



Local Plan Review 2016-2036 Part One: Planning Strategy

SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL

Final Version (Updated June 2020)

APPENDICES

This version incorporates any additions/corrections made since the June 2018 Sustainability Appraisal – see also the SA Addendum (October 2019)

| | Page |
|---|------------|
| Appendix 1 - Local Plan Strategic Objectives | 3 |
| Appendix 2 - Relevance and weighting of SA objectives to site selection | 4 |
| Appendix 3 - Sites that fail under the Critical Criteria | 24 |
| Appendix 4 - Policy Assessment Matrix | 28 |
| Appendix 5 - SA of Strategic policies | 40 |
| Appendix 6 - SA of Site-specific policies and Omission sites | 110 |
| Appendix 7 - Equalities Impact Assessment | 153 |
| Appendix 8 - Comments received in relation to previous consultations on the Local Plan & Sustainability Appraisal and council response | 158 |

Appendix 1

Local Plan Strategic Objectives

The council identified 10 strategic objectives for the Local Plan review to support and achieve sustainable development. These objectives reflect and express in our local context the main plan-making requirements for plan-making set out in national planning policy. They draw on the Sustainability Appraisal process but focus on our highest priorities, and also our biggest challenges that require a judgement to be made between potentially conflicting strategic priorities.

Table A1.1: Local Plan strategic objectives

| To protect and enhance the special character and environment of the New Forest area | | |
|--|--|--|
| SO1 | Landscape and the countryside | To safeguard and where possible enhance the special qualities and landscape character of the New Forest area including the Cranbourne Chase Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and Solent coastline, and to provide an appropriate gateway to and setting for the adjoining New Forest National Park. To maintain and enhance the South West Hampshire Green Belt and to protect locally valued views and landscapes. To facilitate enjoyment of and access to the coast and countryside. To conserve, manage and enhance the setting of heritage assets. |
| SO2 | Biodiversity and environmental quality | To safeguard and improve biodiversity, and the protection and enhancement of wildlife, species, habitats and water bodies in the Plan Area. To avoid where possible or fully mitigate where necessary, the direct and cumulative impacts of development on designated nature conservation sites. To promote the understanding of and care for the natural environment; managing recreational pressures in sensitive locations. To manage and where possible reduce or mitigate activities that unacceptably impact on air quality or levels of noise, dust, odour or light pollution. |
| SO3 | Built environment and heritage | To provide a high quality, safe and attractive living and working environments in our towns, villages and rural areas. To ensure that valued local character and distinctiveness is maintained, that new development is well designed and is appropriate in scale, density, form and character to its context and landscape setting. To conserve, manage and where possible enhance listed buildings and other built heritage assets |
| To provide more homes for local people | | |
| SO4 | Housing provision | To provide for around 10,000 additional homes within the Plan Area 2016-2036 to help meet the needs of the district within the Southampton, Bournemouth and Salisbury housing market areas directing larger scale provision to the main towns and larger villages |
| SO5 | Housing needs, mix and affordability | Provide a range & choice of good quality new homes by type, size, tenure & location. To ensure new housing provision as far as possible addresses local housing needs providing in particular homes more affordable for younger households & a wider spectrum of homes & other measures enabling older residents to continue to live & remain independent in New Forest communities. |
| To support local businesses to prosper for the benefit of the community | | |
| SO6 | Economic opportunity | To facilitate a healthy and growing economy operating within environmental limits and to maximise the benefits to local communities from significant new development. To support economic growth that reflects and complements the District's specific qualities and advantages, in particular low impact tourism, knowledge-based enterprises and marine industries. To improve the supply of flexible, modern premises micro- and start-up businesses need to establish and grow locally. To support and promote measures that enable local residents and employees to access and take up local employment opportunities including to improve their skills and knowledge required, and enabling services such as childcare provision . |
| SO7 | Vibrant and sustainable towns and villages | To maintain the economic vitality and viability of town centres. In the main towns to aim for a good range of facilities providing for social, cultural, entertainment, economic, shopping, leisure, community, health & educational needs of all sections of the local community. In villages to maintain & enable local retail & service provision to meet day-to day needs in rural areas. |
| SO8 | Rural areas and tourism | To promote a positive future for rural areas and to help secure their economic prosperity and social well-being by supporting farming and traditional commoning practices including back-up grazing, agricultural and rural enterprise, tourism and the diversification of the rural economy in ways which are compatible with environmental and landscape objectives and the aims and purposes of the New Forest National Park |
| To protect and promote the safety and wellbeing of people who live and work within the district | | |
| SO9 | Climate change and environmental sustainability | To improve the resilience of local communities to climate change, including managing the risks of flooding and coastal erosion. To prioritise the beneficial re-use of previously developed land and to promote the use of renewable resource and energy sources within sustainable limits. To manage and where possible reduce vehicular emissions and other local factors contributing to climate change or that degrade sensitive environments or quality of life |
| SO10 | Infrastructure provision and sustainable access to opportunities and facilities | To secure provision of the social and physical infrastructure necessary to manage the impact of new development on existing services and communities. To enable participation by all age groups in active recreation to facilitate healthy lifestyles, by providing public open space and opportunities for leisure, sport and informal recreation. To improve safe access to opportunities, services and facilities that enable a fulfilling life including by walking, cycling and where viable by enhancements to public transport services |

Appendix 2

Table A2.1: Relevance and weighting of SA objectives to strategic housing and employment site selection

| |
|--|
| <p>Objective 1 - Meeting Housing Needs Does the site/policy/proposal:</p> <p><i>Appraisal criterion 1A - Contribute effectively to meeting the housing needs of local communities and the housing market area(s)?</i></p> <p>SA question 1.1: Provide sufficient housing to meet the needs of local communities?</p> <p>SA question 1.2: Provide an appropriate range and choice of dwelling types and sizes including opportunities for self and custom build?</p> |
| <p>Not relevant to preliminary strategic housing site selection.</p> |
| <p>All sites allocated for housing would in principle contribute to meeting general housing needs in housing supply terms, but further work is required to confirm sites are suitable, available and deliverable and their potential to address affordable housing and specialist housing needs.</p> |

| |
|--|
| <p>Objective 1 - Meeting Housing Needs Does the site/policy/proposal:</p> <p><i>Appraisal criterion 1B - Provide affordable housing that meets local needs?</i></p> <p>SA question: Help address the local need for affordable housing?</p> |
| <p>Not relevant to preliminary strategic housing site selection.</p> |
| <p>All sites allocated for housing would in principle contribute to meeting affordable housing needs, subject to confirmation that provision would be viable. Factors likely to generate significant abnormal costs include contamination, site clearance, difficult access, and redressing major infrastructure deficits. To be updated with future viability study evidence. This criterion is more relevant for housing policies and site policies.</p> |

| |
|---|
| <p>Objective 1 - Meeting Housing Needs Does the site/policy/proposal:</p> <p><i>Appraisal criterion 1C - Provide appropriately for the special accommodation needs of the area including for an ageing population, travellers and the less mobile?</i></p> <p>SA question 1.4: Provide a range and choice of homes accommodation for older people including supported living?</p> <p>SA question 1.5: Enable people to continue to live independently in their homes?</p> <p>SA question 1.6: Provide for the accommodation needs of travellers</p> <p>SA question 1.7: Provide appropriate opportunities for rural and agricultural workers</p> |
| <p>Not relevant to preliminary strategic housing site selection.</p> |
| <p>All sites allocated for housing could in principle contribute to meeting specialist housing needs subject to suitability and viability. These criteria are more relevant for housing policies and site policies.</p> |

Objective 2 – Accessible opportunities, facilities and services**Does the site/policy/proposal:**

Appraisal criterion 2A - Locate new development to relate well to existing settlements, service and employment centres to reduce the need to travel?

SA question 2.1: Located close to a defined town or local centre?

Scoring Basis:

| | |
|----|--|
| ++ | Within 400m of a defined local centre and/or 800m of a town centre |
| + | Within 800m of a defined local centre and/or 2km of a town centre |
| 0 | Within 800m of a defined local centre and 2-4km of a town centre |
| - | Within 4km of a town or local centre |
| -- | >4km from a town or local centre |

Objectively assessed using Geographical Information System (GIS) mapping (the Council GIS data). Linear measurement from nearest edge of local and town centres to the nearest edge of the site (town and local centre boundaries are those defined in the current adopted Local Plan). Judgement-based adjustments were made for the presence of significant barriers such as railway lines. Final criteria scores took account of any amendments put forward (by site promoters) that improved the score. This criterion was given high weighting in the scoring of Objective 2 – it is essential that new development is located within a reasonable distance of shops and other amenities, both to reduce the need to travel and to meet the needs of less mobile residents.

