulation 16(4) of the SEA Regulations requires responsible authorities (including RCBC) to produce a statement containing the following information as soon as reasonably practical after the adoption of a relevant and qualifying plan or programme:
- How environmental considerations have been integrated into the plan or programme (**Section 2**);
 - How the environmental report has been taken into account (**Section 3**);

¹ Natural England, Historic England and the Environment Agency

- How opinions expressed in response to:
 - i the invitation referred to in regulation 13(2)(d) (**Section 4**);
 - ii action taken by the responsible authority in accordance with regulation 13(4), have been taken into account; (**Section 4**).
 - How the results of any consultations entered into under regulation 14(4) have been taken into account (**Section 4**);
 - The reasons for choosing the plan or programme as adopted, in the light of the other reasonable alternatives dealt with; (**Section 5**);
 - The measures that are to be taken to monitor the significant environmental effects of the implementation of the plan or programme (regulation 16) (**Section 6**).
- 1.4.2 The remainder of this report responds to these six information requirements in turn, before setting out concluding remarks in **Section 7**. It should be noted that this SEA Post Adoption Statement addresses the requirements of the SEA Regulations rather than providing a wider “*Adoption Statement*” or “*Consultation Statement*” for the purposes of the Development Planning Regulations.

2 How environmental considerations have been integrated into the SPD

2.1 Introduction

- 2.1.1 The SEA process involves assessing the performance of an emerging plan or a programme against a series of objectives to test whether it is likely to result in significant effects on the environment. Schedule 2 of the SEA Regulations prescribes a list of environmental topics for which any likely significant effects must be assessed.

2.2 Environmental considerations of relevance to the SPD

- 2.2.1 At the outset of preparing the SEA Screening and Scoping Report, baseline and policy reviews were undertaken to identify the key environmental and socio-economic issues which would need to be considered throughout the preparation of the SPD. A summary of the key identified issues is provided in **Table 2.1** below. To ensure these issues were sufficiently addressed, a dedicated SEA Objective was then devised within an SEA Framework to assess the likely effects of the SPD upon each thematic issue.

Table 2:1 Key Sustainability Issues Identified in Relation to the SPD

SEA Objectives	Key Issues
1. Biodiversity and Geodiversity: Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the green infrastructure network.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is the need to conserve and enhance biodiversity including sites designated at all levels for their ecological value such as the Teesmouth and Cleveland Coast Special Protection Area (SPA). Major industrial led development within the STDC area could adversely impact the designated sites and biodiversity through a range of direct and indirect effects, potentially including loss of roosting, foraging and other habitat, noise disturbance, abstraction of river water, discharge of effluent, contamination and air pollution. The need to safeguard and enhance the green infrastructure network within the South Tees Area
2. Placemaking: Enhance design quality to create great places, protect and enhance key landscape features and historic assets, and safeguard industrial heritage.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The need to protect and enhance cultural heritage assets and their settings. The industrial heritage dates back 170 years. The need to conserve and enhance townscape character, key views and visual amenity.
3. Air Quality: Prevent and reduce emissions and concentrations of harmful atmospheric pollutants and minimise exposure to poor air quality.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The need to minimize the emissions of pollutants to air, in particular from industrial installations and traffic generation. The current main sources of air pollutants affecting the STDC area are from road traffic and industrial combustion and process emissions. The need to safeguard and improve air quality.
4. Water: Conserve, protect and enhance the water environment, water quality and water resources.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The need to protect and enhance the quality of water sources and the water environment. Waterbodies across the site vary in quality and ecological value. Existing industrial landfill facilities within the STDC area have the potential to pollute Lackenby Channel.
5. Energy and Climate Change: Decouple industrial growth and economic prosperity from increased fossil fuel consumption and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The need to decouple industrial activity, employment and economic growth within the South Tees Area from significant greenhouse gas emissions, in order to contribute to climate change mitigation whilst meeting socio-economic objectives. There is a direct relationship between the closure of large industrial installations within the STDC

SEA Objectives	Key Issues
	<p>area and the significant decrease in total GHG emissions observed within the RCBC area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The need to provide a sustainable transport strategy for the South Tees area. • The need to ensure that new development is adaptable to the effects of climate change, taking account of the location of the South Tees on the south bank of the River Tees estuary and associated flood risks.
<p>6. Flood Risk and Resilience: Reduce the risk of flooding, taking into account the effects of climate change, adaptation efforts and the need to enhance resilience.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The need to locate new development away from areas of flood risk or to fully mitigate potential flood risks, taking into account the effects of climate change. The majority of the STDC area lies within Flood Zone 1 however there are several sources for fluvial, tidal, surface water and coastal flooding. There are localised high flood risk areas around the River Tees to the north west, Coatham Sands to the north east and The Fleet and other small water courses to the south.
<p>7. Materials and Waste: Contribute to the implementation of the circular economy, promote recycling and manage waste with minimal environmental impact.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The need to manage hazards and waste arisings in a safe and sustainable manner.
<p>8. Community: Reduce poverty and inequality, tackle social exclusion and promote community cohesion.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The need to reduce multiple deprivation and provide suitable opportunities (economic, social and environmental) for the benefit of all local people
<p>9. Environmental Quality: Remediate land, reduce harmful effects on the environment from contamination, improve land quality and enhance the quality of the physical environment.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The need to remediate extensive areas of contaminated land within the South Tees Area and to reduce environmental effects associated with known contamination. Historic industrial facilities and operations over many decades mean that ground contamination is expected to be significant. • The need to safeguard soil resources.

SEA Objectives	Key Issues
10. Health, Wellbeing and Safety: Protect and improve health, wellbeing and safety, including through reducing health inequalities, enhancing access to high quality open space and avoiding adverse impacts on human health.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The need to protect and enhance the health and wellbeing of the local population, including through avoiding harm from industrial activities and action to reduce significant health inequalities. The population of Redcar and Cleveland has lower life expectancy than average and there are significant health inequalities amongst residents. The need to create and enhance open space provision and accessibility within the South Tees Area.
11. Transport: Enhance and improve connectivity and accessibility through implementing a sustainable transport strategy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rail infrastructure is outdated and there are wider congestion issues on the A19. The current gauge clearance requires freight traffic from Teesport to the south to make a reversing manoeuvre at Darlington, limiting train path availability.
12. Employment: Increase high quality employment opportunities for the working age population across the RCBC and TVCA areas.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The need to ensure that the South Tees Area remains of strategic regional and national importance for industrial activities and employment.
13. Economic Growth and Industrial Excellence: Maximise the contribution of the STDC area to the local, regional and national economies, diversity economic activity, encourage enterprise and support industrial excellence.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The need to maximize the contribution of the South Tees Area to the local and regional economy and to the achievement of sustainable development.
14. Land and Infrastructure: Optimise the efficient use of land and existing infrastructure and provide new or upgraded infrastructure to meet identified needs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The need to make best use of existing infrastructure and provide new/upgraded infrastructure to meet identified needs. The need to maximize resource efficiency, use natural resources sustainably and support the transition to a circular economy. The need to optimize the efficient use of available land.

2.3 SEA Framework

- 2.3.1 The key output from SEA scoping is the production of a SEA Framework, which is subsequently used to assess the performance of the emerging plan or programme. The SEA Framework for the SPD was developed by considering the following:
- The environmental topics prescribed within Annex 1 of the SEA Directive and Schedule 2 of the SEA Regulations;
 - The objectives of other relevant plans and programmes at local, national and international scales;
 - The environmental, social and economic characteristics of the South Tees Area and the surrounding environment (which includes a number of nationally and internationally designated sites);
 - Key environmental and wider sustainability issues identified as being relevant to the planned regeneration of the South Tees Area; and,
 - Responses received from the SEA Consultation Authorities regarding a draft SEA Framework which was set out within the SEA Screening and Scoping Report (PBA, November 2017).
- 2.3.2 The SEA Framework and methodology detailed within the South Tees Masterplan SPD SEA Screening and Scoping Report (PBA, 2017) was used to underpin the SEA process for the SPD. The Framework was subsequently subject to minor amendment throughout the SEA process to take account of feedback received from the SEA Consultation Bodies and ensure that it provided a robust basis upon which to assess the likely significant effects on the environment of the emerging SPD.
- 2.3.3 The final SEA Framework which was used to assess the emerging SPD, as reported within the South Tees Area SPD ER (PBA, March 2018), is provided in **Appendix A**.

2.4 SEA Reporting and Outputs

2.4.1 In line with statutory requirements, SEA has been undertaken, reported and consulted on at each stage in the preparation of the SPD. **Table 2.2** below outlines the main sustainability issues reported on at each stage of the SEA process.

Table 2:2 Iterations of SPD SEA Reports and Consultations

SEA Reporting	Consultation Period	Summary of Issues Considered
SEA Screening and Scoping Report (November 2017)	January 2018	This initial report identified the need to undertake a SEA of the SPD and set out a proposed SEA Framework to assess the likely environmental effects from all substantive components of the document. The SEA Framework comprises a series of sustainability objectives and guide questions regarding identified socio-economic and environmental issues of relevance to the South Tees Area and surrounding environment.
SEA and HRA Reviews of the Initial Draft South Tees Master Plan SPD (October 2017) and the Redrafted South Tees Area SPD (January 2018)	N/A	Two detailed reviews of the emerging SPD were undertaken by PBA on behalf of RCBC to identify any key issues of concern that could affect the conclusions of the SEA, i.e. components of the emerging SPD which could either result in significant adverse effects on the environment or otherwise undermine the implementation of the SPD as intended. The full suite of identified issues and corresponding SEA recommendations for changes to the emerging SPD were identified within the South Tees Area SPD ER (PBA, March 2018) and are detailed in Appendix B of this Statement.
SEA Environmental Report for the South Tees Area SPD Consultation Draft (March 2018)	26 th March – 22 nd April 2018	The South Tees Area SPD ER was produced in March 2018 to formally report the findings of the SEA undertaken in respect of the SPD. The assessment phase of the SEA involved systematically assessing all substantive components of the proposed Consultation Draft South Tees Area SPD (which evolved from the Initial Draft SPD and the Redrafted SPD, in part to respond to the previous SEA recommendations) to identify and assess their likely significant effects on the environment. This assessment was undertaken using the final SEA Framework (provided in Appendix A).

3 How SEA reporting has been taken into account in the SPD

3.1 Overview

- 3.1.1 Aside from complying with the requirements of the SEA Regulations, the main purpose of SEA reporting was to allow consultees, the public and decision makers (i.e. RCBC) to consider the likely impacts of the emerging SPD on relevant environmental issues (see **Table 2.1** above).

3.2 SEA Reporting

- 3.2.1 In line with statutory requirements, SEA has been undertaken, reported and consulted on at each stage in the preparation of the SPD. **Table 3.1** below outlines the main issues reported on at each stage of the SEA process.

Table 3.1: SEA Reporting for the South Tees Area SPD

SEA Reporting	Consultation Period	Summary of Issues Considered
SEA Screening and Scoping Report (November 2017)	January 2018	This initial report identified the need to undertake a SEA of the SPD and set out a proposed SEA Framework to assess the likely environmental effects from all substantive components of the document. The SEA Framework comprises a series of sustainability objectives and guide questions regarding identified socio-economic and environmental issues of relevance to the South Tees Area and surrounding environment.
SEA and HRA Reviews of the Initial Draft South Tees Master Plan SPD (October 2017) and the Redrafted South Tees Area SPD (January 2018)	N/A	Two detailed reviews of the emerging SPD were undertaken by PBA on behalf of RCBC to identify any key issues of concern that could affect the conclusions of the SEA or HRA, i.e. components of the emerging SPD which may either result in significant adverse effects on the environment, significant effects on European Sites or otherwise undermine the implementation of the SPD as intended. The full suite of identified issues and corresponding SEA recommendations for changes to the emerging SPD were identified within the South Tees Area SPD ER (PBA, March 2018) and are detailed in Appendix B of this Statement.
SEA Environmental Report for the South Tees Area SPD Consultation Draft (March 2018)	26 th March – 22 nd April 2018	The South Tees Area SPD ER was produced in March 2018 to formally report the findings of the SEA undertaken in respect of the SPD. The assessment phase of the SEA involved systematically assessing all substantive components of the proposed Consultation Draft South Tees Area SPD (which evolved from the Initial Draft SPD and the Redrafted SPD, in part to respond to the previous SEA recommendations) to identify and assess their likely significant effects on the

		environment. This assessment was undertaken using the final SEA Framework (provided in Appendix A).
Post Consultation Factual Update to South Tees Area SPD ER and HRA Report (May 2018)	N/A	This document was produced by PBA in response to representations submitted regarding the South Tees Area SPD and associated ER and HRA Report. The note responds to minor queries raised by the SEA Consultation Bodies and confirms that the minor changes which were proposed to the SPD prior to its adoption would not affect the conclusions or continued validity of the ER or HRA Report (i.e. no new or different likely significant effects would occur as a result of the changes).

3.3 SEA Assessment Matrices and Scoring

3.3.1 To ensure the SEA remained proportionate, a matrix based approach was adopted to identify and assess likely significant environmental effects from each substantive component of the Consultation Draft SPD, namely:

- Proposed SPD Vision and Objectives;
- Proposed Strategic Development Principles, applying to relevant development proposals across the STDC area; and,
- Proposed Site Specific Development Principles, applying to particular zones within the STDC area.

3.3.2 The SEA was reported using matrices to allow for the consistent identification of likely effects, uncertainties, key assumptions and recommended mitigation or enhancement measures. Supporting text within the SPD was not specifically assessed, as providing this text was consistent with relevant objectives and policies, it could not itself result in any likely significant effects. Inconsistencies between supporting text and some policies were however identified and rectified through the SEA process, thereby enhancing the effectiveness of the SPD overall.

3.3.3 A compatibility matrix and scoring system was developed to test the alignment of the SPD vision and objectives with the South Tees Area SEA Framework, whilst a detailed assessment matrix and associated scoring system was developed to identify likely significant effects from all proposed development principles. These scoring systems are outlined in **Tables 3.1** and **3.2** respectively.

Table 3.1 SEA Compatibility Assessment Scoring

Compatibility Description	Symbol
The assessed component is compatible with this SEA Objective	+
The assessed component would have a neutral effect on this SEA Objective	0
The assessed component would have an uncertain effect on this SEA Objective	?
The assessed component is incompatible with this SEA Objective and mitigation is therefore required to ensure the avoidance of likely significant adverse effects	-

There is no clear relationship between the assessed component and this SEA Objective.	~
---	---

Table 3.2 SEA Scoring System to Establish Likely Significant Effects from Proposed Development Principles

Score	Description	Symbol
Significant (Major) Positive Effect	The proposed development principle contributes significantly to the achievement of the SEA objective.	++
Minor Positive Effect	The proposed development principle contributes to the achievement of the SEA objective but not significantly.	+
Neutral Effect	The proposed development principle is related to but does not have any effect on the achievement of the SEA objective	0
Minor Negative Effect	The proposed development principle detracts from the achievement of the SEA objective but not significantly.	-
Significant (Major) Negative Effect	The proposed development principle detracts significantly from the achievement of the objective. Significant Adverse effect predicted; mitigation therefore required in accordance with the 2004 Regulations.	--
Uncertain Effect	The proposed development principle has an uncertain relationship to the SEA objective or the relationship is dependent on the way in which the aspect is managed. In addition, insufficient information may be available to enable an assessment to be made.	?
No Clear Relationship	There is no clear relationship between the proposed development principle and the achievement of the SEA objective or the relationship is negligible.	~

- 3.3.4 As detailed in **Section 3.4** below, mitigation and enhancement measures were identified to address all likely significant adverse effects, enhance the level of predicted beneficial effects and allow all components of the SPD to contribute positively to the achievement of the SEA Objectives wherever possible.

3.4 SEA Mitigation and Enhancement Recommendations

- 3.4.1 The identification of any assumptions and uncertainties is an important element of SEA, as all SPD components need to be unambiguous to ensure they can be implemented as intended. The assessment of each SPD component was initially undertaken on a pre-mitigation basis, which allowed any ambiguities and other weaknesses to be identified and appropriate mitigation or enhancement recommendations to be devised by the SEA project team to address such issues.

- 3.4.2 As noted in **Table 3.1**, PBA carried out two detailed SEA and HRA focused reviews of the emerging SPD. The first review was undertaken in respect of the Initial Draft South Tees Master Plan SPD, which was published for initial and informal consultation in October 2017, whilst the second review was undertaken in respect of a redrafted and retitled working draft South Tees Area SPD in January 2018. The key findings and recommendations from these reviews, as well as an overview of how the SPD evolved in response, are summarised in **Appendix B**. This clearly demonstrates that even prior to the preparation of the ER, the SEA process closely influenced and contributed to the enhancement of the SPD.
- 3.4.3 A draft ER was then prepared by PBA in March 2018 to identify and assess the likely significant effects on the environment of the then draft version of the Consultation Draft SPD. This ER contained a schedule of proposed mitigation and enhancement recommendations, detailed in **Appendix B**, to address identified uncertainties and enhance the environmental performance and clarity of the document. RCBC subsequently incorporated all but one of the recommendations into the SPD. A final version of the ER was then produced by PBA, with assessment conclusions updated where necessary to take account of the mitigation which had now been incorporated into the SPD and a section added to explain how the SEA recommendations from the draft ER had been actioned by RCBC. This demonstrates that the formal assessment phase of the SEA directly influenced the content of the SPD.
- 3.4.4 In summary, the iterative nature of the SEA process, the independence of the SEA project team and the advice provided throughout by the SEA Consultation Bodies has allowed the SEA to identify and address uncertainties and concerns, as well as to maximise opportunities for environmental enhancement, within the SPD as it evolved. The final adopted SPD directly responds to all relevant issues raised through the SEA process.

4 How the opinions raised during consultation have been taken into account

4.1 Overview

- 4.1.1 The SEA Regulations require the opinions expressed by consultees and the public regarding a SEA to be taken into account during the preparation of the SPD before its adoption. The Consultation Draft SPD was subject to public consultation in tandem with the South Tees Area SPD ER and HRA Report from 26th March – 22nd April 2018.

4.2 Consultation Opportunities

- 4.2.1 Two formal consultation exercises have been carried out as part of this SEA process:

- Consultation with the SEA Consultation Bodies regarding the South Tees Masterplan SEA Screening and Scoping Report (November 2017): November 2017 - January 2018
- Public consultation regarding the South Tees Area SPD ER (March 2018): 26th March – 22nd April 2018

- 4.2.2 **Section 4.3** below identifies how responses received in each of these consultations were taken account of.

4.3 Impact of SEA Related Consultation Responses on the SPD

SEA Screening and Scoping Report (2017)

- 4.3.1 The approach to the SEA and the emerging content of the SPD itself were amended to take account of responses received to the SEA Screening and Scoping Report from the SEA Consultation Bodies, as detailed in **Appendix C**. This demonstrates that even prior to the formal assessment phase and preparation of the ER, the SEA process closely influenced and contributed to the enhancement of the SPD.

SEA of the SPD Consultation Draft (March 2018)

- 4.3.2 The consultation on the SPD Consultation Draft and associated SEA Report was open between 26th March – 22nd April 2018. A total of 13 representations were submitted to RCBC, two of which included comments regarding the SEA Environmental Report. These were submitted by Natural England and Historic England.
- 4.3.3 The representation submitted by Historic England was supportive of the approach taken to the consideration of heritage matters within the ER and welcomed the SEA mitigation which has been incorporated into STDC Development Principle 8 – Preserving Industrial Heritage. No substantive changes to the ER were requested, although Historic England sought clarity regarding whether the listed South Gare Lighthouse is situated within the STDC area and requested consequential amendments to STDC Development Principle 15 – Coastal Community Zone. Historic England also requested that all designated heritage assets within the proximity of the STDC area be identified. In response, a factual update note was produced by PBA to confirm that the Grade II listed South Gare Lighthouse is the only designated heritage asset within the STDC area and is located at its northern most tip.
- 4.3.4 The representation submitted by Natural England was similarly supportive of the SEA carried out in respect of the Draft SPD. This representation requested minor clarifications to the SPD but did not seek any substantive changes that would affect the conclusions or continued validity of the South Tees Area SPD ER.

5 Reasons for choosing the SPD as adopted, in light of other alternatives dealt with

5.1 Overview

- 5.1.1 In accordance with the SEA Regulations, the SEA undertaken in respect of the SPD considered the likely effects from both the preferred approach and all reasonable alternatives which could be identified at each stage of the SPD's development. This section provides an overview of the preferred approach and the reasonable alternatives that were considered.

5.2 Reasonable Alternatives Considered

- 5.2.1 The development principles set out within the SPD relate to and derive their soundness from the SPD Vision and Objectives set out in Section 2 of the SPD, which in turn derive their soundness from relevant policies within the higher level RCLP. As such, each component of the SPD is intended to fulfil a specific role in terms of guiding the siting and design of development proposals, realising industrial led regeneration across the STDC area and implementing policy requirements.
- 5.2.2 It was therefore not possible to identify clear reasonable alternatives to individual components of the SPD in order for these to also be assessed within the SEA. Instead, a suite of high level alternative redevelopment scenarios for the STDC area, and associated potential variations in the content of the SPD were identified and assessed, as detailed in **Table 5.1** below. None of these reasonable alternatives were taken forward as, compared with the comprehensive regeneration strategy detailed within the final SPD, each alternative would make a lower contribution to the achievement of the vision and objectives which have been identified for the STDC area.

Table 5:1 Assessment of Alternative Redevelopment Scenarios

Alternative Redevelopment Scenario	Assessment
Scenario 1: Industrial led development with no changes to existing infrastructure.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Under this redevelopment scenario, industrial led regeneration would be limited to making best use of existing infrastructure previously designed for steelmaking and ironmaking industries. As such, the redevelopment scenario would likely fail to achieve economic diversification and in the light of SSI's demise it is not certain that similar heavy industries to previous steelmaking at the site would be viable in the long term. The absence of new or upgraded infrastructure provision would constraint new employment generating uses on the site and could lead to congestion on the limited number of access routes which presently serve the site. More limited disturbance to sensitive environmental receptors during construction works and from subsequent industrial operations may however result compared with the proposed redevelopment strategy.
Scenario 2: Non-strategic / general employment led development with no changes to existing infrastructure.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Under this redevelopment scenario, industrial led regeneration would be limited to making best use of existing infrastructure previously designed for steelmaking and ironmaking industries, so it is not clear how more general employment generating uses could be successfully implemented. The absence of new or upgraded infrastructure provision would constraint new employment generating uses on the site and could lead to congestion on the limited number of access routes which presently serve the site. More limited disturbance to sensitive environmental receptors during construction works and from subsequent industrial operations may however result compared with the proposed redevelopment strategy.
Scenario 3: Mixed use development with no changes to existing infrastructure.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Under this redevelopment scenario, mixed use development would be limited to making best use of existing infrastructure previously designed for steelmaking and ironmaking industries. This would not be suited to supporting mixed use development; in particular, it is not clear how more general light industrial or commercial employment generating uses could be successfully implemented or how residential development uses could be safely accommodated alongside the heavy industrial infrastructure which dominates the STDC area. The absence of new or upgraded infrastructure provision would constraint new employment generating uses and residential development on the site and could lead to congestion on the limited number of access routes which presently serve the site. More limited disturbance to sensitive environmental receptors during construction works and from subsequent industrial operations may however result compared with the proposed redevelopment strategy.
Scenario 4: Non-strategic / general employment led development with upgraded infrastructure.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Under this redevelopment scenario, whilst new employment uses are likely to be generated and could be supported by new transport infrastructure, this would be at the expense of existing industrial infrastructure which would become unviable and outdated. As such the STDC area would lose one of its most competitive advantages in attempting to secure inward investment, i.e. strategic industrial infrastructure. Therefore, this scenario would undermine the role of Teesside as a regionally and nationally important industrial centre and a centre of excellence for manufacturing and process industries. The scenario would however align with the objective of securing economic diversification. The provision of new transport infrastructure and development of new employment generating uses would be likely to generate similar construction stage impacts on sensitive environmental receptors as under the proposed redevelopment scenario. Operational stage environmental effects would depend upon the proposed type of employment generating uses, which cannot be predicted.

<p>Scenario 5: Mixed use development with upgraded infrastructure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Under this redevelopment scenario, some new employment uses are likely to be generated and could be supported by new transport infrastructure, as well as residential development which could increase population levels and alter the local demographic profile. However, this would be at the expense of existing industrial infrastructure which would become unviable and outdated, and it would also not maximise the creation of employment within the STDC area. As such the STDC area would lose one of its most competitive advantages in attempting to secure inward investment, i.e. strategic industrial infrastructure. Therefore, this scenario would undermine the role of Teesside as a regionally and nationally important industrial centre and a centre of excellence for manufacturing and process industries. The scenario would however align with the objective of securing economic diversification.• The provision of new transport infrastructure and development of new employment generating uses would be likely to generate similar construction stage impacts on sensitive environmental receptors as under the proposed redevelopment scenario. Operational stage environmental effects would depend upon the proposed type of employment generating uses and the scale of residential development, which cannot be predicted.
--	---

5.3 Rationale for adoption of the SPD as prepared

- 5.3.1 RCBC formally adopted the SPD on 24th May 2018 in tandem with the formal adoption of the RCLP. The rationale for the adoption of the SPD as prepared was that, having undertaken statutory SEA and HRA processes and held public consultations, the final SPD both appropriately responds to the need to provide a framework for the comprehensive regeneration of the STDC area and directly responds to all relevant issues raised by stakeholders.
- 5.3.2 As explained in **Section 3.4**, the iterative nature of the SEA process adopted, the independence of the SEA project team and the advice provided by the SEA Consultation Bodies has allowed the SEA to identify and address uncertainties and concerns, as well as to maximise opportunities for environmental enhancement, within the SPD. In consequence, the ER prepared in respect of the Consultation Draft SPD demonstrates that the SPD is not likely to result in any significant adverse effects on the environment, whilst a number of beneficial significant effects are considered likely. A Post Consultation Factual Update Note (PBA, May 2018) confirms that the minor changes which were proposed by RCBC to the SPD prior to its adoption would not affect the conclusions of the ER. As such, the adoption of the SPD as prepared is considered likely to have significant beneficial effects and not likely to have any significant adverse effects on the environment.

6 South Tees Area SPD Monitoring Framework

6.1 Monitoring Requirements

- 6.1.1 The SEA Regulations require arrangements to be in place to monitor the likely significant effects of the implementation all plans and programmes which are subject to SEA. The Regulations further required these arrangements to be described within this SEA Post Adoption Statement. Monitoring is also required to confirm that the approach set out in the SPD continues to be effective and to determine when the SPD should be reviewed, especially given that the comprehensive regeneration of the STDC area will be ongoing for at least 20-25 years.

6.2 SPD Monitoring Framework

- 6.2.1 In response to the monitoring requirements set out above, RCBC, acting in partnership with the STDC, has developed a monitoring framework for the SPD, as detailed in **Table 6.1** below. This framework:
- Identifies the likely significant effects which have been predicted through the SEA and HRA to arise from the implementation of the SPD;
 - Defines the key target(s) or outcome which each component of the SPD seeks to achieve;
 - Sets out indicators to monitor whether the environmental effects which have been predicted through the SEA and HRA actually occur. This monitoring framework should be used to determine whether the SPD is being implemented as intended or if any changes are required as the regeneration of the STDC area evolves; and,
 - Links the suite of thematic strategies which have been proposed in the SPD to relevant components of the SPD from which significant effects on the environment are considered likely. It will be essential for the thematic strategies to take account of the SEA findings and to avoid generating any new likely significant adverse effects on the environment.
- 6.2.2 The monitoring framework includes key metrics such as job creation together with qualitative guide questions which RCBC should use to periodically review the SPD and should report against regularly, whether as part of Annual Monitoring Reports for the adopted RCLP or as a standalone exercise. The selected indicators and guide questions relate to substantive requirements or objectives within individual SPD components, including requirements under certain Development Principles for development proposals to be supported by particular evidence (e.g. to demonstrate the avoidance of unacceptable environmental or amenity effects).
- 6.2.3 In addition to monitoring the likely significant environmental effects of the implementation of the SPD, the monitoring framework provided in **Table 6.1** will serve as the main mechanism for ensuring that the preparation of the thematic strategies referred to in the SPD align with the substantive requirements of the SPD and contribute positively to the SEA Objectives detailed within the South Tees Area SEA Framework (**Appendix A**).