Objective 2 – Accessible opportunities, facilities and services**Does the site/policy/proposal:**

Appraisal criterion 2A - Locate new development to relate well to existing settlements, service and employment centres to reduce the need to travel?

SA question 2.2: Well related to employment opportunities, or provide employment as well as housing?

Scoring Basis:

| | |
|----|--|
| ++ | Significant employment will be provided as part of the development alongside housing |
| + | Employment site (5ha>) or town centre within 800m |
| 0 | Employment site (5ha>) or town centre within 2km |
| - | Employment site (5ha>) or town centre >2km |
| -- | Loss without replacement of a good quality employment site in active use or where is identified need or demand |

Objectively assessed using GIS mapping (the Council GIS data). Linear measurement from nearest edge of employment sites of 5 ha. or more and/or a town centre to the nearest edge of the site (employment sites and town centre boundaries as defined in the current adopted Local Plan). Judgement-based adjustments were made for the presence of significant barriers such as railway lines. Final criteria scores took account of any amendments put forward (by site promoters) that improved the score. This criterion was given medium weighting in the scoring of Objective 2 as the opportunity to work locally is a sustainability benefit but also a matter of personal choice influenced by other considerations.

| Objective 2 – Accessible opportunities, facilities and services | |
|--|---|
| Does the site/policy/proposal: | |
| <i>Appraisal criterion 2B - Provide convenient access to leisure, community and cultural facilities?</i> | |
| <i>SA question 2.3: Located near community facilities?</i> | |
| Scoring Basis: | |
| ++ | Community meeting place or library within 800m |
| + | Community meeting place or library within 2km |
| 0 | Community meeting place or library 2-4km |
| - | Community meeting place or library further than 4km |
| -- | Loss of a community facility in active use without compensatory provision |
| <p>Objectively assessed using GIS mapping (the Council GIS data). Linear measurement from nearest edge of library site and community centre to the nearest edge of the site. Judgement-based adjustments were made for the presence of significant barriers such as railway lines. Final criteria scores took account of any amendments put forward (by site promoters) that improved the score. This criterion was given low weighting in the scoring of Objective 2 as existing patterns of community facilities' provision are subject to review and budget constraints on the one hand, and on the other strategic development provides opportunities to provide new facilities.</p> | |

| Objective 2 – Accessible opportunities, facilities and services | |
|---|---|
| Does the site/policy/proposal: | |
| <i>Appraisal criterion 2C - Benefit from or provide access to schools and early years' child care in the local area?</i> | |
| <i>SA question 2.4: Accessible to an infant / primary school with adequate capacity?</i> | |
| Scoring Basis: | |
| ++ | Scheme delivers additional primary school capacity within 800m |
| + | Within 800m of infant/primary school with capacity |
| 0 | Within 2km of infant/primary school with capacity |
| - | 2-4km from infant/primary school with capacity |
| -- | >4km from infant/primary school with capacity, and/or new school provision required but not delivered by the scheme |
| <p>Objectively assessed using GIS mapping (the Council GIS data). Linear measurement from nearest edge of school sites to the nearest edge of the site. Judgement-based adjustments were made for the presence of significant barriers such as railway lines. Final criteria scores took account of any amendments put forward (by site promoters) that improved the score. This criterion was given medium weighting in the scoring of Objective 2 as parental choice influences decisions about which primary school to attend.</p> | |

| Objective 2 – Accessible opportunities, facilities and services | |
|---|---|
| Does the site/policy/proposal: | |
| <i>Appraisal criterion 2C Benefit from or provide access to schools and early years' child care in the local area?</i> | |
| SA question 2.5: Accessible to a secondary school with adequate capacity? | |
| Scoring Basis: | |
| ++ | Scheme delivers additional secondary school capacity within 2km |
| + | Within 2km of a secondary school with capacity |
| 0 | Within 4km of secondary school with capacity |
| - | >4km from secondary school with capacity |
| -- | New secondary school provision required but not delivered by the scheme |
| Objectively assessed using GIS mapping (the Council GIS data). Linear measurement from nearest edge of school sites to the nearest edge of the site. Judgement-based adjustments were made for the presence of significant barriers such as railway lines. Final criteria scores took account of any amendments put forward (by site promoters) that improved the score. This criterion was given low weighting in the scoring of Objective 2 as parental choice significantly influences decisions about which secondary school to attend. Dialogue with Hampshire County Council provided further evidence with regard to any extra provision that is required and this is reflected in site policies where applicable. | |

| Objective 2 – Accessible opportunities, facilities and services | |
|---|---|
| Does the site/policy/proposal: | |
| <i>Appraisal criterion 2D Benefit from, enhance or provide opportunities for access and movement by sustainable modes of transport (train, bus, bicycle, walking)?</i> | |
| SA question 2.6: Well located to a main public transport route serving a higher order settlement? | |
| Scoring Basis: | |
| ++ | Site development would provide or extend a main bus route to serve the site |
| + | The site would be within 400m of main bus route or within 800m of train station |
| 0 | Within 800m of main bus route or within 1.5km of train station |
| - | More than 800m from a main bus route or 1.5km from a train station |
| -- | More than 2km from a main bus route or 4km from a train station |
| Main bus routes (e.g. an hourly 7 day service connecting to a town or city) and train stations are a snapshot in time and may change during the course of Local Plan production. | |
| Objectively assessed using GIS mapping (the Council GIS data). Linear measurement from nearest edge of the site to the nearest bus route or train station. Judgement-based adjustments were made for the presence of significant barriers such as railway lines. Final criteria scores took account of any amendments put forward (by site promoters) that improved the score. This criterion was given high weighting in the scoring of Objective 2. | |
| Scope exists for sites to improve their rating by appropriate provision or mitigation. | |

| Objective 2 – Accessible opportunities, facilities and services | |
|--|---|
| Does the site/policy/proposal: | |
| <i>Appraisal criterion 2D Benefit from, enhance or provide opportunities for access and movement by sustainable modes of transport (train, bus, bicycle, walking)?</i> | |
| <i>SA question 2.7: Well connected to facilities by footpaths and cycleways?</i> | |
| Scoring Basis: | |
| ++ | Provides enhanced local connectivity to facilities by provision of new surfaced foot and cycle ways |
| + | Is well connected to facilities by existing surfaced footpaths and cycle routes |
| 0 | Has a surfaced footpath connection |
| - | Has an unsurfaced footpath requiring offsite enhancement |
| -- | Has no or limited connections to facilities by footpaths and cycle routes and limited scope to provide them |
| <p>Officer judgement assigned to each site – assessing the existence and condition of footpaths using the Council Ordnance Survey data, HCC Rights of Way, aerial photography and Google Street View. This criterion was given high weighting in the scoring of Objective 2.</p> <p>Scope for sites to improve their rating by appropriate provision and mitigation.</p> | |

| Objective 2 – Accessible opportunities, facilities and services | |
|---|---|
| Does the site/policy/proposal: | |
| <i>Appraisal criterion 2E Provide a suitable connection to the road network (and advisory lorry network for employment use) for the proposed use?</i> | |
| <i>SA question 2.8: Adequately served by highways infrastructure appropriate to the form of development?</i> | |
| Scoring Basis: | |
| ++ | The wider highways network would be significantly enhanced by the development (and/or by related highways mitigation to achieve sufficient capacity). |
| + | The local road network would be enhanced by the development (and/or by related highways mitigation to achieve sufficient capacity). |
| 0 | There is adequate existing highways infrastructure capacity to accommodate the development without significant offsite works. |
| - | Offsite highways infrastructure improvements are required and are unlikely to significantly affect the delivery or viability of the development, but have no wider benefits |
| -- | Substantial improvements to the highways network will be required which are likely to either significantly delay development and/or adversely affect the area. |
| <p>Initial assessment was based on high level transport modelling of the strategic road network with possible scores of 0, - or --. This was updated from Hampshire County Council (HCC) consultation feedback and any site based transport assessments. Local Plan transport and viability assessment and (where provided) site promoter transport assessments informed final SA judgements. This criterion was given high weighting in the scoring of Objective 2.</p> <p>There is scope for sites to improve rating by provision or mitigation that meets the CIL tests of necessity and is viable to implement.</p> | |

| |
|--|
| Objective 2 – Accessible opportunities, facilities and services |
| Does the site/policy/proposal: |
| <i>Appraisal criterion 2F Provide for or improve access using mobile or high speed broadband devices?</i> |
| <i>SA question 2.9: Adequately served by high speed broadband?</i> |
| Not relevant to preliminary strategic housing site selection. |
| The recent agreement by BT Openreach to provide fibre broadband for free to developments of 100+ dwellings means that all strategic sites have the potential to meet this SA objective so it is screened out for preliminary site selection. Openreach recommends developers inform them of a sites' broadband need at the land purchase stage (and at least 9 months before first occupancy). |

| | |
|--|---|
| Objective 3 – Safe and Healthy environments | |
| Does the site/policy/proposal: | |
| <i>Appraisal criterion 3A Provide for safe movement and safe access by vehicle and for cyclists and pedestrians, especially the young and less mobile?</i> | |
| <i>SA question 3.1 Provide safe access to the site including by foot / cycle?</i> | |
| Scoring Basis: | |
| ++ | Development would provide safe vehicular access and significantly enhance wider pedestrian and cycle routes |
| + | Development would provide safe vehicular access and improve local pedestrian or cycle access |
| ?+ | Appears to have or be able to provide safe and suitable site access |
| 0 | The site is adequately served by existing pedestrian and cycle access |
| ?- | Requires offsite mitigation to achieve safe site access |
| - | Safe vehicular access, but lacking suitable provision for access by foot or on cycle |
| -- | Safe vehicular, pedestrian and cycle access cannot be achieved |
| Assessment based on officer judgement assessing the existence and condition of access points using the Council Ordnance Survey data, aerial photography and Google Street View. This criterion was given high weighting in the scoring of Objective 3. | |
| Scope for sites to change category by masterplanning provision or mitigation. Site promoter transport assessments and access proposals (where received) and consultation with HCC as Highways Authority informed final SA judgements. | |

| Objective 3 – Safe and Healthy environments | |
|---|--|
| Does the site/policy/proposal: | |
| <i>Appraisal criterion 3B Ensure that potentially hazardous activities are appropriately located and managed, and to avoid locating sensitive uses where they would be adversely affected by safety hazards or pollution?</i> | |
| <i>SA question 3.2: Significantly affected by existing levels of pollution or a hazardous or polluting activity or installation?</i> | |
| Scoring Basis: | |
| ++ | Development would remove or reduce to acceptable levels a significant health or safety hazard, without compromising a business use or infrastructure of strategic significance |
| + | Site unaffected by safety or pollution hazards |
| 0 | Safety or pollution hazards that can be borne or mitigated without constraining development |
| - | Site affected by safety or pollution hazards that will limit or constrain development despite mitigation |
| -- | Site affected by safety or pollution hazards that rule out housing development |
| Part factual / part officer judgement, assessment based on the presence of HSE and MoD blast zones, gas and oil pipelines, overhead pylons, activities generating significant noise/light/odour/air pollution including Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs), dust, and potentially contaminated land or water bodies. This criterion was given high weighting in the scoring of Objective 3. | |
| Issues affecting a site are noted to inform consideration of potential mitigation (where possible). | |

| Objective 3 – Safe and Healthy environments | |
|---|--|
| Does the site/policy/proposal: | |
| <i>Appraisal criterion 3C Protect and where possible improve air quality</i> | |
| <i>SA question 3.3: Protect and where possible improve air quality.</i> | |
| Not relevant to preliminary strategic housing site selection. | |
| Relevant for site policy and implementation but not for strategic housing site selection stage. | |

| Objective 3 – Safe and Healthy environments | |
|--|--|
| Does the site/policy/proposal: | |
| <i>Appraisal criterion 3D Promote and contribute to personal safety and security in developments and in the public realm to help reduce crime and the fear of crime?</i> | |
| <i>Criterion 3.4: Achieve or improve personal and public safety and security.</i> | |
| Not relevant to preliminary strategic housing site selection. | |
| Relevant for site policy and implementation but not for strategic housing site selection stage. | |

| Objective 4 – A Thriving Economy | |
|--|--|
| Does the site/policy/proposal: | |
| <i>Appraisal criterion 4A Support businesses to start, grow and adapt to serve local markets and target wider opportunities.</i> | |
| <i>SA question 4.1: Protect viable business uses on designated business sites and in other appropriate locations?</i> | |
| Scoring Basis: | |
| ++ | Enhances a business use in an appropriate location |
| + | Retains a viable business in an appropriate location |
| 0 | No effect or not relevant |
| - | Relocation of a viable business without enhancement |
| -- | Loss of a viable business in an appropriate location |
| Will not be applicable at strategic site selections stage for green field locations except where development would appear to result in the loss of a viable business - each site checked by officer judgement. Loss of an apparently viable business would result in a low score for the site. | |

| Objective 4 – A Thriving Economy | |
|---|--|
| Does the site/policy/proposal: | |
| <i>Appraisal criterion 4B Support the vitality and viability of town, district and service centres?</i> | |
| <i>SA question 4.3: Protect commercial sites and premises in town and local centres in viable use or suitable to meet identified needs?</i> | |
| Not relevant to preliminary strategic housing site selection. | |
| Not applicable at strategic site selection stage (all green field locations). | |

| Objective 5 – Protecting Biodiversity and Wildlife | |
|---|---|
| Does the site/policy/proposal: | |
| <i>Appraisal criterion 5A Protect and where possible enhance biodiversity and designated nature conservation sites (international, national and local), Ancient Woodlands and Priority Habitats and Species?</i> | |
| <i>Criterion 5.1: Have an adverse, neutral or beneficial effect on an internationally designated Natura 2000 conservation site?</i> | |
| Scoring Basis: | |
| ++ | Site is >2km from a Natura site |
| + | Site is >800m from a Natura site |
| 0 | Site is 400-800m from a Natura site |
| - | Site is within 400m of a Natura 2000 site |
| -- | Site is a Natura 2000 site in whole or part, or is within 400m of the New Forest SPA/SAC. |
| Objectively assessed using GIS mapping (the Council GIS data). Linear measurement from nearest edge of the site to the nearest edge of any Natura 2000 site with comments added if appropriate, taking into account any strong barriers like railway lines or rivers, or whether the area between the site and Natura site is already developed or includes significant barriers to access. (i.e. would reduce the access to recreation areas in the Natura 2000 sites). This criterion was given high weighting in the scoring of Objective 5. | |
| Following discussions with Natural England housing development is judged unsustainable on sites or parts of sites within 400m of the New Forest SPA and SAC (although we make allowance if there are significant existing built up areas within the 400m buffer between the land parcel and the SPA / SAC area). This is reflected in the 'red' unsustainable score above. 400m is a general housing exclusion zone applied to the Thames Basin Heaths and Dorset Heaths to help manage pet predation risks to ground nesting birds. Land within 400m may be suitable for recreational mitigation or open space subject to masterplanning. | |

| Objective 5 – Protecting Biodiversity and Wildlife | |
|---|--|
| Does the site/policy/proposal: | |
| Appraisal criterion 5A Protect and where possible enhance biodiversity and designated nature conservation sites (international, national and local), Ancient Woodlands and Priority Habitats and Species? | |
| <i>SA question 5.2 Have an adverse, neutral or beneficial effect on a Site of Special Scientific Interest (that is not also designated as a Natura site)?</i> | |
| Scoring Basis: | |
| ++ | Site is >800m from a SSSI that is not a Natura site |
| + | Site is 400-800m from a SSSI that is not a Natura site |
| 0 | The site is within 400m of an SSSI that is not a Natura site |
| - | The site is within 50m of an SSSI that is not a Natura site |
| -- | The site is an SSSI in whole or part (and not a Natura site) |
| <p>Objectively assessed using GIS mapping (the Council GIS data). Linear measurement from nearest edge of the site to the nearest edge of a SSSI site with comments added if appropriate, taking into account any strong barriers like railway lines or rivers, or whether the area between the site and the SSSI is already developed or includes significant barriers to access (i.e. would reduce the access to recreation areas in the SSSI). This criterion was given high weighting in the scoring of Objective 5.</p> <p>For planning applications, where the SSSI is not a Natura 2000 site, Natural England's <i>Impact Risk Zones</i> should be used to help identify potential threats to the SSSI site.</p> | |

| Objective 5 – Protecting Biodiversity and Wildlife | |
|---|---|
| Does the site/policy/proposal: | |
| Appraisal criterion 5A Protect and where possible enhance biodiversity and designated nature conservation sites (international, national and local), Ancient Woodlands and Priority Habitats and Species? | |
| <i>SA question 5.3: Have an adverse, neutral or beneficial effect on a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC), Ancient Woodlands, protected species, Priority or other habitats of nature conservation value?</i> | |
| Scoring Basis: | |
| ++ | Development design would protect or enhance a SINC or Ancient Woodland and/or or fully safeguard protected species onsite |
| + | Development design would protect or enhance non-designated areas or features of habitat/ nature conservation value |
| 0 | Not applicable or no/neutral impact |
| - | Development would harm non-designated areas or features of habitat/ nature conservation value |
| -- | Development would adversely impact on a SINC, Ancient Woodland or protected species |
| <p>Part factual / part officer judgement, based on an assessment of each site for the presence of SINC (using GIS mapping: the Council / Hampshire HBIC GIS data). Hampshire Biodiversity Information Centre Priority Habitat Mapping work identifies other potential areas. Non-SINC features considered include areas of woodland, hedgerows, water courses and ponds. This criterion was given high weighting in the scoring of Objective 5. Possible enhancement could include joining up areas of habitat - are there priority habitats/SINC immediately adjacent to the site which presents opportunities to enhance, as part of development?</p> <p>Where impacts are currently uncertain these are used to inform site policies and masterplans. There is scope to improve rating by effective site masterplanning.</p> | |