Table 6.1: South Tees Area SPD Monitoring Framework

SPD Component	Likely Significant Effects (as predicted in the South Tees Area SPD ER, March 2018)	Target / Outcome	Monitoring Indicators	Linked Thematic Strategies
Vision and Objectives	<p>Range of potential significant beneficial effects, in particular from SPD Objective 8 which sets a framework for pollution reduction and environmental enhancement across the STDC area:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SEA Objective 1 - Biodiversity and Geodiversity SEA Objective 2 – Placemaking SEA Objective 3 - Air Quality SEA Objective 4 – Water SEA Objective 5 – Energy and Climate Change SEA Objective 6 – Flood Risk and Resilience SEA Objective 9 – Environmental Quality 	<p>The SPD Vision seeks the comprehensive regeneration of the STDC area encompassing land remediation, pollution reduction, creation of up to 20,000 jobs, development of a modern industrial park focused on manufacturing innovation and advanced technologies, environmental enhancements and community benefits.</p>	<p><u>Key Metrics:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extent of unremediated or remediated land (suitable for future intended use) Number of direct jobs and businesses created by sector within the STDC area. Contribution of the STDC area to the regional (Tees Valley) and national economy. Opportunities provided for local education, training and skills improvements. Funding and implementation of new or upgraded infrastructure to serve the STDC area. Air quality measurements (including NO2 and PM10) across the STDC area. Funding and implementation of environmental enhancements. <p><u>Influence on regeneration proposals and investment:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the implementation of the SPD Vision is positively influencing inward investment decisions. Does the SPD Vision align with the regeneration strategy being pursued by the STDC? Do planning applications explain how they contribute to the SPD Vision? <p><u>Influence on RCBC planning decisions:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do reports of handling (RoH) assess the contribution of development proposals to the SPD Vision? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environment and Biodiversity Strategy Open Space Strategy Water and Flood Risk Management Strategy Energy Strategy Ground Remediation Strategy General Utilities and Industrial Utilities Strategies Materials and Waste Management Strategy Transport Strategy Port Facilities and Logistics Strategy Demolition and Salvage Strategy

SPD Component	Likely Significant Effects (as predicted in the South Tees Area SPD ER, March 2018)	Target / Outcome	Monitoring Indicators	Linked Thematic Strategies
Development Principle STDC1: Regeneration Priorities	<p>Likely significant beneficial effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SEA Objective 1 - Biodiversity and Geodiversity SEA Objective 2 – Placemaking SEA Objective 3 - Air Quality SEA Objective 6 – Flood Risk and Resilience SEA Objective 7 – Materials and Waste SEA Objective 8 – Community SEA Objective 9 – Environmental Quality SEA Objective 10 – Health, Wellbeing and Safety SEA Objective 11 - Transport SEA Objective 12 – Employment SEA Objective 13 – Economic Growth and Industrial Excellence SEA Objective 14 – Land and Infrastructure <p>No likely significant adverse effects</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Co-ordinated and collaborative approach to economic development, co-location and inward investment Generate high skilled employment opportunities and a broad range of new jobs within the STDC area Catalyse job creation across the Tees Valley Expansion of port facilities and new port related development Deliver redevelopment with reduced energy costs and waste minimisation Develop low carbon and circular economy uses Prioritise uses connected to advanced manufacturing and technologies Improve connectivity, develop strategic access points and improve active travel links Strengthen connections to Redcar and surrounding area Co-location of compatible uses Contribute to sustainable flood risk management Contribute to habitat protection and encourage biodiversity Major contribution to education and skills Make best use of available land and infrastructure Development of open space as a connector Provide high quality public realm and buildings Protect heritage assets and the historic environment Protect and enhance landscape character 	<p><u>Key Metrics:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of direct jobs and businesses created by sector within the STDC area. Contribution of the STDC area to the regional (Tees Valley) and national economy. Opportunities provided for local education, training and skills improvements. Funding and implementation of new or upgraded infrastructure to serve the STDC area. Funding and implementation of environmental enhancements. <p><u>Influence on regeneration proposals and investment:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do planning applications explain how they align with or contribute to relevant objectives within this Development Principle? Is there sufficient evidence of co-ordination and collaboration to deliver economic development, co-location and inward investment? Are redevelopment proposals focused on advanced manufacturing and technologies, and are they aligned with low carbon and circular economy priorities? Are improvements in connectivity and expanded port activities being realised? Are environmental enhancements (including remediation) and public realm improvements adequately and timeously being delivered? <p><u>Influence on RCBC planning decisions:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do RoH assess the alignment of development proposals with relevant objectives within this Development Principle? Do RoH assess employment impacts within the STDC area and for the Tees Valley? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environment and Biodiversity Strategy Open Space Strategy Water and Flood Risk Management Strategy Ground Remediation Strategy General Utilities and Industrial Utilities Strategies Materials and Waste Management Strategy Transport Strategy Port Facilities and Logistics Strategy Demolition and Salvage Strategy

SPD Component	Likely Significant Effects (as predicted in the South Tees Area SPD ER, March 2018)	Target / Outcome	Monitoring Indicators	Linked Thematic Strategies
Development Principle STDC2: Land Assembly and Delivery	<p>Likely significant beneficial effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SEA Objective 12 – Employment SEA Objective 13 – Economic Growth and Industrial Excellence SEA Objective 14 – Land and Infrastructure <p>No likely significant adverse effects</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assembly of disconnected land ownerships to create integrated large development zones (to unlock their remediation and redevelopment potential). Avoidance of development restricting future phases of regeneration/redevelopment. 	<p><u>Key Metrics:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number and size of vacant and derelict land holdings. Land transactions within the STDC area: number of voluntary or negotiated sales or use of compulsory purchase orders. Land quality: areas (ha) of land unremediated or remediated. Number of new businesses / investors within the STDC area. <p><u>Influence on regeneration proposals and investment:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do planning applications explain how they align with this Development Principle, especially with regards to avoiding restrictions on future redevelopment? Changes in the capability of land holdings to accommodate known and expected market demands. Evidence of changes in investor interest and the nature of redevelopment proposals as land assembly occurs. <p><u>Influence on RCBC planning decisions:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do RoH assess the alignment of development proposals with this Development Principle, especially with regards to avoiding restrictions on future redevelopment? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ground Remediation Strategy General Utilities and Industrial Utilities Strategies Port Facilities and Logistics Strategy

SPD Component	Likely Significant Effects (as predicted in the South Tees Area SPD ER, March 2018)	Target / Outcome	Monitoring Indicators	Linked Thematic Strategies
Development Principle STDC3: Phasing Strategy	<p>Likely significant beneficial effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SEA Objective 9 – Environmental Quality SEA Objective 12 – Employment SEA Objective 13 – Economic Growth and Industrial Excellence SEA Objective 14 – Land and Infrastructure <p>No likely significant adverse effects</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Direct development proposals to suitable locations depending on their land use and operational requirements. Co-location of suitable uses. Early redevelopment in areas not requiring extensive remediation, demolition or remediation. Estimated delivery timescales as per <i>Summary of Expected Development Programme</i> (SPD page 22): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Land assembly by 2020; - Site preparation and infrastructure largely complete by 2035; - Redevelopment largely complete by 2042; - Initial focus on South Zone. 	<p><u>Key Metrics:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Delivery of land assembly, remediation, infrastructure and redevelopment in relation to the Summary of Expected Development Programme (SPD page 22). Extent of remediation occurring as part of redevelopment projects. <p><u>Influence on regeneration proposals and investment:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do planning applications explain how they align with this Development Principle, especially with regards to co-location and the preferred phasing of redevelopment? Do planning applications provide cumulative impact assessments which take account of existing and approved development within the STDC area? Evidence of co-location and synergies between inward investment decisions. <p><u>Influence on RCBC planning decisions:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do RoH assess the alignment of development proposals with this Development Principle, especially with regards to co-location and the preferred phasing of development? Do RoH assess cumulative impacts from redevelopment proposals, taking account of existing and approved development within the STDC area? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ground Remediation Strategy General Utilities and Industrial Utilities Strategies Port Facilities and Logistics Strategy Demolition and Salvage Strategy

SPD Component	Likely Significant Effects (as predicted in the South Tees Area SPD ER, March 2018)	Target / Outcome	Monitoring Indicators	Linked Thematic Strategies
Development Principle STDC4: Economic Development Strategy	<p>Likely significant beneficial effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SEA Objective 12 – Employment SEA Objective 13 – Economic Growth and Industrial Excellence SEA Objective 14 – Land and Infrastructure <p>No likely significant adverse effects</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prioritise economic development proposals for specialist industries, in particular uses connected to advanced manufacturing and technologies. Industrial led regeneration in accordance with RCLP policies LS4 and ED6. Promote a potential Free Trade Zone within the STDC area. Secure appropriate developer contributions, including for infrastructure, local employment and training. 	<p><u>Key Metrics:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of direct jobs and businesses created by sector within the STDC area. Contribution of the STDC area to the regional (Tees Valley) and national economy. Amount, timing and purpose of developer contributions secured. <p><u>Influence on regeneration proposals and investment:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Progress towards implementing a Free Trade Zone within the STDC area Do planning applications explain how they align with this Development Principle, especially in terms of prioritising specialist industries and uses connected to advanced manufacturing and technologies? Do planning applications address the need for appropriate developer contributions? <p><u>Influence on RCBC planning decisions:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are proposals for specialist uses, advanced manufacturing and technologies coming forward and being consented, or is there any impediment to this? Do RoH assess the alignment of development proposals with this Development Principle, especially with regards to prioritising specialist industries and uses connected to advanced manufacturing and technologies? Do RoH address the need for appropriate developer contributions? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Energy Strategy Ground Remediation Strategy General Utilities and Industrial Utilities Strategies Materials and Waste Management Strategy Port Facilities and Logistics Strategy

SPD Component	Likely Significant Effects (as predicted in the South Tees Area SPD ER, March 2018)	Target / Outcome	Monitoring Indicators	Linked Thematic Strategies
Development Principle STDC5: Transport Infrastructure	<p>Likely significant beneficial effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SEA Objective 2 – Placemaking SEA Objective 10 – Health, Wellbeing and Safety SEA Objective 11 – Transport SEA Objective 12 – Employment SEA Objective 13 – Economic Growth and Industrial Excellence SEA Objective 14 – Land and Infrastructure <p>No likely significant adverse effects</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improve and enhance the transport network serving the STDC area. Safeguard and develop an Infrastructure Corridor. Improve external connectivity. Delivery of individual road, rail, port and footpath/cycle infrastructure proposals as identified within this Development Principle. Ensure transport infrastructure upgrades avoid unacceptable adverse environmental or amenity effects. 	<p><u>Key Metrics:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Usage and capacity of existing transport infrastructure within the STDC area by mode. Funding and implementation of the identified transport infrastructure proposals. Progress towards the implementation of an Infrastructure Corridor. <p><u>Influence on regeneration proposals and investment:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do planning applications explain how they align with this Development Principle? Do planning/consenting applications for the identified transport infrastructure proposals explain their need? Do planning/consenting applications for the identified transport infrastructure proposals address the acceptability of predicted environmental or amenity impacts? Is there evidence that the regeneration of the STDC area is still constrained by the transport network? <p><u>Influence on RCBC planning decisions:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What action has been taken to realise the implementation of the identified transport infrastructure proposals and the Infrastructure Corridor? Do RoH assess the alignment of development proposals with this Development Principle, including in terms of improving connectivity and safeguarding and implementing the Infrastructure Corridor? Do RoH regarding the identified transport infrastructure proposals assess their need and the acceptability of any likely environmental or amenity impacts? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environment and Biodiversity Strategy Open Space Strategy Transport Strategy Port Facilities and Logistics Strategy

SPD Component	Likely Significant Effects (as predicted in the South Tees Area SPD ER, March 2018)	Target / Outcome	Monitoring Indicators	Linked Thematic Strategies
Development Principle STDC6: Energy Innovation	<p>Likely significant beneficial effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SEA Objective 5 – Energy and Climate Change <p>No likely significant adverse effects</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop new energy generation facilities, including renewables and innovative projects. Ensure new energy generation is appropriately sited and avoids unacceptable adverse environmental or amenity effects. 	<p><u>Key Metrics:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> MW of energy generation capacity per technology type consented or delivered within the STDC area. Energy balance: total MW of energy generation capacity consented or delivered versus demand within the STDC area. MW of renewable and low carbon energy generation capacity either proposed, consented or delivered within the STDC area. <p><u>Influence on regeneration proposals and investment:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do planning applications explain how they align with this Development Principle, especially with regards to how the energy requirements of the proposal will be met? Do planning applications for energy generation proposals explain their proposed siting and address the acceptability of predicted environmental or amenity impacts? <p><u>Influence on RCBC planning decisions:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do RoH assess the alignment of development proposals with this Development Principle, including in terms of how the energy requirements of the proposal will be met? Do RoH regarding energy generation proposals address their need, siting and the acceptability of any likely environmental or amenity impacts? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environment and Biodiversity Strategy Energy Strategy General Utilities and Industrial Utilities Strategies

SPD Component	Likely Significant Effects (as predicted in the South Tees Area SPD ER, March 2018)	Target / Outcome	Monitoring Indicators	Linked Thematic Strategies
Development Principle STDC7: Environmental Protection and Enhancement	<p>Likely significant beneficial effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SEA Objective 1 – Biodiversity and Geodiversity SEA Objective 2 – Placemaking SEA Objective 4 – Water SEA Objective 9 – Environmental Quality <p>No likely significant adverse effects</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Net environmental gain where appropriate and viable Protect and where appropriate enhance designated and non-designated sites of biodiversity and geodiversity value. Remediation of contaminated land and reduction of environmental harm. Achieve redevelopment that responds appropriately to its environmental setting. Green infrastructure provision in accordance with RCLP Policy N2. Safeguard the Teesmouth and Cleveland Coast Special Protection Area, including through implementation of the RCLP Recreation Management Plan in accordance with RCLP Policy N4. 	<p><u>Key Metrics:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of proposals subject to EIA or HRA (excluding Appropriate Assessment) and their consenting outcome. Number of proposals requiring an Appropriate Assessment and their consenting outcome. Contribution of proposals to the implementation of the RCLP Recreation Management Plan. Funding and implementation of green infrastructure and open space projects. Land quality: areas (ha) of land unremediated or remediated. Air quality measurements (including NO2 and PM10) across the STDC area. Evidence of changes in environmental harm sources and receptors within the STDC area. <p><u>Influence on regeneration proposals and investment:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are environmental enhancements (including remediation), green infrastructure provision and open space projects adequately and timeously being delivered? Do planning applications explain how they align with this Development Principle, especially with regards to protecting designated sites/protected species and demonstrating net environmental gain? <p><u>Influence on RCBC planning decisions:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do RoH assess the alignment of development proposals with this Development Principle, especially with regards to delivering land remediation, protecting designated sites/protected species and demonstrating net environmental gain? Do RoH consider whether the RCLP Recreation Management Plan is engaged by proposals? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environment and Biodiversity Strategy Open Space Strategy Water and Flood Risk Management Strategy Ground Remediation Strategy Demolition and Salvage Strategy