| Objective 5 – Protecting Biodiversity and Wildlife | |
|--|--|
| Does the site/policy/proposal: | |
| Appraisal criterion 5B Avoid, limit or mitigate recreational or other pressures on designated Natura 2000 sites? | |
| <i>SA question 5.4: Adequately mitigate potential recreational impacts on the New Forest SPA and SAC and/or Solent Ramsar sites?</i> | |
| Scoring Basis: | |
| ++ | Site includes recreational mitigation on or adjoining the site significantly above the required standard. |
| + | Site includes full provision to the required standard to mitigate recreational impacts on or adjoining the site, or appears capable of sufficient onsite mitigation. |
| 0 | Site includes contractually confirmed onsite mitigation to the required standard and in an appropriate location relative to the site |
| - | Mitigation measures provided are below the required standard (in terms of location, quantity or quality), or does not appear capable of sufficient onsite mitigation |
| -- | No confirmed mitigation measures in place |
| <p>Part factual / part officer judgement, based on an assessment of each site. This is based on an appropriate mitigation approach agreed with Natural England based on whether the site appears capable of sufficient mitigation at current standard of 8 ha per 1000 population (allowing 2.5 ha per 100 homes for mitigation and open space).</p> <p>The assessment standard requires a land area of at least 5ha (for urban edge sites) and more typically 6.5ha (for more rural and village edge sites). Mitigation land must under the control of the site promoter, on-site or in the immediate vicinity and open in nature (i.e. wooded land is not suitable, and if the majority is woodland then it is deemed that it will to stay in situ and therefore no open land is available for mitigation). This criterion is given high weighting in the scoring of Objective 5.</p> <p>Scope to further improve ratings through site design (by site promoters), was considered at site policy / masterplan stage.</p> | |

| Objective 5 - Protecting Biodiversity and Wildlife | |
|---|--|
| Does the site/policy/proposal: | |
| Appraisal criterion 5C Maintain and enhance biodiversity and provide opportunities to create or join up habitats? | |
| <i>SA question 5.5: Create, enhance or connect areas of local habitat and biodiversity value?</i> | |
| Not relevant to preliminary strategic housing site selection. | |
| Relevant for site policy and implementation but not for site selection - to be appraised at site policy / masterplan stage. | |

| Objective 6 – Accessible Green Space, Coast and Water Bodies | |
|--|--|
| Does the site/policy/proposal: | |
| Appraisal criterion 6A Protect open space and ensure development benefits from and/or provides sufficient outdoor play facilities and public open space for informal recreation? | |
| SA question 6.1: Provide or be located near Public Open Space (POS)? | |
| Scoring Basis: | |
| ++ | Scope for provision of public open space to the policy standard including 0.25ha+ onsite informal public open space and nearest informal POS is within 600m |
| + | Scope for provision of public open space to the policy standard including 0.25ha+ onsite informal open space where the nearest informal POS is more than 600m away |
| 0 | No scope for provision of public open space on site but existing informal POS provision of at least 0.25ha is within 600m |
| - | No scope for provision of public open space on site and existing informal POS provision of at least 0.25ha is more than 600m away |
| -- | Loss of accessible informal public open space without alternative provision |
| Objective assessment of compliance to policy standard based on whether there is likely to be 2.5 ha of land per 100 units available for Green Infrastructure, public open space and mitigation. The informal open space element is defined as an amalgam of land such as 'amenity open space' and 'natural greenspace' and 'parks and gardens'. | |
| Final SA site scores are based on updated council open space deficiency mapping, building on existing assessments and <i>Fields in Trust</i> provision standards. This criterion was given low weighting in the scoring of Objective 6 as we assume suitable provision will be required by policy and can be delivered as part of the site development. Scope to improve SA score through site design. | |

| Objective 6 – Accessible Green Space, Coast and Water Bodies | |
|--|---|
| Does the site/policy/proposal: | |
| Appraisal criterion 6B Protect outdoor sports facilities and ensure development benefits from and/or provides sufficient local opportunities for outdoor sports | |
| SA question 6.2: Provide or contribute to the provision of outdoor sports facilities? | |
| Scoring Basis: | |
| ++ | Onsite provision of outdoor sports facilities fully meeting identified needs |
| + | Needs met by some onsite provision of outdoor sports facilities together with existing provision within 1200m |
| 0 | Adequate existing provision within 1200m |
| - | Offsite contribution to help meet identified formal open space needs |
| -- | No contribution for formal open space |
| Objective assessment based on whether there is likely to be 2.5 ha of land per 100 units available for Green Infrastructure, public open space and mitigation. If there is a baseline excess of formal open space provision, additional housing and reduced open space may be possible. The 1200m distance is based on <i>Fields in Trust</i> guidance. Requires assessment of baseline level of provision to establish any net additional requirement for onsite provision. This criterion was given low weighting in the scoring of Objective 6. | |

| Objective 6 – Accessible Green Space, Coast and Water Bodies | |
|---|---|
| Does the site/policy/proposal: | |
| <i>Appraisal criterion 6C Protect and where possible enhance natural and semi natural open spaces, water bodies and features of green infrastructure value.</i> | |
| SA question 6.3: Have an adverse, neutral or beneficial effect on TPO trees and protected hedgerows? | |
| Scoring Basis: | |
| ++ | GI value of TPO trees and protected hedgerows enhanced e.g. by the site masterplan |
| + | TPO trees and protected hedgerows safeguarded |
| 0 | Not applicable or no/neutral effect |
| ? | TPO trees/protected hedgerows present, potential for harm but scope for enhancement at masterplan stage |
| - | Loss of TPO trees and/or hedgerows offset by mitigation |
| -- | Unmitigated loss of TPO trees and/or protected hedgerows |
| Objective site appraisal based on the presence of features of Green Infrastructure value – which should be noted for future detailed assessment at masterplan stage. Greenfield sites may contain features that should be retained for their future Green Infrastructure value. This criterion was given low weighting in the scoring of Objective 6. | |
| Scope to improve SA score through site design. | |

| Objective 6 – Accessible Green Space, Coast and Water Bodies | |
|---|--|
| Does the site/policy/proposal: | |
| <i>Appraisal criterion 6C Protect and where possible enhance natural and semi natural open spaces, water bodies and features of green infrastructure value.</i> | |
| SA question 6.4: Have an adverse, neutral or beneficial effect on natural and semi natural open spaces, water bodies and networks of them? | |
| Not relevant to preliminary strategic housing site selection. | |
| Relevant at site policy and implementation stage. | |

| Objective 6 – Accessible Green Space, Coast and Water Bodies | |
|--|---|
| Does the site/policy/proposal: | |
| <i>Appraisal criterion 6D Enable public enjoyment of the countryside, coast and water bodies within environmental constraints?</i> | |
| SA question 6.5: Have an adverse, neutral or beneficial effect on rights of way (PROW) or public foot paths providing access to the coast, water bodies or the countryside? | |
| Scoring Basis: | |
| ++ | Access to the coast, waterways or countryside enhanced e.g. by the site masterplan |
| + | Access to the coast, waterways or countryside safeguarded |
| 0 | Not applicable or no/neutral effect |
| ? | PROWs/footpaths present, potential for harm but scope for enhancement at masterplan stage |
| - | Reduced access to the coast, waterways or countryside offset by mitigation |
| -- | Unmitigated loss of access to the coast, waterways or countryside |
| GIS data used on existing HCC Rights of Way, bridleways, byways and other footpaths. Sites may have footpaths and Public Rights of Way (PROW) that should be retained and where possible enhanced for their future amenity, access and mitigation value. | |
| This criterion was given low weighting in the scoring of Objective 6 as we assume that appropriate arrangements can be secured at masterplan stage to remove or mitigate the potential for loss or harm from site development. | |

| Objective 7 – Protecting Townscape and Landscape | |
|---|---|
| Does the site/policy/proposal: | |
| Appraisal criterion 7A Maintain and where possible enhance local distinctiveness, townscape and the public realm? | |
| <i>SA question 7.1: Would residential development have a potentially adverse, neutral or positive impact on locally important views, setting or identified features?</i> | |
| Scoring Basis: | |
| ++ | Significant positive impact on views and/or setting |
| + | Positive impact on views and/or setting |
| 0 | Low or no impact |
| - | Harmful impact on views and/or setting |
| -- | Loss of or significant harm to an important view or setting |
| <p>Settlement edges and areas of emerging potential for housing were assessed through site visits, GIS and online photography alongside preparation of a <i>Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Study</i> by the Councils Landscape officer. Site promoter assessments and solutions (where received) informed final SA judgements. Elsewhere an assessment of + or - was made by officers using existing landscape assessments, Google aerial photography, Street View and Bing Maps to assess the use and character of land and the extent to which potential development would be visually prominent or erode important views or settings. This criterion was given medium weighting in the scoring of Objective 7.</p> | |