SPD Component	Likely Significant Effects (as predicted in the South Tees Area SPD ER, March 2018)	Target / Outcome	Monitoring Indicators	Linked Thematic Strategies
Development Principle STDC8: Preserving Industrial Heritage	<p>Likely significant beneficial effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SEA Objective 2 – Placemaking <p>No likely significant adverse effects</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify industrial heritage assets for retention Develop industrial heritage trail. Avoid unacceptable harm to retained heritage assets and their setting. 	<p><u>Key Metrics:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number, condition and use of retained heritage assets within the STDC area. Funding and implementation of industrial heritage trail. <p><u>Influence on regeneration proposals and investment:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do planning applications explain how they align with this Development Principle, especially with regards to the acceptability of any predicted impacts on heritage assets? <p><u>Influence on RCBC planning decisions:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has RCBC identified industrial heritage assets for retention? Do RoH assess the alignment of development proposals with this Development Principle, especially with regards to addressing the acceptability of predicted impacts on heritage assets? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environment and Biodiversity Strategy Open Space Strategy Demolition and Salvage Strategy
Development Principle STDC9: Site Remediation	<p>Likely significant beneficial effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SEA Objective 4 – Water SEA Objective 9 – Environmental Quality SEA Objective 10 – Health, Wellbeing and Safety <p>No likely significant adverse effects</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Achieve proportionate and risk-based remediation of contaminated land across the STDC area. Where appropriate, provide environmental betterment through remediation. Short term use of Landfill Zone to support remediation and redevelopment on other parts of the STDC area. Ensure remediation protects the Teesmouth and Cleveland Coast Special Protection Area in accordance with RCLP Policy N4. Ensure remediation avoids unacceptable impacts on water quality and the water environment. 	<p><u>Key Metrics:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land quality: areas (ha) of land unremediated or remediated. Type of remediation techniques deployed across the STDC area. Ecological, chemical and WFD status of watercourses within and waterbodies adjacent to the STDC area. <p><u>Influence on regeneration proposals and investment:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is remediation mainly delivered through redevelopment or on a standalone basis? Do planning applications explain how they align with this Development Principle, especially with regards to delivering remediation and making land suitable for future intended uses? <p><u>Influence on RCBC planning decisions:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do RoH assess the alignment of development proposals with this Development Principle, especially with regards to delivering remediation and making land suitable for future intended use? Do RoH regarding remediation proposals address their need and the acceptability of any likely environmental (including water quality) or amenity impacts? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environment and Biodiversity Strategy Water and Flood Risk Management Strategy Ground Remediation Strategy General Utilities and Industrial Utilities Strategies Materials and Waste Management Strategy Transport Strategy Port Facilities and Logistics Strategy Demolition and Salvage Strategy

SPD Component	Likely Significant Effects (as predicted in the South Tees Area SPD ER, March 2018)	Target / Outcome	Monitoring Indicators	Linked Thematic Strategies
Development Principle STDC10: Utilities	<p>Likely significant beneficial effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SEA Objective 4 – Water SEA Objective 6 – Flood Risk and Resilience SEA Objective 7 – Materials and Waste SEA Objective 11 - Transport SEA Objective 12 – Employment SEA Objective 13 – Economic Growth and Industrial Excellence SEA Objective 14 – Land and Infrastructure <p>No likely significant adverse effects</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provision of adequate utilities and associated infrastructure to support redevelopment and accommodate new uses. Safeguarding of existing and permitted utilities infrastructure. Infrastructure upgrades to implement site wide Water and Flood Risk Management, Materials and Waste Management, Energy and General and Industrial Utilities Strategies. Biodiversity and landscape enhancement through flood risk management and water infrastructure proposals. Implementation of the waste hierarchy, including waste minimisation, in all development proposals (supported by waste audits). Delivery of energy infrastructure proposals as identified within this Development Principle. 	<p><u>Key Metrics:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Funding and implementation of infrastructure upgrades to implement site wide Water and Flood Risk Management, Materials and Waste Management, Energy and General and Industrial Utilities Strategies. Funding and implementation of flood risk management proposals (and associated biodiversity and landscape enhancements). Type, capacity and spatial extent of proposed, consented or operational utilities infrastructure within the STDC area. Utilities requirements of proposed, consented or operational developments within the STDC area. Waste tonnage generated within the STDC area by business sector that is re-used, recycled, recovered or landfilled. Waste tonnage exported from the STDC area. <p><u>Influence on regeneration proposals and investment:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are biodiversity and landscape enhancements adequately and timeously being delivered through flood risk management and water infrastructure projects? Do planning applications explain how they align with this Development Principle, especially with regards to making the best use of utilities infrastructure, minimising waste generation and supporting sustainable flood risk management? Are planning applications supported by a waste audit? <p><u>Influence on RCBC planning decisions:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do RoH assess the alignment of development proposals with this Development Principle, especially with regards to making the best use of utilities infrastructure, minimising waste generation and supporting sustainable flood risk management? Do RoH assess the waste audits submitted in support of planning applications? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environment and Biodiversity Strategy Water and Flood Risk Management Energy Strategy General Utilities and Industrial Utilities Strategies Materials and Waste Management Strategy

SPD Component	Likely Significant Effects (as predicted in the South Tees Area SPD ER, March 2018)	Target / Outcome	Monitoring Indicators	Linked Thematic Strategies
Site Specific Development Principle STDC11: North Development Zone	<p>Likely significant beneficial effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SEA Objective 5 – Energy and Climate Change SEA Objective 6 – Flood Risk and Resilience SEA Objective 9 – Environmental Quality SEA Objective 12 – Employment SEA Objective 13 – Economic Growth and Industrial Excellence SEA Objective 14 – Land and Infrastructure <p>No likely significant adverse effects</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prioritise redevelopment proposals relating to port related industry, major space users/large scale manufacturing, energy innovation, power generation and storage, bulk materials and mineral processing. Land assembly to maximise regeneration and development potential. Safeguarding and development of open space, recreation and heritage area. Protection of important environmental assets. Ensure land stability and avoid increased gas and leachate risks from redevelopment on the site of closed landfill operations. Redevelopment in accordance with RCLP and forthcoming Environment and Biodiversity, Open Space, Water and Flood Risk Management and Ground Remediation Strategies (as well as the other thematic strategies not specifically referenced in this Development Principle). 	<p><u>Key Metrics:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land transactions within the North Development Zone: number of voluntary or negotiated sales or use of compulsory purchase orders. Number of direct jobs and businesses created by sector within the North Development Zone. Land quality: areas (ha) of land remediated, unremediated, vacant or derelict within the North Development Zone. Funding and implementation of open space, recreation and heritage area. Ecological and chemical status of waterbodies within or adjacent to the North Development Zone. <p><u>Influence on regeneration proposals and investment:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are open space, heritage and recreational improvements adequately and timeously being delivered? Have redevelopment proposals on the site of closed landfill operations adequately addressed gas and leachate risks? Do planning applications for proposals within the North Development Zone explain how they align with this Development Principle, especially in terms of prioritising the stated uses? Do planning applications for proposals within the North Development Zone address the acceptability of predicted environmental, heritage, amenity and safety impacts? <p><u>Influence on RCBC planning decisions:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do RoH for proposals within the North Development Zone assess the alignment of development proposals with this Development Principle, especially with regards to prioritising the stated uses? Do RoH for proposals within the North Development Zone assess the acceptability of predicted environmental, heritage, amenity and safety impacts? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environment and Biodiversity Strategy Open Space Strategy Water and Flood Risk Management Strategy Energy Strategy Ground Remediation Strategy General Utilities and Industrial Utilities Strategies Materials and Waste Management Strategy Transport Strategy Port Facilities and Logistics Strategy Demolition and Salvage Strategy

SPD Component	Likely Significant Effects (as predicted in the South Tees Area SPD ER, March 2018)	Target / Outcome	Monitoring Indicators	Linked Thematic Strategies
Site Specific Development Principle STDC12: North East Industrial Zone	<p>Likely significant beneficial effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SEA Objective 3 - Air Quality SEA Objective 6 – Flood Risk and Resilience SEA Objective 7 – Materials and Waste SEA Objective 9 – Environmental Quality SEA Objective 12 – Employment SEA Objective 13 – Economic Growth and Industrial Excellence SEA Objective 14 – Land and Infrastructure <p>No likely significant adverse effects</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prioritise redevelopment proposals relating to advanced manufacturing, research and development, testing and laboratory services and industrial and technology training. Avoid landfill gas or contamination migration. Protection of important environmental assets. Ensure land stability and avoid increased gas and leachate risks from redevelopment on the site of closed landfill operations. Redevelopment in accordance with RCLP and forthcoming Environment and Biodiversity, Water and Flood Risk Management, Materials and Waste Management and Ground Remediation Strategies (as well as the other thematic strategies not specifically referenced in this Development Principle). 	<p><u>Key Metrics:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of direct jobs and businesses created by sector within the North East Industrial Zone. Land quality: areas (ha) of land remediated, unremediated, vacant or derelict within the North East Industrial Zone. Ecological and chemical status of waterbodies within or adjacent to the North East Industrial Zone. <p><u>Influence on regeneration proposals and investment:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Have redevelopment proposals on the site of closed landfill operations adequately addressed gas and leachate risks? Do planning applications for proposals within the North East Industrial Zone explain how they align with this Development Principle, especially in terms of prioritising the stated uses? Do planning applications for proposals within the North East Industrial Zone address the acceptability of predicted environmental, heritage, amenity and safety impacts? <p><u>Influence on RCBC planning decisions:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do RoH for proposals within the North East Industrial Zone assess the alignment of development proposals with this Development Principle, especially with regards to prioritising the stated uses? Do RoH for proposals within the North East Industrial Zone assess the acceptability of predicted environmental, heritage, amenity and safety impacts? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environment and Biodiversity Strategy Open Space Strategy Water and Flood Risk Management Strategy Energy Strategy Ground Remediation Strategy General Utilities and Industrial Utilities Strategies Materials and Waste Management Strategy Transport Strategy Demolition and Salvage Strategy

SPD Component	Likely Significant Effects (as predicted in the South Tees Area SPD ER, March 2018)	Target / Outcome	Monitoring Indicators	Linked Thematic Strategies
Site Specific Development Principle STDC13: Central Industrial Zone	<p>Likely significant beneficial effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SEA Objective 6 – Flood Risk and Resilience SEA Objective 11 - Transport SEA Objective 12 – Employment SEA Objective 13 – Economic Growth and Industrial Excellence SEA Objective 14 – Land and Infrastructure <p>No likely significant adverse effects</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prioritise redevelopment proposals relating to the rail industry or requiring a location with direct access to rail infrastructure, large equipment manufacturing and repair, metals related industries and fabrication and assembly. 	<p><u>Key Metrics:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Usage and capacity of rail infrastructure within the STDC area overall and within the Central Industrial Zone. Number of direct jobs and businesses created by sector within the Central Industrial Zone. <p><u>Influence on regeneration proposals and investment:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do planning applications for proposals within the Central Industrial Zone explain how they align with this Development Principle, especially in terms of focusing rail related proposals within this Zone? <p><u>Influence on RCBC planning decisions:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do RoH for proposals within the Central Industrial Zone assess the alignment of development proposals with this Development Principle, especially with regards to focusing rail related proposals within this Zone? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environment and Biodiversity Strategy Open Space Strategy Water and Flood Risk Management Strategy Ground Remediation Strategy General Utilities and Industrial Utilities Strategies Transport Strategy Port Facilities and Logistics Strategy

SPD Component	Likely Significant Effects (as predicted in the South Tees Area SPD ER, March 2018)	Target / Outcome	Monitoring Indicators	Linked Thematic Strategies
Site Specific Development Principle STDC14: South Industrial Zone	<p>Likely significant beneficial effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SEA Objective 3 - Air Quality SEA Objective 5 – Energy and Climate Change SEA Objective 6 – Flood Risk and Resilience SEA Objective 9 – Environmental Quality SEA Objective 12 – Employment SEA Objective 13 – Economic Growth and Industrial Excellence SEA Objective 14 – Land and Infrastructure <p>No likely significant adverse effects</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prioritise redevelopment proposals relating to port-related uses, including port-based fabrication, offshore energy industries, including manufacturing, materials processing and manufacturing, contract fabrication and energy generation and, potentially, rig and large equipment decommissioning Safeguarding and development of open space, recreation and heritage area. Avoid landfill gas migration. Ensure land stability and avoid increased gas and leachate risks from redevelopment on the site of closed landfill operations. Redevelopment in accordance with RCLP and forthcoming Environment and Biodiversity, Open Space, Water and Flood Risk Management and Ground Remediation Strategies (as well as the other thematic strategies not specifically referenced in this Development Principle). 	<p><u>Key Metrics:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of direct jobs and businesses created by sector within the South Industrial Zone. Land quality: areas (ha) of land remediated, unremediated, vacant or derelict within the South Industrial Zone. Ecological and chemical status of waterbodies within or adjacent to the South Industrial Zone. <p><u>Influence on regeneration proposals and investment:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are open space, heritage and recreational improvements adequately and timeously being delivered? Have redevelopment proposals on the site of closed landfill operations adequately addressed gas and leachate risks? Do planning applications for proposals within the South Industrial Zone explain how they align with this Development Principle, especially in terms of prioritising the stated uses? Do planning applications for proposals within the South Industrial Zone address the acceptability of predicted environmental, heritage, amenity and safety impacts? <p><u>Influence on RCBC planning decisions:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do RoH for proposals within the South Industrial Zone assess the alignment of development proposals with this Development Principle, especially with regards to prioritising the stated uses? Do RoH for proposals within the South Industrial Zone assess the acceptability of predicted environmental, heritage, amenity and safety impacts? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environment and Biodiversity Strategy Open Space Strategy Water and Flood Risk Management Strategy Energy Strategy Ground Remediation Strategy General Utilities and Industrial Utilities Strategies Materials and Waste Management Strategy Transport Strategy Port Facilities and Logistics Strategy Demolition and Salvage Strategy

SPD Component	Likely Significant Effects (as predicted in the South Tees Area SPD ER, March 2018)	Target / Outcome	Monitoring Indicators	Linked Thematic Strategies
Site Specific Development Principle STDC15: Coastal Community Zone	<p>Likely significant beneficial effects on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SEA Objective 2 – Placemaking SEA Objective 5 – Energy and Climate Change SEA Objective 6 – Flood Risk and Resilience SEA Objective 8 – Community SEA Objective 9 – Environmental Quality SEA Objective 10 – Health, Wellbeing and Safety SEA Objective 12 – Employment SEA Objective 13 – Economic Growth and Industrial Excellence SEA Objective 14 – Land and Infrastructure <p>No likely significant adverse effects</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prioritise redevelopment proposals relating to environmental enhancement, small-scale leisure and community uses and improved public access. The potential for renewable energy generation and energy storage will also be explored. Implementation of the RCLP Recreation Management Plan. Redevelopment in accordance with RCLP and forthcoming thematic strategies, in particular, with regard to the protection of heritage assets. 	<p><u>Key Metrics:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of direct jobs and businesses created by sector within the Coastal Community Zone. Land quality: areas (ha) of land remediated, unremediated, vacant or derelict within the Coastal Community Zone. Ecological and chemical status of waterbodies within or adjacent to the Coastal Community Zone. <p><u>Influence on regeneration proposals and investment:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are environmental enhancements, recreational facilities and open space, improvements adequately and timeously being delivered? Do planning applications for proposals within the Coastal Community Zone explain how they align with this Development Principle, especially in terms of prioritising the stated uses? Do planning applications for proposals within the Coastal Community Zone address the acceptability of predicted environmental, heritage, amenity and safety impacts? <p><u>Influence on RCBC planning decisions:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do RoH for proposals within the Coastal Community Zone assess the alignment of development proposals with this Development Principle, especially with regards to prioritising the stated uses? Do RoH for proposals within the Coastal Community Zone assess the acceptability of predicted environmental, heritage, amenity and safety impacts? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environment and Biodiversity Strategy Open Space Strategy Water and Flood Risk Management Strategy Energy Strategy Ground Remediation Strategy Transport Strategy

7 Conclusion

- 7.1.1 This Post Adoption Statement for the South Tees Area SPD has reported on the following details:
- How environmental considerations have been integrated into the SPD as adopted (**Section 2** of this Statement);
 - How the environmental report has been taken into account (**Section 3**);
 - How opinions expressed in response to:
 - i the invitation referred to in regulation 13(2)(d); and
 - ii action taken by the responsible authorities (RCBC and the STDC) in accordance with regulation 13(4), have been taken into account; (**Section 4**).
 - How the results of any consultations entered into under regulation 14(4) have been taken into account (**Section 4**);
 - The reasons for adopting the SPD as prepared, 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 effects of the implementation of the SPD as predicted within the ER (regulation 16) (**Section 6** of this Statement). This monitoring framework should be used to undertake periodic reviews of the SPD to ensure that the document functions effectively. In doing so, the monitoring framework should help to ensure that the significant beneficial environmental effects of the SPD which have been predicted through the SEA process materialise and that, in line with the conclusions of the ER, no significant adverse effects occur.
- 7.1.2 **Section 3.4** and **Appendix B** of this report demonstrate that the final SPD has been closely informed by the SEA and that all environmental issues and concerns identified through the SEA process have now been addressed. As per the findings of the ER which accompanied the Consultation Draft SPD, it can therefore be concluded that the SPD is likely to have significant beneficial effects on the environment and that no significant adverse effects are considered likely.

Appendix A SEA Framework

A.1.1 Table A.1 below sets out the SEA Framework which has underpinned the SEA of the SPD.

Table A.1 SPD SEA Framework

Proposed SEA Objective	Proposed SEA Guide Questions – <i>Will the SPD...</i>
<p>1. Biodiversity and Geodiversity: Conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and promote improvements to the green infrastructure network.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safeguard the integrity or conservation objectives of any site designated at international, national or local levels for reasons of biodiversity or geodiversity value or species protection? • Protect valued species or habitats, including but not limited to European Protected Species and their habitats? • Safeguard against habitat loss or fragmentation and will it conserve or enhance habitat connectivity? • Conserve or enhance protected trees or important woodland areas? • Improve access to nature? • Prevent spread or introduction of invasive non-native species? • Seek to enhance and achieve a net gain in biodiversity, wherever possible?
<p>2. Placemaking: Enhance design quality to create great places, protect and enhance key landscape features and historic assets, and safeguard industrial heritage.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promote high quality architecture and design which fosters a sense of place? • Create and maintain a safe and attractive public realm which encourages people to walk and cycle? • Ensure appropriate scale, massing and density of development? • Protect and enhance landscape character and key landscape features? • Conserve, protect or enhance heritage assets, including their setting? • Safeguard and celebrate industrial heritage?

<p>3. Air Quality: Prevent and reduce emissions and concentrations of harmful atmospheric pollutants and minimise exposure to poor air quality.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintain or improve local air quality? • Impact on areas with known poor air quality? • Prevent and reduce emissions and concentrations of harmful atmospheric pollutants?
<p>4. Water: Conserve, protect and enhance the water environment, water quality and water resources.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve the quality of waterbodies helping to meet the objectives of the Water Framework Directive? • Maintain or enhance the ecological status of the water environment? • Result in the release of water-borne pollution into watercourses or groundwater? • Affect the volume of surface water runoff into water bodies? • Support improvements where required to water infrastructure (water supply/sewerage)? • Maintain or enhance the ecological and chemical status of the water environment?
<p>5. Energy and Climate Change: Decouple industrial growth and economic prosperity from increased fossil fuel consumption and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure that industrial led regeneration does not reverse recent declines in GHG emissions from the STDC area? • Reduce GHG emissions from key sectors, including manufacturing and industrial processes? • Facilitate investment in and promote the use of low carbon and sustainable technologies, equipment and infrastructure?
<p>6. Flood Risk and Resilience: Reduce the risk of flooding, taking into account the effects of climate change, adaptation efforts and the need to enhance resilience.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimise the risk of flooding from all sources to all land, infrastructure, property and people? • Manage residual flood risks appropriately and avoid new flood risks? • Seek to minimise new development in areas prone to flood risk or mitigate the potential for such risk? • Promote sustainable urban drainage? • Increase resilience to major incidents?

<p>7. Materials and Waste: Contribute to the implementation of the circular economy, promote recycling and manage waste with minimal environmental impact.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promote the principles of circular economy? • Minimise the production of waste? • Treat and process waste in accordance with the principles of the waste hierarchy with minimal impact on the environment?
<p>8. Community: Reduce poverty and inequality, tackle social exclusion and promote community cohesion.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promote a culture of equality, fairness and respect for people and the environment? • Reduce poverty and social exclusion? • Improve educational attainment and skills levels, including within the working age population? • Prevent or reduce severance and consequent inequalities for those groups who are more greatly affected by severance?
<p>9. Environmental Quality: Remediate land, reduce harmful effects on the environment from contamination, improve land quality and enhance the quality of the physical environment.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remediate known contamination of land and groundwater to make sites suitable for their intended use and provide environmental betterment? • Reduce harmful effects on the environment from contamination? • Improve land quality? • Avoid or reduce noise and odour pollution? • Improve the physical attractiveness of the environment? • Will the SPD remediate groundwater contamination in such a manner as to promote environmental betterment and with the result of an improvement to the chemical quality of the groundwater underlying the site?
<p>10. Health, Wellbeing and Safety: Protect and improve health, wellbeing and safety, including through reducing health inequalities, enhancing access to high quality open space and avoiding adverse impacts on human health.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce inequalities in and improve the physical and mental health and wellbeing of communities? • Facilitate and/or encourage active travel or physical recreation? • Ensure the provision of safe access for all transport modes, including pedestrians and cyclists? • Increase open space provision?

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protect and enhance the quality of and access to recreational assets, including open spaces and path networks?
11. Transport: Enhance and improve connectivity and accessibility through implementing a sustainable transport strategy.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve connectivity both within the STDC area and to other areas? • Improve the accessibility of the transport network? • Enhance the capacity of the transport network? • Reduce traffic flows and congestion on adopted roads and pavements? • Encourage a shift to more sustainable forms of transport?
12. Employment: Increase high quality employment opportunities for the working age population across the RCBC and TVCA areas.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contribute to the delivery of 20,000 net new jobs within the STDC area when fully developed? • Improve access to employment, especially for local people? • Increase and diversify employment opportunities?
13. Economic Growth and Industrial Excellence: Maximise the contribution of the STDC area to the local, regional and national economies, diversity economic activity, encourage enterprise and support industrial excellence.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safeguard and strengthen the role of Teesside as a regionally and nationally important industrial centre and a centre of excellence for manufacturing and process industries? • Help to deliver the right type of development and economic activities in the right location to maximise the economic competitiveness of the STDC area and its contribution to the economy? • Help to diversify the local economy? • Encourage inward investment? • Support innovation and new enterprises? • Promote the co-location of synergistic economic activities, industries and land uses?
14. Land and Infrastructure: Optimise the efficient use of land and existing infrastructure and provide new or upgraded infrastructure to meet identified needs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make efficient use of available land and existing infrastructure? • Support the provision of new or upgraded infrastructure to meet identified needs? • Safeguard the viability of existing and future industrial infrastructure?

Appendix B SEA Mitigation and Enhancement Recommendations

B.1 SEA and HRA Reviews of the Emerging SPD

- B.1.1 The key findings and recommendations from PBA's two pre-assessment reviews of the emerging SPD, as well as an overview of how the SPD evolved in response, are summarised in **Table B.1** below.

Table B.1 Summary of PBA Reviews of the Emerging SPD

Topic / SPD Section ²	Review Findings & Recommendations	Response in Final Draft SPD (March 2018)
PBA Review of Initial Draft SPD (October 2017)		
General Comment: Structure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To allow the SEA and HRA to focus on identifying likely significant effects and to adopt proportionate assessment techniques, the SPD should be restructured to clearly distinguish between all substantive components (e.g. tests/requirements for development proposals) and explanatory or rationale text which in itself would not result in LSE Consideration should be given to adopting a hierarchical structure with strategic components such as the STDC vision and objectives set out above the Development Principles. All strategic components, including specifically a vision and objectives for the SPD (as opposed to the STDC), should be placed in a specific section or box, to separate strategic and development management components. In tandem, the status of the STDC vision should be clarified. Any intended difference in the status and/or implementation of the Development Principles versus supporting text in open paragraphs should be clarified. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The SPD now includes strategic and development management components in separate sections. It also clearly identifies all substantive components (all placed in coloured text boxes) as opposed to non-substantive supporting text.
General Comment: Status of SPD and Regeneration Masterplan / Background Study	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To confirm the status of the STDC's Regeneration Masterplan and the SPD and to address associated SEA implications, both documents should be amended to confirm that only the SPD will be formally adopted by RCBC. Whilst not being formally adopted, the Regeneration Masterplan could however be "noted" by RCBC when approving the SPD. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 1 of the SPD confirms that only the SPD will be formally adopted by RCBC. For clarity and to reflect its status as a supporting rather than policy document, the STDC's Regeneration Masterplan has been retitled 'South Tees Area Background Study'.

² This refers to the section or policy number/title in the version of the SPD to which the review comment relates. Please note that section numbering and headings within the final draft SPD have changed from those within the Initial Draft SPD (October 2017). It should also be noted that the STDC's Regeneration Masterplan (October 2017) has been retitled South Tees Area Background Study and that section numbering within this may have changed.

Topic / SPD Section ²	Review Findings & Recommendations	Response in Final Draft SPD (March 2018)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Text within the Initial Draft SPD which defers to the Regeneration Masterplan for specific proposals, tests, requirements and expectations should be recast to clearly include these substantive points within the SPD itself. The Regeneration Masterplan should only be deferred to in the SPD for contextual matters (e.g. detailed guidance on constraints and opportunities affecting the STDC area, and for regeneration ideas). Use of images from the Regeneration Masterplan would enhance the clarity and implementation of the SPD by breaking up and illustrating tests, requirements and expectations as set out within the text of the document. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The SPD now includes relevant plans and images from the South Tees Area Background Study.
General Comment: Cross-references to higher level plans and policies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The SPD should include clear cross-references to relevant policies within the RCLP and, where appropriate, relevant provisions within the NPPF. Policy references within the SPD need to be updated to include all RCLP policies as modified post-examination which are now of relevance to the STDC area and this SPD. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The SPD now includes clear cross-references to relevant policies within the RCLP and, where appropriate, relevant provisions within the NPPF, including in relation to individual development principles.
Paragraph 1.11 – MDC Core Principles	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a degree of misalignment between the strategic components of the SPD and that of the STDC's Regeneration Masterplan. This is of concern as all strategic components with potential to result in likely significant effects need to be clearly defined and considered within the SEA and HRA of the SPD. The SPD should include a vision and clear set of objectives of the SPD itself (i.e. not only the STDC's corporate aims). The SPD should correctly identify the strategic components of the Regeneration Masterplan, that is, the STDC's "core principles", "core objectives" and "key aims". The same terminology should be adopted in both documents for consistency. Related to this, the key aims of the STDC (as per page 13 of the Regeneration 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 2 of the SPD now clearly sets out a vision and objectives for the SPD, rather than detailing wider aims of the STDC. The SPD vision does however relate closely to the spatial vision for the STDC area detailed within the South Tees Area Background Study.