| Objective 7 – Protecting Townscape and Landscape | |
|---|--|
| Does the site/policy/proposal: | |
| Appraisal criterion 7A Maintain and where possible enhance local distinctiveness, townscape and the public realm? | |
| <i>SA question 7.2: Would residential development conserve and enhance the intrinsic and landscape / townscape / seascape character of the locality?</i> | |
| Scoring Basis: | |
| ++ | Enhances the sense of physical and visual separation |
| + | Maintains the sense of physical and visual separation |
| 0 | Impact not significant or not applicable |
| ?- | Likely to significantly diminish the sense of physical and visual separation |
| - | Significantly diminishes the sense of physical and visual separation |
| -- | Proposal physically merges neighbouring settlements |
| <p>Settlement edges and areas of emerging potential for housing were assessed through site visits, GIS and online photography alongside preparation of a <i>Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Study</i> by the Councils Landscape officer. Elsewhere an interim assessment of + or - was made by officers using Google aerial photography, Street View and Bing Maps to assess the extent to which potential development would be visually prominent or erode important settlement gaps.</p> <p>Full assessment requires masterplanning information and there was scope for sites to change rating by good design and/or mitigation - site promoter assessments and solutions (where received) informed final SA judgements.</p> | |

| |
|--|
| Objective 7 – Protecting Townscape and Landscape |
| Does the site/policy/proposal: |
| <i>Appraisal criterion 7A Maintain and where possible enhance local distinctiveness, townscape and the public realm?</i> |
| <i>SA question 7.3: Help secure development of high quality design appropriate to its setting and context?</i> |
| Not relevant to preliminary strategic housing site selection. |
| Relevant at site policy and implementation stage. |

| | |
|---|---|
| Objective 7 – Protecting Townscape and Landscape | |
| Does the site/policy/proposal: | |
| <i>Appraisal criterion 7B Safeguard the setting and purposes of the New Forest National Park and the setting of the Cranborne Chase AONB?</i> | |
| <i>SA question 7.4: Safeguard the setting and purposes of the New Forest National Park and the setting of the Cranborne Chase AONB?</i> | |
| Scoring Basis: | |
| ++ | Significant positive impact on the setting of the National Park or landscape character of the AONB. |
| + | Positive impact on the setting of the National Park or landscape character of the AONB. |
| 0 | No or neutral impact or not applicable |
| - | Harm to the setting of the National Park or the landscape character of the AONB acceptably mitigated |
| -- | Harm to the setting of the National Park or the landscape character of the AONB that it is not possible to adequately mitigate. |
| <p>Direct site visits and officer judgement by the Councils Landscape Architect was assigned to the strategic sites via a <i>Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Study</i>, to enable an initial assessment. This criterion was given high weighting in the scoring of Objective 7. For non-strategic sites, an assessment is based on visual extent of gap infill and the use and ground cover of land being assessed using Google Street View and Bing Maps. Full assessment requires masterplanning information. There was scope for sites to change criteria scoring by good design and/or mitigation - site promoter assessments and solutions (where received) have informed final SA judgements.</p> <p>Further consultation with NFNPA and AONB Management Board will be required where necessary.</p> | |

| Objective 7 – Protecting Townscape and Landscape | |
|--|--|
| Does the site/policy/proposal: | |
| <i>Appraisal criterion 7C Protect and where possible enhance the intrinsic character and beauty of the general countryside and coast?</i> | |
| <i>SA question 7.5 Protect and where possible enhance the intrinsic character and beauty of the general countryside and coast?</i> | |
| Scoring Basis: | |
| ++ | Landscape improvement to an area of low value or degraded landscape visible from a wider area |
| + | Landscape improvement to an area of low value or degraded landscape not visible from a wide area |
| 0 | No or neutral impact or not applicable |
| - | Harm to a site or area of high landscape value acceptably mitigated |
| -- | Loss of or harm to an area of high landscape value that it is not possible to adequately mitigate. |
| Settlement edges and areas of emerging potential for housing were assessed through site visits, GIS and online photography alongside preparation of a <i>Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Study</i> by the Councils Landscape officer. Elsewhere an assessment of + or – has been made by officers using existing landscape assessments, Google aerial photography, Street View and Bing Maps to assess the use and character of land and the landscape. | |
| Full assessment requires masterplanning information. There was scope for sites to change rating by good design and/or mitigation - site promoter assessments and solutions (where received) informed the final SA judgements. | |

| Objective 7 – Protecting Townscape and Landscape | |
|---|--|
| Does the site/policy/proposal: | |
| <i>Appraisal criterion 7D Conserve and/or manage important geological sites and features?</i> | |
| <i>SA question 7.6: Conserve and/or manage important geological sites and features?</i> | |
| Not relevant to preliminary strategic housing site selection. | |
| Relevant for site policy and implementation but not for site selection. | |

| Objective 7 – Protecting Townscape and Landscape | |
|---|--|
| Does the site/policy/proposal: | |
| <i>Appraisal criterion 7E Protect and where possible enhance the beneficial use of land that meets the statutory purposes of Green Belt?</i> | |
| <i>SA question 7.7: Have an adverse, neutral or beneficial effect on land in Green Belt that continues to serve the statutory purposes of Green Belt?</i> | |
| Scoring Basis: | |
| ++ | Significantly enhances Green Belt land to better meet the purposes of Green Belt |
| + | Moderately enhances Green Belt land to better meet the purposes of Green Belt |
| 0 | Not applicable or affects Green Belt land that weakly meets the purposes of Green Belt |
| - | Potential loss of Green Belt land that moderately meets the purposes of Green Belt |
| -- | Potential loss of Green Belt land that strongly meets the purposes of Green Belt |
| The independent Green Belt study was used to provide an objective appraisal as to what extent each site within the Green Belt contributes to the five purposes of Green Belt as set out in paragraph 80 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). Chapter 8 provides a SA of scenarios for the protection or use of some Green Belt land, which has been used to inform the spatial strategy. | |

| Objective 7 – Protecting Townscape and Landscape | |
|---|--|
| Does the site/policy/proposal: | |
| Appraisal criterion 7F Protect identified tranquil areas and areas of dark night skies? | |
| <i>SA question 7.8 Have an adverse, neutral or beneficial effect on identified tranquil areas and areas of identified dark night skies?</i> | |
| Scoring Basis: | |
| ++ | Development would remove or substantially reduce a significant noise or light disturbance affecting in an identified tranquil area or area of dark skies respectively |
| + | Development would reduce to a less harmful level existing noise or light pollution in an identified tranquil area or area of dark skies respectively |
| 0 | No impact or not relevant |
| - | Site is in a tranquil/dark skies area and impact may be harmful |
| -- | Development would introduce significant noise or light disturbance in an identified tranquil area or area of dark skies that it is not possible to adequately mitigate |
| <p>Mostly objectively assessed using mapping data from New Forest National Park Authority and the Council for the Protection of Rural England (CPRE) with some officer judgment applied in relation to other possible light disturbance. Tranquil areas are as defined by either or both of the CPRE map of tranquil areas and mapping work of tranquil areas by the New Forest National Park Authority.</p> <p>The Council used tranquillity areas for its SA appraisal but also considered possible light disturbance within them. Towards the end of the examination into the Local Plan the AONB was designated as an International Dark Sky Reserve.</p> <p>This criterion was given high weighting in the scoring of Objective 7. Site based ratings could be improved with appropriate design or mitigation.</p> | |

| Objective 8 – Conserving Heritage | |
|---|--|
| Does the site/policy/proposal: | |
| Appraisal criterion 8A Conserve, manage and enhance historic buildings, sites, features, places, areas and landscapes, and where appropriate improve public access to them? | |
| <i>SA question 8.1: Have an adverse, neutral or beneficial effect on listed buildings, conservation areas, historic parks and gardens, scheduled monuments and archaeological areas (including non-scheduled archaeological remains of demonstrably equivalent significance to scheduled monuments); and their settings?</i> | |
| Scoring Basis: | |
| ++ | Protect or safeguard a designated heritage asset identified to be at risk |
| + | Enhance a designated heritage asset or appropriate public access to it |
| 0 | No impact or not relevant |
| ?- | May adversely affect a designated heritage asset unless mitigated |
| -- | Significant harm to or loss of a designated heritage asset that it is not possible to adequately mitigate. |
| <p>Assessment based on officer judgement and the presence of known Heritage Assets (listed buildings, conservation areas, historic parks and gardens, scheduled monuments and archaeological areas, including non-scheduled archaeological remains of demonstrably equivalent significance to scheduled monuments). This criterion was given medium weighting in the scoring of Objective 8.</p> <p>Full assessment requires masterplanning information. There was scope for sites to change category by good design and/or mitigation.</p> | |

| Objective 8 – Conserving Heritage | |
|--|--|
| Does the site/policy/proposal: | |
| <i>Appraisal criterion 8A Conserve, manage and enhance historic buildings, sites, features, places, areas and landscapes, and where appropriate improve public access to them?</i> | |
| SA question 8.2 Have an adverse, neutral or beneficial effect on a non-designated heritage asset or other non-scheduled archaeological remains? | |
| Not relevant to preliminary strategic housing site selection. | |
| Relevant for site policy and implementation but not for site selection. | |

| Objective 9 – Sustainable Natural Resources | |
|--|--|
| Does the site/policy/proposal: | |
| <i>Appraisal criterion 9A Protect soil quality and the best and most versatile agricultural land?</i> | |
| SA question 9.1 Have an adverse, neutral or beneficial effect on higher grade agricultural land? | |
| Scoring Basis: | |
| ++ | Restores grade 1-2 land to beneficial agricultural use |
| + | Restores grade 3a-3b land to beneficial agricultural use |
| 0 | Loss of lower quality agricultural land (Grades 4, or 5) |
| - | Loss of medium quality agricultural land (Grades 3a or 3b) |
| -- | Loss of high quality agricultural land (BMV Grades 1 or 2) |
| Objective assessment based on which grade of agricultural land the site covers. This criterion was given low weighting in the scoring of Objective 9. Scores of '+' or '++' may be possible by offsite mitigation which bring about an improvement in the grade of adjacent agricultural land. This criterion was given low weighting in the scoring of Objective 9. | |
| It is noted that 3a is also Best and Most Versatile Land (BMV) quality, but it has not been possible for the council to distinguish between 3a and 3b (lack of data). In order to distinguish between Grade 3 and Grade 1 and 2, we have given Grade 3 a negative score for the purposes of the SA. | |

| Objective 9 – Sustainable Natural Resources | |
|--|---|
| Does the site/policy/proposal: | |
| <i>Appraisal criterion 9B Ensure sufficient water supply, protect water sources and water bodies, and maintain and where possible enhance water quality and water use efficiency?</i> | |
| SA question 9.2 Have an adverse, neutral or beneficial effect on a Groundwater Source Protection Zone? | |
| Scoring Basis: | |
| ++ | Removes or significantly reduces a pollution risk use in groundwater SPZ1 |
| + | Removes or significantly reduces a pollution risk use in groundwater SPZ2 |
| 0 | Sites is not in SPZ 1 or 2 |
| - | Site is all or mainly in groundwater SPZ2 |
| -- | Site is all or mainly in groundwater SPZ1 |
| Objective assessment based on the presence of Environment Agency <i>Groundwater Source Protection Zones</i> using Environment Agency derived mapping. Source Protection Zones (SPZs) have been defined for groundwater sources such as wells, boreholes and springs used for public drinking water supply. These zones show the risk of contamination from any activities that might cause pollution in the area. The mapping denotes three main zones (inner, outer and total catchment). The initial site assessments were able to yield scores of '0', '-' and '--'. Scores of '+' and '++' required the presence of actual or potential pollution risk and steps to reduce or remove it confirmed by masterplanning and related technical work with site promoters and statutory bodies. | |
| This criterion was given high weighting in the scoring of Objective 9. | |

| |
|---|
| Objective 9 – Sustainable Natural Resources |
| Does the site/policy/proposal: |
| <i>Appraisal criterion 9B Ensure sufficient water supply, protect water sources and water bodies, and maintain and where possible enhance water quality and water use efficiency?</i> |
| <i>SA question 9.3 Have or provide sufficient waste water network and treatment capacity?</i> |
| Not relevant to preliminary strategic housing site selection. |
| This was not scored in the interim SA Sites Assessment (2016). |
| As an interim position we assumed these matters were capable of satisfactory resolution pending further work through ongoing consultation with Hampshire County Council, Natural England, Environment Agency and the water companies. Subsequent work with these authorities brought to light an issue regarding water quality on the River Avon and in the Solent and Southampton Water. |

| |
|---|
| Objective 9 – Sustainable Natural Resources |
| Does the site/policy/proposal: |
| <i>Appraisal criterion 9B Ensure sufficient water supply, protect water sources and water bodies, and maintain and where possible enhance water quality and water use efficiency?</i> |
| <i>SA question 9.3B Include surface water management techniques that could affect the quality of any nearby open water bodies?</i> |
| Not relevant to preliminary strategic housing site selection. |
| Relevant for site policy and implementation but not for site selection. |

| |
|---|
| Objective 9 – Sustainable Natural Resources |
| Does the site/policy/proposal: |
| <i>Appraisal criterion 9B Ensure sufficient water supply, protect water sources and water bodies, and maintain and where possible enhance water quality and water use efficiency?</i> |
| <i>SA question 9.4 Have or provide sufficient water supply for planned growth?</i> |
| Not relevant to preliminary strategic housing site selection. |
| Relevant for site policy and implementation but not for site selection. There is ongoing consultation with Environment Agency and the water companies on this matter. |

| | |
|---|---|
| Objective 9 – Sustainable Natural Resources | |
| Does the site/policy/proposal: | |
| <i>Appraisal criterion 9C Encourage the beneficial re-use of previously developed land, redundant buildings and the restoration of contaminated or degraded land?</i> | |
| <i>SA question 9.5 Bring derelict, contaminated, redundant or previously developed land or buildings back into beneficial use?</i> | |
| Scoring Basis: | |
| ++ | Restores contaminated land to beneficial use |
| + | Restores or reuses previously developed land or redundant buildings |
| 0 | Not applicable |
| - | Contamination is a development risk unless remediated |
| -- | Development poses an unacceptable risk of releasing contained contamination |
| Objective assessment based on Environmental Health land contamination records. Where risks are identified Environmental Health was consulted regarding scope for viable risk containment or land restoration. A full assessment will require details of proposed development and land survey by site promoters. There was scope for sites to change category by remediation and/or mitigation. This criterion was given high weighting in the scoring of Objective 9. | |

| Objective 9 – Sustainable Natural Resources | |
|--|---|
| Does the site/policy/proposal: | |
| <i>Appraisal criterion 9D Enable the sustainable extraction of safeguarded and workable mineral resources?</i> | |
| SA question 9.6 Have an adverse, neutral or beneficial effect on a safeguarded mineral resource or facility? | |
| Scoring Basis: | |
| ++ | Enables the extraction of a safeguarded mineral resource in a viable and appropriate location for extraction |
| + | Protects the future extraction of a safeguarded mineral resource in a location appropriate for extraction |
| 0 | No effect, not relevant or minerals not workable |
| - | Jeopardises or complicates the extraction of safeguarded minerals in a location appropriate for extraction |
| -- | Curtails or sterilises the extraction of a safeguarded mineral resource in a viable and appropriate location for extraction |
| Resource potential assessed using Hampshire County Council Minerals Safeguarding areas and supplemented by site promoter mineral surveys where appropriate. Suitability for extraction based on evidence of active working on or adjacent to the site or site acquisition for mineral working, in consultation with Hampshire County Council (HCC). Where strategic sites were deemed to jeopardise or complicate the extraction of safeguarded minerals HCC as Minerals & Waste authority has provided opinion on the potential for extraction opportunity and whether the working of those sites is likely to be significantly harmful to the environment, public safety or residential amenity (including HGV access). This criterion was given medium weighting in the scoring of Objective 9. | |

| Objective 10 – Managing Climate Change | |
|---|--|
| Does the site/policy/proposal: | |
| <i>Appraisal criterion 10A Locate development to help limit the emission of greenhouse gases by minimising the need to travel by private vehicle?</i> | |
| SA question 10.1 Reduce the need to travel by being conveniently accessible by public transport, cycling and walking? | |
| Scoring Basis: | |
| ++ | Combined score +5 to +8 for access to facilities and by sustainable transport modes (criteria 2A and 2D) |
| + | Combined score +2 to 4+ for access to facilities and by sustainable transport modes (criteria 2A and 2D) |
| 0 | Combined score -1 to +1 for access to facilities and by sustainable transport modes (criteria 2A and 2D) |
| - | Combined score -4 to -2 for access to facilities and by sustainable transport modes (criteria 2A and 2D) |
| -- | Combined score -8 to -5 for access to facilities and by sustainable transport modes (criteria 2A and 2D) |
| Assessment by combining the ratings for criteria 2A and 2D as a proxy for minimising the need to travel by private car. The four SA questions (2.1 and 2.2 / 2.6 and 2.7) give a scoring range of '8+' to '8-'. This criterion was given high weighting in the scoring of Objective 10. | |