Topic / SPD Section ²	Review Findings & Recommendations	Response in Final Draft SPD (March 2018)
	Masterplan) should be included within the SPD in order that they can be material planning considerations.	
Paragraph 2.1 – 2.2 and Development Principle STDC1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The spatial vision set out in section 1.05.1 of the Regeneration Masterplan should be included in full as a strategic component of the SPD. This vision should be placed together with SPD objectives and other strategic components in a discrete section, after which development management components, including Development Principles and explanatory text should follow. This would allow each substantive component of the SPD to be proportionately assessed within the SEA and HRA. 	
Development Principle STDC2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To remove potential uncertainties, the intended purpose objective of land assembly should be included within the wording of this Development Principle. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development Principle STDC2 – Land Assembly and Delivery now clearly states the purpose of land assembly, namely <i>“to maximise the development and regeneration potential of the area by creating sites that are capable of meeting demand for inward investment and operators’ business and accommodation requirements across the Area”</i>.
Paragraph 2.7 and Development Principle 5 – Energy Innovation; Paragraphs 2.8 – 2.10 and Development Principle STDC6 – Environmental Enhancements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All substantive components (i.e. text setting out expectations, tests and requirements for development proposals) should be separated from non-substantive explanatory text. Such expectations, tests and requirements should be included within Development Principles or other appropriate boxes, to ensure that all likely significant effects from the SPD can be identified through the SEA and HRA. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The SPD now clearly identifies all substantive components (all placed in coloured text boxes) as opposed to non-substantive supporting text.
Paragraphs 2.8 – 2.10 and Development Principle STDC 6 – Environmental Enhancements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clear tests/requirements should be inserted within Development Principle STDC 6 to identify the qualifying features of and afford appropriate levels of protection to the Teesmouth and Cleveland Coast SPA and the Coatham Sands SSSI. Specifically, the SPD should 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development Principle STDC7: Environmental Protection and Enhancement now sets out clear and objective criteria to protect and where possible enhance biodiversity and geodiversity interests. In particular

Topic / SPD Section ²	Review Findings & Recommendations	Response in Final Draft SPD (March 2018)
	<p>require the avoidance of likely significant adverse effects on the SPA and significant harm to the SSSI, as per higher level policy requirements. In this regard, cross references should be added between Development Principle STDC 6 and RCLP Policy N4 and paragraph 118 of the NPPF (2012). The proposal to require the avoidance of all adverse effects on the ecological interests of designated sites is unclear and should be removed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Given the scale of industrial development envisaged, the additional wording proposed above should include a test to assess and mitigate where required any likely significant cumulative impacts on designated sites or wider biodiversity, including specifically the qualifying interests of the Teesmouth and Cleveland Coast SPA (and possible extension) or the Coatham Sands SSSI). To avoid HRA concerns, it is recommended that a credits system should not be pursued through the SPD (and the related Regeneration Masterplan), or at least not as proposed within the Initial Draft SPD. The SPD should be amended to require applicants to seek guidance from statutory consultees regarding potential impacts on the features for which European Sites are designated such that mitigation measures can be built into the scheme design, thus avoiding need for consideration of IROPI, alternatives and suitable compensation. Any mitigation framework or hierarchy must be compliant with the NPP (2012) at paragraph 118 and should be clearly explained within the SPD. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Particular consideration is given to the need to safeguard the integrity of the Teesmouth and Cleveland Coast SPA and Ramsar Site, as well as the need for development proposals to comply with a mitigation hierarchy that seeks to minimise environmental impacts. 2. The development principle provides support for the delivery of green infrastructure to create a network of open spaces; 3. The development principle includes commitments to the future preparation of environment, biodiversity and open space strategies for the STDC area; and, 4. The development principle requires development proposals to demonstrate net environmental gain where viable.
Paragraph 2.23 – 2.30 and Development Principles STDC 9 – 11: Transport Infrastructure Proposals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is misalignment between the road infrastructure interventions listed in paragraph 2.23 and Development Principle 9, as well as between the infrastructure corridor proposals listed in paragraph 2.26 and Development Principle 10. A single list of infrastructure intervention per 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development Principle STDC5 - Transport Infrastructure now identifies a consolidated list of transport interventions which will be supported, as well as providing greater clarity regarding the proposed infrastructure corridor.

Topic / SPD Section ²	Review Findings & Recommendations	Response in Final Draft SPD (March 2018)
	transport mode should be included within a Development Principle and associated explanatory text.	
Paragraph 2.42 and Development Principle STDC 12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As the SPD is not intended to be a Local Plan document (which would require a Sustainability Appraisal rather than SEA to be undertaken), it will have the status of non-statutory guidance and therefore should not include either policies or land use allocations. The SPD may therefore not have the ability to “safeguard” land for specific land uses itself, and any proposal to do so would need to be considered in detail within the SEA and HRA. To address this the SPD should seek to direct land uses to suitable areas rather than safeguarding land for specific purposes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The SPD no longer proposes to safeguard land for specific uses. Rather, the site specific development principles (STDC 11 – 15) direct particular uses to appropriate zones within the STDC area.
Development Principles STDC 14 and 15: Phasing Requirements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The SPD should clarify which remediation and land release phasing plans are being referred to. Any phasing or land release plans referred to should be included within the SPD to allow these to be considered within the SEA and HRA. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development Principle STDC3 – Phasing Strategy now provides greater clarity regarding the proposed phasing of remediation and development within the STDC area, without referring to a specific phasing plan.
Development Principle STDC 16: Land Use Zoning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The SPD should include an over-view land use zoning plan from the Regeneration Masterplan. The SPD should acknowledge designated areas and relevant RCLP policies, including requirements regarding the implementation of the Recreation Management Plan for the Teesmouth and Cleveland Coast Special Protection Area (SPA) Local Plan. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site specific development principles within the SPD are supported by Figure 6 – Development Zones which splits the STDC area into five zones. Development Principle STDC7 – Environmental Protection and Enhancement and other relevant site specific development principles identify the need to protect designated areas and accord with relevant RCLP policies, in particular Policy N4 – Biodiversity and Geodiversity Conservation.
Paragraphs 2.63 – 2.75: Utilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A hierarchical structure of headings should be used to clearly define all substantive utilities requirements within the SPD. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development Principle STDC10 – Utilities now provides clearer guidance regarding utilities constraints, opportunities and the need for future upgrades within the STDC area.

Topic / SPD Section ²	Review Findings & Recommendations	Response in Final Draft SPD (March 2018)
Paragraphs 2.35 – 2.36 and Development Principle STDC13; Paragraphs 2.76 – 2.78: Open Space Strategy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A single, clear open space strategy should be set out within a Development Principle, supported by a single set of explanatory text paragraphs including cross reference to the SPA Recreation Management Plan. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The SPD now commits to the future production of environment, open space and biodiversity strategies for the STDC area.
PBA Review of Redrafted SPD (January 2018)		
General Comment: Relationship between substantive components and supporting text	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To enhance readability and prioritise the SPD's substantive components (i.e. not supporting text), these components should be moved to the start of each thematic section (after a short introduction). Detailed supporting text should then follow afterwards. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The SPD now includes the substantive components at the start of each section, followed by supporting text.
General Comment: Implementation clauses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All substantive components within the SPD should include an implementation clause, which should be explained where relevant in associated supporting text. As such, the purpose of including each Development Principle and other substantive component within the SPD, and their implications for planning and development decision making, should be clarified. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The SPD objectives and all development principles now include implementation clauses where relevant to ensure they can be delivered.
Section 1 Introduction - Consideration of SPD key parameters	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To enhance readability and confirm compliance with statutory SEA and HRA requirements, the start of the introduction section should more clearly confirm the SPD's key parameters, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The intended status, purpose and scope of the SPD; b) The relationship between the SPD and the Regeneration Master Plan / Background Study; c) The relationship between RCBC and STDC in preparing the SPD; d) That full SEA and HRA processes are being undertaken in accordance with statutory requirements and have informed the SPD. The SPD should note upfront that an SEA Environmental Report and HRA Screening will be 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 1 of the SPD has been recast and now clearly identifies the role that the SEA process has played and will continue to play in informing the document. The section also clearly articulates the relationship between the SPD and the South Tees Area Background Study.

Topic / SPD Section ²	Review Findings & Recommendations	Response in Final Draft SPD (March 2018)
	<p>published for consultation in tandem with the finalised draft SPD and the revised STDC Regeneration Background Study. Together these will constitute 'the consultation documents'; and,</p> <p>e) That all representations received regarding the consultation documents will be taken into account in finalising the SPD.</p>	
Sections 1 Introduction & 2 Vision and Objectives - Core Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sections 1 and 2 of the SPD should be amended to clarify the planning status and intended implementation of both the STDC's core objectives and those identified for the SPD. Consideration should be given to using different terms to distinguish between the STDC's and SPD's objectives/aims (e.g. referring to STDC core objectives versus SPD key aims). However, for clarity the same terminology should be adopted to refer to the STDC's core objectives as per the STDC Regeneration Master Plan / Background Study document. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 2 of the SPD now clearly sets out a vision and objectives for the SPD, rather than detailing wider aims of the STDC. The SPD vision does however relate closely to the spatial vision for the STDC area detailed within the South Tees Area Background Study.
Section 1 Introduction - Policy Context & Cross-references (throughout)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To enhance the value of including an introductory policy context section in the SPD, the section should be amended to briefly identify the need for the SPD to conform with the NPPF and RCLP and then identify the ways in which the SPD responds to or supports the higher level policy framework. This could be supported by a more detailed matrix of relevant RCLP policies and NPPF provisions within an appendix. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The SPD now includes clear cross-references to relevant policies within the RCLP and, where appropriate, relevant provisions within the NPPF, including in relation to individual development principles.
Section 1 Introduction - Supporting studies, guidance and strategies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consistent terminology should be adopted when referring to the daughter documents which will be prepared to help implement the SPD and associated Regeneration Master Plan / Background Study. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The SPD now consistently refers to a suite of thematic strategies which will be prepared to help implement the SPD and regenerate the STDC area.
Section 2 - Vision & Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consideration should be given to inserting references to remediating contamination and improving environmental quality within the vision. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The vision set out in section 2 of the SPD now includes a clear reference to "<i>achieving the remediation of land contamination and to</i>

Topic / SPD Section ²	Review Findings & Recommendations	Response in Final Draft SPD (March 2018)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A clear linking statement should be inserted to relate the Strategic Development Principles in Section 3 onwards to the Vision and Objectives in Section 2 of the SPD. 	<p><i>promoting and encouraging environmental improvement</i>".</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The inclusion of a linking statement between sections 2 and 3 of the SPD is identified as a further mitigation measure in Section 6 and Appendix D of this ER.
Section 3 Strategic Development Principles - STDC 1 (Regeneration Priorities) and supporting text	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development Principle STDC 1: Regeneration Priorities should be expanded to include an implementation clause. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This development principle now includes an implementation clause to assist with its delivery.
Section 3 Strategic Development Principles – STDC 2 (Land Assembly & Delivery) and supporting text	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To enhance the effectiveness of STDC2, this Development Principle and associated supporting text could instead provide clear support for the use of CPO powers where necessary to achieve the STDC's and the SPD's core objectives (as detailed in Sections 1 and 2 of the SPD). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development Principle STDC2 – Land Assembly and Delivery now more clearly identifies the need for land assembly within the STDC area.
Section 3 Strategic Development – STDC 3 (Economic Development Strategy) and supporting text	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development Principle STDC 3 Economic Development Strategy should be expanded to include clear requirements for development proposals to avoid sterilising future development opportunities and to maximise the economic growth potential of the STDC area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development Principle STDC2 – Land Assembly and Delivery now includes a clear requirement for development proposals to avoid conflicts and not to sterilise future development land.
Section 3 – STDC 4 (Transport Infrastructure) and supporting text	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 16. STDC 4 should be amended to clarify that the identified transport infrastructure projects are supported in principle, subject to confirmation of the need for each project and the avoidance of unacceptable environmental or amenity impacts. Paragraph 3.36 should be amended to confirm that: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> transport infrastructure proposals will be expected to avoid likely significant adverse effects on the SPA or 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development Principle STDC5 – Transport Infrastructure now makes the support given to identified transport infrastructure upgrades conditional on the avoidance of unacceptable adverse environmental or amenity impacts. Development Principle STDC7 – Environmental Protection and Enhancement now provides a clear and objective criteria to protect and where possible enhance biodiversity and geodiversity

Topic / SPD Section ²	Review Findings & Recommendations	Response in Final Draft SPD (March 2018)
	<p>significant harm to the South Gare & Coatham Sands SSSI;</p> <p>b) cumulative impacts from infrastructure proposals, existing development and relevant approved developments (e.g. planning permissions for redevelopment proposals adjacent to proposed infrastructure); and,</p> <p>c) any infrastructure proposals giving rise to likely significant adverse effects on the SPA would need to be subject to an Appropriate Assessment (AA) by RCBC prior to the determination of any related planning application. Further details regarding AA/HRA requirements should be detailed under a separate Development Principle which should be expanded to consider environmental protection as well as enhancement.</p>	<p>interests, including in relation to proposed infrastructure upgrades.</p>
<p>Section 3 – STDC 5 (Energy) and supporting text</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development Principle STDC 5 should be amended to prioritize the delivery of appropriate energy infrastructure to accommodate expected high density, industrial activities across the STDC area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The need to support the delivery of appropriate energy infrastructure to accommodate expected high density, industrial activities across the STDC area is identified as a further mitigation measure in relation to Development Principle 6 – Energy Innovation within Section 6 and Appendix E of this ER.
<p>Section 3 – STDC 6 (Environmental Enhancement) and supporting text</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development Principle STDC 6 should be amended to confirm that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) existing habitats should be protected and enhanced where possible, in addition to the creation of new habitats where viable. Related to this, the scope of the Development Principle (i.e. relating to all biodiversity interests rather than only designated sites) should be clarified. b) The mitigation framework set out in the NPPF (2012) should be adopted in all development proposals; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development Principle STDC7 - Environmental Protection and Enhancement now sets out clear and objective criteria to protect and where possible enhance biodiversity and geodiversity interests. In particular <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Particular consideration is given to the need to safeguard the integrity of the Teesmouth and Cleveland Coast SPA and Ramsar Site, as well as the need for development proposals to comply with a mitigation hierarchy that seeks to minimise environmental impacts.

Topic / SPD Section ²	Review Findings & Recommendations	Response in Final Draft SPD (March 2018)
	<p>c) Proposals affecting the SPA must clearly demonstrate that they will not result in significant effects on its integrity, conservation objectives or qualifying features, taking account of any environmental enhancement/betterment resulting from land remediation. The SPD should not imply that the habitat banking framework should be used to address likely impacts specifically on the SPA.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development Principle STDC 6 should also be expanded to confirm that environmental betterment through the remediation of contaminated land and any use of habitat banking would contribute to demonstrating net environmental gain from development proposals. • Section 2 and Development Principle STDC 1 should confirm whether pollution reduction, long term environmental sustainability and biodiversity are core objectives for the regeneration of the STDC area, meaning that the paragraph 3.39 should be amended to confirm that existing habitats should be protected and enhanced where possible. 	<p>2. The development principle provides support for the delivery of green infrastructure to create a network of open spaces;</p> <p>3. The development principle includes commitments to the future preparation of environment, biodiversity and open space strategies for the STDC area; and,</p> <p>4. The development principle requires development proposals to demonstrate net environmental gain where viable.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SPD objectives detailed in section 2 and Development Principle STDC1 – Regeneration Priorities identify the need for pollution reduction, long term environmental sustainability and biodiversity protection as part of the regeneration of the STDC area.
Section 3 – STDC 7 (Heritage) and supporting text	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development Principle STDC 7 should be amended to require proposals not to result in unacceptable adverse effects on the integrity, setting or understanding of identified heritage assets. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development Principle STDC8 – Preserving Industrial Heritage now requires the avoidance of unacceptable harm to the significance of specific retained heritage or cultural assets (i.e. to their integrity and reasons for retention).
Section 3 – STDC 8 (Site Remediation) and supporting text	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development Principle STDC 7 should be amended to confirm the scope and implications for development proposals of the STDC area wide remediation strategy identified within this Development Principle, as well as setting out clearer remediation requirements for the determination of planning applications. This should include a specific protection for the Teesmouth and Cleveland Coast SPA against significant adverse effects from remediation activities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development Principle STDC9 – Site Remediation now identifies the need for redevelopment of the STDC area to reduce pollution (not merely avoid additional pollution) and contribute to long term sustainability. It also identifies the need to remediate known contamination, including to reduce environmental harm, and provide environmental betterment.