| Objective 10 – Managing Climate Change | |
|---|--|
| Does the site/policy/proposal: | |
| <i>Appraisal criterion 10B Encourage energy and resource efficiency and climate change resilience in the siting, construction and adaptability of development?</i> | |
| SA question 10.2 Encourage energy and resource efficiency and climate change resilience in the siting, construction and adaptability of development? | |
| Not relevant to preliminary strategic housing site selection. | |
| Relevant for site policy and implementation but not for site selection. | |

| Objective 10 – Managing Climate Change | |
|---|--|
| Does the site/policy/proposal: | |
| Appraisal criterion 10C Encourage microgeneration and renewable and community-based energy projects in environmentally and visually appropriate locations? | |
| SA question 10.3: Encourage microgeneration and renewable and community-based energy projects in environmentally and visually appropriate locations? | |
| Not relevant to preliminary strategic housing site selection. | |
| Relevant for site policy and implementation but not for site selection. | |

| Objective 10 – Managing Climate Change | |
|--|---|
| Does the site/policy/proposal: | |
| Appraisal criterion 10D Avoid, reduce or manage the risk to people and property from flooding and erosion, taking into account the likely effects of climate change? | |
| SA question 10.4: At risk from flooding or coastal erosion (taking into account climate change)? | |
| Scoring Basis: | |
| ++ | Site FZ1 with no known flood risk issues and development could reduce or resolve flood risks over a wider area, and not in a CCMA |
| + | Site FZ1 and development would reduce flood risk elsewhere arising from this site, and not in a CCMA |
| 0 | Site in FZ1 with no other known flood risk issues, and not in a CCMA |
| - | Site FZ1 but with known issues of groundwater, drain or surface flooding, or where development could worsen flooding off-site or destabilise land |
| -- | Site in FZ 2 or 3, or the majority affected by significant ground, drain or surface water flooding, or in a CCMA |
| <p>FZ1,2,3 = Flood Risk Zone 1, 2, and 3 (incorporating 3a and 3b). CCMA = Coastal Change Management Area (adopted Local Plan Part 2)</p> <p>Objective assessment based on the councils Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (Level 1), and Environment Agency risk mapping (flood risk mapping Zones 1, 2 and 3 and EA surface water flood risk mapping); and adopted Local Plan Climate Change Management Area. The SFRA data provides up to date information on risks from ground water, ordinary watercourses, drains and sewers.</p> <p>Sites wholly or predominantly within FZ 2 and 3 were screened out as <i>critical criteria</i> failures and not assessed further.</p> <p>There was scope for site ratings to be improved by mitigation including SUDs. Land at flood risk was still potentially suitable for open space, SUDs or SANGs within a wider development (and where required strategic sites were assessed in the councils Level 2 SFRA). This criterion was given high weighting in the scoring of Objective 10.</p> | |

Appendix 3**Table A3.1: Sites screened out under Critical Criteria**

The following table lists the sites that have failed the SA assessment under the critical criteria.

| Site Ref | Location | Summary of Nature Conservation / Exclusion Zones | Summary of Flood Risk |
|----------|----------------------|---|--------------------------|
| B002 | Breamore | | Surface Water Flood Risk |
| B007 | Breamore (north of) | SINC designations in the southern half of the site. | Flood Zone 3 |
| BS004 | Bransgore | | Flood Zone 3 |
| BS006 | Sopley | SPA / SAC (River Avon) / Ramsar / SSSI / SINC | Flood Zone 3 |
| BS013 | Sopley | | Flood Zone 3 |
| BS019 | Sopley | | Flood Zone 3 |
| BS022 | Avon | SPA / SAC (River Avon) / Ramsar / SSSI | Flood Zone 3 |
| BS024 | Ripley | | Flood Zone 3 |
| BS025 | Ripley | | Flood Zone 3 |
| BS027 | Bransgore | | Flood Zone 3 |
| BS028 | Bransgore | | Flood Zone 3 |
| BS034 | Avon Tyrell | SPA / SAC (River Avon) / Ramsar / SSSI | Flood Zone 3 |
| BS039 | Kingston | SPA / SAC (River Avon) / Ramsar / SSSI | Flood Zone 3 |
| D001 | Damerham | Some parts of the floodplain are designated SINC. | Flood Zone 3 |
| D013 | Martin Down | National Nature Reserve. SSSI applies to the whole site. | Surface Water Flood Risk |
| D014 | Martin Down | National Nature Reserve. SSSI applies to the whole site. | Surface Water Flood Risk |
| D016 | Martin | | Surface Water Flood Risk |
| E001 | Ellingham (south of) | Whole site designated SPA, Ramsar & SSSI, extensive SAC along River Avon. | Flood Zone 3 |
| E002 | Blashford | | Flood Zone 3 |
| E015 | Ellingham | | Flood Zone 3 |
| E016 | Ellingham | Ramsar / SPA / SAC (River Avon) / SSSI designations cover the whole site. | Flood Zone 3 |
| E020 | Ibsley | | Flood Zone 3 |
| E027 | Harbridge | Ramsar / SPA / SAC (River Avon) / SSSI designations cover the majority of the site. | Flood Zone 3 |
| E029 | North Gorley | | Flood Zone 3 |
| E030 | North Gorley | Within 400m of New Forest SPA | No Flood Risk |
| F003 | Fordingbridge | Ramsar / SPA / SAC / SSSI designations cover the River Avon. | Flood Zone 3 |

| Site Ref | Location | Summary of Nature Conservation / Exclusion Zones | Summary of Flood Risk |
|----------|-------------------------|--|--------------------------|
| F015 | Fordingbridge | SINC designation covers eastern end of the site. | Flood Zone 3 |
| F016 | Fordingbridge | | Flood Zone 3 |
| F017 | Fordingbridge | | Flood Zone 3 |
| F024 | Fordingbridge | | Flood Zone 3 |
| F025 | Fordingbridge | | Surface Water Flood Risk |
| F028 | Fordingbridge | | Flood Zone 3 |
| F035 | Fordingbridge | River Avon is designated as SAC / SSSI. | Flood Zone 3 |
| FH006 | Fawley | SPA / SAC / Ramsar / SSSI designated. | Flood Zone 3 |
| FH007 | Fawley | SPA / SAC / Ramsar / SSSI designated. HSE exclusion zone (inner consultation area) | Intertidal zone |
| FH010 | Fawley Refinery Complex | HSE exclusion zone (inner consultation area) | Flood Zone 3 |
| FH011 | Fawley | HSE exclusion zone (inner consultation area) | No Flood Risk |
| FH012 | Fawley | | Flood Zone 3 |
| FH013 | Fawley | | Flood Zone 3 |
| H001 | Dibden | SSSI covers whole site. SINC covers majority of site. Partly in MoD blast zone. | Flood Zone 3 |
| H002 | Dibden | SPA / Ramsar / SSSI designations cover the whole site. Partly in MoD blast zone. | Flood Zone 3 |
| H003 | Dibden Purlieu | Half of the site is designated a SSSI and SINC. | Surface Water Flood Risk |
| H006 | Dibden Purlieu | HSE exclusion zone | No Flood Risk |
| H008 | Hythe | SINC designation covers most of the site. | Surface Water Flood Risk |
| H012 | Hythe | SINC designations cover parts of the site. | Flood Zone 3 |
| H017 | Hythe | | Flood Zone 3 |
| H018 | Hythe | | Flood Zone 3 |
| HIN009 | Beckley | SINC designation covers the whole site. | Flood Zone 3 |
| HIN022 | Hinton | | Flood Zone 3 |
| HIN024 | Hinton | | Flood Zone 3 |
| L015 | Lymington | | Flood Zone 3 |
| L016 | Lymington | | Flood Zone 3 |
| L017 | Lymington | | Flood Zone 3 |
| L018 | Lymington | SPA / SSSI designations affect the south-east corner of the site. | Flood Zone 3 |
| L029 | Pennington | Ramsar / SINC designations cover the majority of the site. | No Flood Risk |
| L032 | Pennington | SINC designation on the south-eastern edge of the site. | Flood Zone 3 |
| L033 | Pennington | SINC designation present on eastern edge. | Flood Zone 3 |