Topic / SPD Section ²	Review Findings & Recommendations	Response in Final Draft SPD (March 2018)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The reference to “offsetting” the costs of remediation within paragraph 3.54 should be clarified or deleted. 	
Section 3 – STDC 9 (Phasing Strategy) and supporting text	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For clarity, consideration should be given to moving this Development Principle to a more prominent, upfront part of the SPD, e.g. after Development Principle STDC 1. This Development Principle should be expanded to confirm that any likely cumulative impacts from a proposal and other relevant approved developments (on top of existing built development) should be assessed. Development proposals should avoid any unacceptable adverse cumulative impacts. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The development principle dealing with phasing has been moved upfront to become Development Principle STDC3 – Phasing Strategy. Development Principle STDC3 – Phasing Strategy now confirms that any likely cumulative impacts from a proposal and other relevant approved developments should be assessed and that development proposals should avoid unacceptable adverse cumulative impacts.
Section 3 – STDC 10 (Utilities) and supporting text	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Whilst it is recognised that the scope of future supporting strategies cannot yet be confirmed, this Development Principle should be expanded to set out broad objectives or priorities that will be addressed through them. This would provide a reference point to ensure future supporting strategies remain within the scope of the SPD (and thus its SEA and HRA) and appropriately address key issues. Development Principle STDC 10 should also confirm that once the utilities and flood risk strategies have been prepared they will become material considerations in the determination of planning applications where relevant. Any intended difference in the support provided to energy generation proposals across the STDC area or in specific designated areas between STDC 5 and this Development Principle should be clarified. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development Principle STDC10 – Utilities now provides clearer guidance regarding utilities constraints, opportunities and the need for future upgrades within the STDC area. It also confirms that water and flood risk management, materials and waste management, energy and utility strategies will be prepared to help implement the SPD.
Section 4 – Site Specific Development Principles	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The status of the white land within the STDC red line boundary area on Figure 5 – Development Zones should be clarified. Related to this, supporting text should confirm that the SPD will be applicable to the determination of all planning applications within the STDC area, not only those within defined Development Zones. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Paragraph 4.4 now clearly identifies the status of white land within the STDC area as shown on Figure 6 – Development Zones of the SPD. Paragraph 4.11 has been amended to confirm that likely significant adverse effects from development proposals (including but not limited to those within

Topic / SPD Section ²	Review Findings & Recommendations	Response in Final Draft SPD (March 2018)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Paragraph 4.10 should be corrected and simplified to state that development within the North Industrial Zone has the potential to result in significant adverse effects upon biodiversity interests. Such effects should be addressed using the mitigation hierarchy defined within the NPPF (2012) at paragraph 118 and in accordance with STDC 6 – Environmental Enhancement. Development Principle STDC 12 should be amended to enhance the weight afforded to the consideration of protection and enhancement proposals in a future biodiversity strategy and to itself provide clearer requirements in terms of biodiversity enhancement. Consideration should be given to the closer alignment of this Development Principle with Policy N4 within the RCLP. 	<p>the North Industrial Zone) should be addressed using the mitigation hierarchy defined within the NPPF (2012) at paragraph 118 and in accordance with STDC 7 – Environmental Protection and Enhancement.</p>
Section 5 – Implementation and Delivery – The Next Steps	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Paragraph 5.5 should be corrected to confirm that all development proposals falling within Schedule 2 of the EIA Regulations must undergo EIA screening, either prior to the submission of a planning application or before its validation. To ensure that sufficient screening information is provided by applicants to satisfy the screening requirements of the 2017 EIA Regulations, this paragraph could be expanded to list the information which needs to be provided to enable RCBC to adopt a EIA screening opinion. The objectives and scope of the intended future strategies/supporting documents identified in paragraphs 5.13 – 5.15 should be moved to sit alongside relevant Development Principles earlier in the SPD (e.g. in relation to STDC's 4, 6 and 10). In addition, section 5 should confirm whether a Biodiversity Strategy or Biodiversity and Open Space Strategy is proposed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Paragraph 5.5 now confirms that all development proposals falling within Schedule 2 of the EIA Regulations must undergo EIA screening, either prior to the submission of a planning application or before its validation. Paragraph 5.6 now outlines the information which needs to be provided to enable RCBC to adopt a EIA screening opinion. Commitments to the development and implementation of thematic strategies to assist in the delivery of the SPD and the regeneration of the STDC area have been moved to sit within relevant strategic and site specific development principles.

B.1.2 X

B.2 Addressing Uncertainties and Weaknesses through Formal SEA Mitigation and Enhancement Recommendations

- B.2.1 A draft ER containing a schedule of proposed mitigation and enhancement recommendations was issued by PBA to RCBC in mid-March 2018, following which RCBC incorporated all but one of the recommendations into the final version of the Consultation Draft SPD. Details of the SEA recommendations and how these were addressed by RCBC are detailed below.

SPD Vision – Mitigation and Enhancement Recommendations

- B.2.2 The draft South Tees Area SPD ER recommended the following changes to the vision set out in the then draft Consultation Draft SPD, all of which were subsequently incorporated by RCBC:

- The SPD Vision should be expanded to provide a high-level hook for connectivity and transport infrastructure related Objectives and Development Principles which follow;
- The reference within the SPD Vision to “*promoting and encouraging environmental improvement and bio-diversity*” should be reworded for clarity, e.g. “*safeguarding biodiversity and promoting and encouraging environmental improvement*”;
- To address identified uncertainties and inconsistencies, paragraph 2.1 in section 2 of the SPD should be amended to delete the word “Core”. This paragraph should also be expanded to include a link to individual Development Principles, e.g.: “*This will be realised through implementing the Development Principles set out in Sections 3 and 4*”;
- The SPD Vision and relevant Objectives should be expanded to address design quality and placemaking issues (which would indirectly include the safeguarding of important industrial heritage, even if not directly stated in an Objective);
- The SPD Vision would benefit from the inclusion of a reference to prioritising redevelopment which capitalises on existing industrial infrastructure and makes best use of available land;
- To allow the SPD vision to contribute positively to SEA Objective 10 (Health, Wellbeing and Safety), it should be expanded to include a consideration of human health and safety, including in relation to future industrial activities. SPD objective 6 or 10 should also be expanded to include similar consideration of health, wellbeing and safety imperatives.

SPD Objectives – Mitigation and Enhancement Recommendations

- B.2.3 The draft South Tees Area SPD ER recommended the following changes to the SPD objectives set out in the then draft Consultation Draft SPD, all of which were subsequently incorporated by RCBC:
- Objective 8 should also be reworded for clarity and expanded to include references to landscape character, green infrastructure and open space improvements, e.g.: “*deliver redevelopment in a way that provides long term sustainability, reduces pollution, manages the water environment, contributes to habitat protection, safeguards biodiversity and enhances green infrastructure, open space and landscape character*”;
 - To allow SPD objective 7 to contribute positively to SEA Objectives 2 (Placemaking) and 5 (Energy and Climate Change), it should be expanded to support the creation of an integrated and safe transport network which takes account of the needs of a variety of users (which would include active travel users and pedestrians) and includes sustainable travel measures;

- To address identified uncertainties in SPD objective 9, the wording in relation to education and skills transformation should be clarified. To enhance the contribution of this objective to SEA Objective 8 (Community) and address equalities issues, consideration should also be given to including a reference to providing economic and employment opportunities for a wide range of demographic groups. For example, this could relate to the promotion of apprenticeship schemes in new industrial developments;
- To address identified uncertainties in SPD objective 10, the wording in relation to realising economic and community benefits should be clarified. E.g.: *“Use the regeneration opportunity to strengthen transport connections with Redcar town centre and other urban centres and to deliver economic and community benefits”*.

Development Principles – Mitigation and Enhancement Recommendations

- B.2.4 During the SEA a number of mitigation and enhancement recommendations were made by the SEA project team in respect of each development principle within the emerging SPD, and with one exception these were agreed by RCBC. As such, these changes were incorporated into the SPD to remove uncertainties and strengthen its alignment with the South Tees Area SEA Framework. **Table B.2** below lists all of the mitigation and enhancement recommendations made per development principle and confirms how these recommendations were addressed by RCBC.

Table B.2 Schedule of Development Principle Mitigation and Enhancement Recommendations

SPD Development Principle	SEA Recommendations (per Draft ER)	RCBC Response
Strategic Development Principles		
General (recommendations apply to multiple strategic development principles)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To address potential ambiguities within Development Principle STDC5 and other development principles where the assessment criteria of avoiding “<i>unacceptable adverse impacts</i>” is adopted, a definition of impact acceptability should be included in the SPD as supporting text. The following definition is recommended: “<i>Acceptability will be determined through an assessment of the details of a development proposal, including its predicted beneficial and adverse impacts, and the extent to which any predicted adverse impacts can be satisfactorily addressed. Where a development proposal is supported by a statutory Environmental Statement and a formal EIA has been carried out, the level and significance of likely residual impacts predicted by the applicant will be taken into account by the Council in determining the acceptability of such impacts</i>”. In addition to providing a clear and transparent assessment framework, this definition incorporates the legal requirement for RCBC to examine a submitted ES and reach a reasoned conclusion on the likely significant effects of any proposed EIA Development. 	SEA recommendation agreed and implemented
Development Principle STDC1 - Regeneration Priorities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For clarity, the title of Development Principle STDC1 should be amended from “<i>Regeneration Priorities</i>” to “<i>Regeneration Priorities</i>”; To enhance the clarity and implementation of Development Principle STDC1 it is recommended that the current implementation clause should be replaced with the wording “<i>In line with the SPD’s Vision and Objectives, the following priorities are identified for the STDC area:</i>”. A new implementation clause should then be inserted after the bullet point list of priorities, e.g. “<i>Development proposals will be expected to contribute to the delivery of the above priorities where relevant</i>” before continuing as before (“<i>The council, in partnership with the STDC, will seek to resist piecemeal development...</i>”); Within this development principle, “gateway features” has been misspelled and currently reads “getaway”; for clarity this should be corrected. The last principle (regarding the quality of buildings and infrastructure) in this development principle should be expanded to support public realm improvements, the conservation or protection of (industrial) heritage assets and the protection and enhancement of landscape character. 	SEA recommendations agreed and implemented

SPD Development Principle	SEA Recommendations (per Draft ER)	RCBC Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To enhance the contribution of this development principle to SEA Objective 6 (Flood Risk and Resilience), the priority regarding long term sustainability should be expanded to require development proposals to contribute to sustainable flood risk management. To address identified uncertainties and allow Development Principle STDC1 to contribute more positively to SEA Objective 10 (Health, Wellbeing and Safety), the priority regarding local connectivity improvements should be expanded to reference active travel. An additional priority should also be developed to require high health and safety standards to be demonstrated in all development proposals and industrial activities. To enhance the contribution of this development principle to SEA Objective 11 (Transport), the priority regarding uses connected to the low carbon economy should be expanded to instead refer to "<i>uses and infrastructure connected to...</i>". The priority which supports on-site infrastructure improvements should be expanded to reference the need to make best use of existing transport infrastructure, including substantial rail facilities, as well as developing new or upgraded infrastructure where required; and, To address the identified uncertainty and allow this development principle to more positively contribute to SEA Objective 14 (Land and Infrastructure), and to strengthen the support afforded to comprehensive redevelopment, the principle should be expanded to both recognise the value of existing industrial infrastructure and the need to make best use of available land and infrastructure. 	
Development Principle STDC2 - Land Assembly and Delivery	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For clarity and brevity, the sentence structure within Development Principle STDC2 should be revised; and, For accuracy and to address the identified uncertainty, the wording "<i>the vision for the Area...</i>" within the second paragraph of Development Principle STDC2 should be amended to insert "<i>SPD's</i>" before the word "<i>vision</i>". 	SEA recommendations agreed and implemented
Development Principle STDC3 - Phasing Strategy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development Principle STDC3 should be recast to clarify "<i>the approach</i>" to redevelopment being promoted. In doing so the development principle should confirm whether a specific sequential approach should be used to prioritise redevelopment, or whether any development proposal capable of being implemented as a 'quick win' will be supported. The development principle should also be expanded to confirm that areas requiring more extensive remediation, demolition and/or infrastructure upgrades will also be supported for redevelopment, although it is recognised that this is likely to take longer to secure; 	SEA recommendations agreed and implemented

SPD Development Principle	SEA Recommendations (per Draft ER)	RCBC Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For clarity, the final sentence within Development Principle STDC3 should be split in two to firstly require the identification and assessment of cumulative impacts and secondly require the avoidance of unacceptable adverse cumulative impacts; To address identified deficiencies and allow this development principle to contribute positively to SEA Objective 9 (Environmental Quality), it should be expanded to provide clear support for remediation and redevelopment across the whole STDC area, including to reduce environmental harm and deliver environmental betterment as well as to facilitate industrial redevelopment. Therefore, whilst continuing to prioritise 'quick wins' the development principle should also identify an approach to secure the redevelopment of more contaminated areas, which in some cases may occur over the longer term; and, To address identified uncertainties this development principle should be expanded to provide clear support for remediation and redevelopment across the whole STDC area and for major new infrastructure to be delivered when necessary to unlock the full economic and employment potential of a new industrial business park. 	
Development Principle STDC4 - Economic Development Strategy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For clarity, the first sentence within Development Principle STDC 4 should be amended to confirm that the references to LS4 and ED6 relate to RCLP policies; For accuracy, the final sentence of Development Principle STDC 4 should be corrected to refer to RCLP Policy SD5 - Developer Contributions; and, To enhance the soundness of this development principle, address the identified uncertainty and enable the development principle to contribute positively to SEA Objective 8 (Community) the potential requirement for developer contributions in support of local employment and training should be clarified. In particular, these potential developer contribution requirements should be linked more explicitly to the requirements within Local Plan Policy SD5 for contributions "<i>to fund necessary infrastructure and other community benefits required as a consequence of development</i>". The implementation of this development principle would also benefit from the inclusion of an explanation of the developer contribution requirements and expectations within supporting text. 	SEA recommendations agreed and implemented
Development Principle STDC5 - Transport Infrastructure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To address identified uncertainties and enable this development principle to contribute positively to SEA Objective 5 (Energy and Climate Change), it should be expanded to include a clear expectation that proposals for major employment generating uses within the STDC area should not result in either traffic congestion or an overall increase in GHG emissions from the transport 	SEA recommendation not agreed owing to incompatibility with higher level RCLP.

SPD Development Principle	SEA Recommendations (per Draft ER)	RCBC Response
	<p>sector as a result of commuting. Related to this, the development principle should encourage development proposals likely to generate significant traffic movements to provide and implement a sustainable travel plan, in accordance with higher level policy requirements within the RCLP.</p>	<p>Instead, the first sentence in paragraph 4 of this development principle was amended to make it clear that all development proposals will be required to avoid causing traffic congestion by being served by adequate transport infrastructure.</p>
<p>Development Principle STDC6: Energy Innovation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To address identified uncertainties, Development Principle STDC6 should be recast to provide clearer assessment criteria. If the delivery of sustainable development is retained, this should be objectively defined within supporting text to the development principle; • To address identified inconsistencies between Development Principle STDC6 and supporting text, the development principle should be expanded to provide clearer support for the development of on-site energy generation developments to meet assessed energy needs, including from future industrial activities, subject to proposals being sited and designed appropriately. For clarity, Development Principle STDC6 should also include cross-references to Development Principle STDC10 and the site-specific development principles (11 – 15); and, • Related to the previous recommendation, to address identified uncertainties this development principle should be expanded to require all energy generation development proposals to be appropriately sited and designed in order to avoid unacceptable adverse environmental or amenity effects; 	<p>SEA recommendations agreed and implemented</p>
<p>Development Principle STDC7 - Environmental</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For clarity the third paragraph of this development principle should be amended to require applicants for development proposals affecting the Teesmouth and Cleveland Coast SPA to submit a Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) Screening Report to demonstrate the 	<p>SEA recommendation agreed and implemented</p>

SPD Development Principle	SEA Recommendations (per Draft ER)	RCBC Response
Protection and Enhancement	avoidance of likely significant adverse effects on the SPA. Only in the event that the HRA Screening Report is unable to demonstrate this would a full Appropriate Assessment be needed, in which case further mitigation measures may need to be devised to avoid residual significant effects on the integrity or conservation objectives of the SPA.	
Development Principle STDC8 - Preserving Industrial Heritage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To address identified ambiguities within Development Principle STDC 8, the requirement for development proposals to avoid “<i>unacceptable harm to the significance of specific retained assets of heritage or cultural importance</i>” should be explained within supporting text. In particular, it should be explained that the significance of heritage assets relates to their integrity, contribution to historical understanding and the reasons why the asset is identified for retention; 	SEA recommendation agreed and implemented
Development Principle STDC9 - Site Remediation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To enhance the contribution of this development principle to SEA Objective 4 (Water) it should be expanded to include explicit consideration of and remediation requirements for contamination of the water environment; and, To address identified uncertainties, the supporting text which accompanies this development principle should be expanded to confirm that the Landfill Zone is likely to be appropriate for future renewable energy development after it is capped. This would not commit to renewable energy development in this location but would provide greater certainty of the SPD’s support in principle for any proposals which come forward in future. 	SEA recommendations agreed and implemented
Development Principle STDC10 - Utilities	No mitigation or enhancement recommendations proposed in relation to this development principle.	N/A
Site Specific Development Principles		
General (recommendations apply to multiple strategic development principles)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To allow the specific development principles to contribute positively to SEA Objective 6 (Flood Risk), they could be expanded to address potential flood risks within each zone. 	SEA recommendation agreed and implemented
Development Principle STDC11 - North Development Zone	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To address identified inconsistencies and provide clear support for land assembly within the North Industrial Zone, Development Principle STDC11 should be expanded to identify the need for land 	SEA recommendation agreed and implemented

SPD Development Principle	SEA Recommendations (per Draft ER)	RCBC Response
	assembly. In this regard it would also be helpful to add a cross-reference to Development Principle STDC 2 – Land Assembly and Delivery;	
Development Principle STDC12 - North East Ecological Industrial Zone	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To address identified uncertainties, Development Principle STDC12 should be expanded to mirror the requirements for the Teardrop site' set out in paragraph 4.15 of the supporting text. 	SEA recommendation agreed and implemented
Development Principle STDC13 - Central Industrial Zone	No mitigation or enhancement recommendations proposed in relation to this development principle.	N/A
Development Principle STDC14 - South Industrial Zone	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To address identified inconsistencies and likely significant adverse effect on SEA Objective 1 (Biodiversity and Geodiversity), Development Principle STDC 14 should be expanded to confirm that development proposals within the south industrial zone should accord with RCLP Policy N4 and have regard to Development Principle STDC7 (as amended in light of separate recommendations made in Appendix E); In consequence of the above recommendation it is also recommended that paragraph 4.23 should be amended to state that development proposals which have the potential to result in a likely significant effect on European Sites should be subject to HRA screening in accordance with Development Principle STDC7 and RCLP Policy N4, and that adequate mitigation or compensation should be provided to address any likely significant effects or harm to wider biodiversity interests. 	SEA recommendations agreed and implemented
Development Principle STDC15 - Coastal Community Zone	No mitigation or enhancement recommendations proposed in relation to this development principle.	N/A

Appendix C SPD Response to SEA Screening and Scoping Consultation Comments

- C.1.1 The approach to the SEA and the emerging content of the SPD itself were amended to take account of responses received to the SEA Screening and Scoping Report from the SEA Consultation Bodies, as detailed in **Table C.1** below.

Table C.1: Response to SEA Screening and Scoping Consultation Comments

Points raised by SEA Consultation Bodies	SPD Response	SEA Response
Environment Agency		
Confirmed agreement that SEA is required for the SPD	RCBC adopted a positive SEA Screening Determination, confirming that a full SEA would be undertaken, in February 2018.	An ER was prepared to report the findings of the SEA carried out in respect of the Consultation Draft SPD. The ER and SPD was consulted on from 26 th March – 22 nd April 2018.
Generally considered that the proposed SEA Objectives adequately cover relevant environmental issues.	N/A	Noted and welcomed. No changes to SEA Objectives were made.
Identified additional legislation and policy documents to be considered in the Review of Plans and Programmes provided in Appendix B of the Scoping Report	N/A	Appendix B of the SEA Screening and Scoping Report was carried forward into the ER. The additional documents identified by the Environment Agency were referenced.
Recommended that water quantity, as well as quality, should be identified as key environmental issues, whilst surface and groundwater should be addressed separately. Also recommended that remediation should be given more consideration.	N/A	Table 3.1 – Key Environmental Issues of the ER referred to water quality and quantity and separates out surface and groundwater issues. The remediation of contamination through the regeneration of the STDC area was addressed in the Screening and SEA Scoping Report and then emphasised in this ER.
Recommended two additional Guide Questions in relation to SEA Objective 1 – Biodiversity and Geodiversity: <i>prevent spread or introduction of invasive non-native species?</i> <i>seek to enhance and achieve a net gain in biodiversity, wherever possible?</i>	To allow the SPD to perform positively against the second recommended Guide Question, additional criteria were included in Development Principle STDC7 – Environmental Protection and Enhancement to: 1. Require the implementation of the mitigation hierarchy to ensure the avoidance of likely significant adverse effects on European Sites, significant harm to SSSI and other unacceptable adverse environmental effects; and,	The suggested additional Guide Questions were included in the SEA Framework.

Points raised by SEA Consultation Bodies	SPD Response	SEA Response
	2. Require development proposals to demonstrate “ <i>net environmental gain</i> ” where viable. This will be assessed taking account of the nature of the proposal, on-site remediation and contributions to other environmental improvements within the STDC area where appropriate, including the implementation of a planned habitat banking framework.	
Recommended one additional Guide Question in relation to SEA Objective 4 – Water: <i>Maintain or enhance the ecological and chemical status of the water environment?</i>	N/A	The suggested additional Guide Question were included in the SEA Framework.
Advised that the South Gare and Coatham Sands SSSI is under review in tandem with the proposed extension to the Teesmouth and Cleveland Coast SPA, and that this should be referred to in Table A.1	N/A	Appendix A of the SEA Screening and Scoping Report was carried forward to form an appendix of the Environmental Report and has been updated to confirm the status of the SSSI and proposed SPA extension.
Recommended that green infrastructure measures should be implemented within the STDC area to provide opportunities for priority habitat creation and species migration alongside industrial development.	Development Principle STDC7 – Environmental Protection and Enhancement now provides support for the delivery of green infrastructure to create a network of open spaces and habitats; and commits to the future preparation of environment, biodiversity and open space strategies for the STDC area.	N/A
Advised that the emerging Tees Estuary Habitat Framework should be considered in the emerging SPD	Development Principle STDC7 – Environmental Protection and Enhancement now requires development proposals to demonstrate “ <i>net environmental gain</i> ” where viable. The use of the Tees Estuary Habitat Framework would be one method of demonstrating compliance with this requirement.	N/A

Points raised by SEA Consultation Bodies	SPD Response	SEA Response
Noted that environmental betterment should form part of the remediation strategy for the STDC area.	Development Principle STDC9 - Site Remediation identifies the need for redevelopment of the STDC area to reduce pollution (not merely avoid additional pollution) and contribute to long term sustainability. The development principle also identifies the need to remediate known contamination, including to reduce environmental harm and provide environmental betterment.	The wording of the suggested additional Guide Question is too specific for this SEA and overlaps with a recommended additional Guide Question under SEA Objective 4 (Water) within the SEA Framework. Instead, the first Guide Question under SEA Objective 9 was amended to read: <i>Will the SPD remediate known contamination of land and groundwater to make sites suitable for their intended use and provide environmental betterment?</i>
Recommended one additional Guide Question in relation to SEA Objective 9 - Environmental Quality: <i>Will the SPD remediate groundwater contamination in such a manner as to promote environmental betterment and with the result of an improvement to the chemical quality of the groundwater underlying the site?</i>	As above, on-site remediation will also be taken account of in implementing the requirement in Development Principle STDC7 – Environmental Protection and Enhancement for development proposals to demonstrate “ <i>net environmental gain</i> ” where viable.	
Recommended that the final Guide Question under SEA Objective 7 – Materials and Waste should be amended to read: <i>Treat and process waste in accordance with the principles of the waste hierarchy with minimal impact on the environment?</i>	Development Principle STDC10 - Utilities now requires new major developments to carry out a waste audit and take steps to minimise and manage waste arising from construction and operational activities in accordance with the waste hierarchy.	The final Guide Question under SEA Objective 7 within the SEA Framework was amended as recommended.
Natural England		
Advised that there are likely to be significant environmental effects from the SPD and thus an SEA should be undertaken.	RCBC adopted a positive SEA Screening Determination, confirming that a full SEA would be undertaken, in February 2018.	An ER was prepared to report the findings of the SEA carried out in respect of the Consultation Draft SPD. The ER and SPD was consulted on from 26 th March – 22 nd April 2018.
Welcomed the approach taken in the SEA Scoping Report and considered that this provides a “ <i>good framework</i> ” for the assessment of the SPD.	N/A	Noted and welcomed.

Points raised by SEA Consultation Bodies	SPD Response	SEA Response
Recommended that one additional Guide Question in relation to SEA Objective 1 – Biodiversity & Geodiversity: <i>'Will the SPD enhance biodiversity and geodiversity and seek to achieve net gain?'</i>	N/A	A very similar Guide Question was suggested by the Environment Agency (see above) and was preferred over this wording as it provides greater clarity. No additional change was therefore made to the SEA Framework.
Advised that any adverse impacts from a deterioration in air and water quality on ecologically sensitive receptors should be considered.	Development Principle STDC7 - Environmental Protection and Enhancement now explicitly confirms that both direct and indirect impacts on sensitive ecological receptors from development proposals need to be assessed.	It was considered that the Guide Question under SEA Objective 1 – Biodiversity and Geodiversity within the SEA Framework were sufficiently broad to consider the assessment of both direct and indirect impacts on sensitive ecological receptors. No additional changes were therefore made to the SEA Framework.
Recommended that a Guide Question should be added to assess impacts on existing recreational assets (quality and or extent): <i>Will the SPD...avoid impacts on the quality and extent of existing recreational assets, such as formal or informal footpaths?</i>	N/A	Impacts on existing recreational assets were addressed through multiple Guide Questions under SEA Objectives 1 (access to nature), 2 (public realm), 8 (severance), 9 (physical attractiveness) and 10 (active travel, physical recreation, open space quality) within the SEA Framework. However, to address Natural England's recommendation the final Guide Question under SEA Objective 10 – Health, Wellbeing and Safety was amended to read: <i>Will the SPD...protect and enhance the quality of and access to recreational assets, including open spaces and path networks?</i>
Concurred with the Environmental Agency that the emerging Tees Estuary Habitat Framework should be considered in the emerging SPD	As noted above, the Tees Estuary Habitat Framework would be addressed by within the context of the requirement within Development Principle STDC7 - Environmental Protection and Enhancement for development proposals to demonstrate net environmental gain where viable.	N/A

Points raised by SEA Consultation Bodies	SPD Response	SEA Response
Provided a list of types of plans relating to the natural environment that should be considered where applicable.	N/A	Appendix B of the SEA Screening and Scoping Report was carried forward into the ER. The additional documents identified by the Environment Agency were referenced.
Historic England		
Noted the potential for the regeneration of the STDC area to recognise its industrial heritage and use this to create a unique sense of place.	Development Principle STDC8 - Preserving Industrial Heritage now requires the identification and protection where appropriate and viable of industrial heritage assets within the STDC area, including as part of a new industrial heritage trail, and requires the avoidance of unacceptable harm to the significance of specific retained heritage or cultural assets (i.e. to their integrity and reasons for retention).	Industrial heritage matters are considered within SEA Objective 2 – Placemaking and no changes have been made to the SEA Framework in this respect.
Confirmed there are no designated heritage assets within the STDC area but that there are a number within its vicinity. Welcomed the intention for the STDC area to integrate with its surroundings.	N/A	Noted.
Recommended that further work be undertaken to understand the historical significance of the STDC area and its surroundings, specifically in relation to its historical development, identified heritage assets and designated assets whose setting might be affected.	If required, further work to address these issues could be undertaken when preparing the Open Space thematic strategy which will support the SPD.	N/A
Expressed an interest in undertaking work to develop an archive record of the STDC's industrial heritage. Also provided a link to guidance regarding recording redundant power stations.	No specific implications for the SPD.	N/A