| Site Ref | Location | Summary of Nature Conservation / Exclusion Zones | Summary of Flood Risk |
|----------|----------------|--|---------------------------------------|
| L034 | Pennington | SPA / SSSI designations cover the whole site. | Flood Zone 3 |
| M003 | Marchwood | SPA / SAC / Ramsar / SSSI designations cover part of the site. | No Flood Risk |
| M015 | Marchwood | MoD blast zone | Flood Zone 2 |
| M016 | Marchwood | MoD blast zone | Flood Zone 3 |
| MS001 | Milford on Sea | SINC designation covers the eastern end of the site. | No Flood Risk |
| MS003a | Milford on Sea | SSSI / SPA / SAC / Ramsar / SINC designations apply to the whole site. | Flood Zone 3 |
| MS004 | Milford on Sea | SPA / Ramsar / SSSI cover the whole site. SAC covers southern half of the site. | Flood Zone 3 |
| MS007a | Keyhaven | SPA / SSSI designations apply to south-east. SINC applies to majority of the site. | Flood Zone 3 |
| MS037 | Milford on Sea | | Within Climate Change Management Area |
| MS042 | Milford on Sea | | Flood Zone 3 |
| MS048 | Milford on Sea | | Surface Water Flood Risk |
| NM024 | Barton on Sea | | Surface Water Flood Risk |
| NM025 | Barton on Sea | SSSI designation covers the southern area of the site. | Within Climate Change Management Area |
| NM026 | Barton on Sea | SSSI designation covers the southern part of the site. | Within Climate Change Management Area |
| NM051 | Barton on Sea | | Within Climate Change Management Area |
| NM052 | Barton on Sea | | Within Climate Change Management Area |
| NM056 | Barton on Sea | | Flood Zone 3 |
| R004 | Kingston | | Flood Zone 3 |
| R006 | North Kingston | | Flood Zone 3 |
| R007 | North Kingston | | Flood Zone 3 |
| R008 | North Kingston | | Flood Zone 3 |
| R011 | Kingston | Majority of site is designated Ramsar and SSSI. | Flood Zone 3 |
| R012 | Moortown | Majority of site designated SPA / Ramsar / SSSI. River Avon designated SAC. | Flood Zone 3 |
| R018b | Ringwood | | Flood Zone 3 |
| R019 | Upper Kingston | | Flood Zone 3 |
| R026 | Ringwood | | Flood Zone 3 |
| R027 | Ringwood | | Flood Zone 3 |
| R032 | Ringwood | Ramsar / SPA / SSSI designations cover part of the site. | Flood Zone 3 |
| R033 | Ringwood | | Flood Zone 3 |
| R034 | Ringwood | Majority of site is designated SPA / SAC / Ramsar / SSSI. | Flood Zone 3 |

| Site Ref | Location | Summary of Nature Conservation / Exclusion Zones | Summary of Flood Risk |
|-----------------|-----------------|---|------------------------------|
| R035 | Ringwood | Ramsar / SPA / SAC (River Avon) / SSSI designations cover majority of the site. | Flood Zone 3 |
| R036 | Ringwood | River Avon designated Ramsar / SPA / SAC / SSSI. | Flood Zone 3 |
| R039 | Blashford Lakes | | Flood Zone 3 |
| R041a | Ringwood | | Flood Zone 3 |
| R043 | Blashford | | Flood Zone 3 |
| R047 | Blashford | | Flood Zone 3 |
| R048 | Blashford | | Flood Zone 3 |
| R050 | Ringwood | SPA, SAC and SSSI designations apply to the southern end of the site. | Flood Zone 2 |
| S009 | Ashford | | Flood Zone 3 |
| T005 | Totton | Site is partly covered by SINC designation. | Flood Zone 3 |
| T008 | Totton | | Flood Zone 3 |
| T011a | Hillstreet | | Flood Zone 3 |
| T020 | Totton | SINC designation covers majority of the site. | Flood Zone 3 |
| T027 | Totton | SPA / SAC / Ramsar / SSSI designations. | Flood Zone 3 |
| T034 | Totton | SPA / SAC / Ramsar / SSSI designations cover this site. | Flood Zone 3 |

Appendix 4

Table A4.1: Policy Assessment Matrix

| Objective 1. MEETING HOUSING NEEDS - To provide for overall housing need | | |
|---|--|--|
| Criteria | Possible Indicators | Source of baseline information |
| 1A Will it contribute effectively to meeting the housing needs of local communities and the housing market area(s)? 1B Will it provide affordable housing that meets local needs? 1C Will it provide appropriately for the special accommodation needs of the area including for an ageing population, travellers and the less mobile? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Housing Trajectory showing past and projected housing completions / dwelling types. - % second homes - Affordable housing completions by tenure - Number of affordable dwellings completed in rural locations / exceptions sites - Number of households classed as homeless - Proportion of Local Authority homes classed as 'non decent' - Housing and specialised accommodation for older people and people with disabilities - Gypsy and Traveller plots / pitches permitted / tolerated. - Agricultural and Forestry workers dwellings permitted. - Affordable sheltered, extra care and residential care home dwellings permitted. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HCC / NFDC annual housing monitoring • Housing needs assessments • Housing waiting lists/ homelessness • Census • Building control data • NFDC application data • NFDC Viability study • Information arising from Duty to Cooperate |
| Commentary: Policies will need to meet the Objectively Assessed Need (OAN) as far as possible within the environmental constraints of the plan area and subject to the viability of development. This will set out the range of dwelling types that reflects the SHMAA and any other registers / sources. In addition a framework for market housing will be needed that offers a variety of residential / household types and sets out criteria for encouraging new builds that facilitate remodelling or flexibility in existing units. | | |
| Likely evolution of the issue without implementation ('no change') of the Local Plan Review: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uncertainty over how the needs of strategic housing market areas should be addressed by development within this Local Plan area. Potential for ad hoc releases of land for development through planning applications and appeals if a five year housing land supply was not provided or the proposed housing delivery target was not met without a coordinated approach. • Higher housing costs may suppress household formation. Increasing numbers of people in housing need or in inadequate or unsuitable housing. Increasing social deprivation and inequality. • Lack of suitable housing choices for older age groups will mean that they are more likely to under-occupy dwellings which no longer adequately meet their housing needs, inhibiting the potential release of housing which might be suitable for other households | |
| Scoring basis: | What effect the proposed policy option would have relative to the 'no change' position (++ / - - etc) and why? | |
| ++ | Significant positive impact | Policy / option has no adverse effects on housing provision AND policy / option strongly supports the provision of a wide range of house types tenures and sizes to meet the needs of all sectors of the community, including a significant provision of affordable housing. |
| + | Positive impact | Policy / option has no adverse effects on housing provision AND policy / option strongly supports the provision of a limited number and range of house types tenures and sizes to meet the needs of all sectors of the community, including some provision of affordable housing. |
| ?i | Uncertain / Depends on implementation | Effects are uncertain and further information is required make a judgement / implementation requirements will remain unclear until development stage. |
| +/- | Mixed | The policy partially meets the objective (meets some need e.g. in some needs, but is deficient in others) |
| - | Negative impact | Policy / option makes no provision for housing or land for housing AND policy / option will reduce opportunities to provide housing or land for housing to meet the needs of the community. |
| -- | Significant negative impact | Policy / option makes no provision for housing or land for housing AND policy / option will significantly reduce opportunities to provide housing or land for housing to meet the needs of the community. |
| 0 | No effect | The policy has no effect on the objective. |
| Assumptions: All new housing would in principle contribute to meeting general housing needs in housing supply terms, but some will be more suitable, available or deliverable to address affordable housing and specialist housing needs (either on site or by way of financial contribution). Factors likely to generate abnormal costs include contamination, site clearance, access, and redressing infrastructure deficits | | |
| How adverse effects will be avoided or mitigated: Housing development must be designed to ensure integration with existing communities, and provide access to facilities either to existing amenities or by the provision of new facilities. The strategic sites treated on own merits and expected to produce a mitigation strategy illustrated by Landscape Framework (prepared by joint working between all land promoters and developers involved). Infrastructure provision will vary on a site by site basis (informed by the Local Plan evidence base). | | |

Objective 2. ACCESSIBLE OPPORTUNITIES, FACILITIES AND SERVICES - To provide a range of services, facilities and opportunities that are accessible to the local community and reduce the need to travel

| Criteria | Possible Indicators | Source of baseline information |
|---|---|---|
| 2B Provide convenient access to leisure, community and cultural facilities? 2C Benefit from or provide access to schools and early years' child care in the local area? 2D Benefit from, enhance or provide opportunities for access and movement by sustainable modes of transport (train, bus, bicycle, walking)? 2E Provide a suitable connection to the road network (and advisory lorry network for employment use) for the proposed use? 2F Provide for or improve access using mobile or high speed broadband devices? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applications approved for new or improved community facilities • Amount of completed leisure development • New recreational development permitted • New public transport routes / facilities • Pedestrian and bicycle numbers on selected lengths of road/ paths | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NFDC applications data • Highway Authority data • Public transport operators data • Data collected from permanent automated cycle counters at 10 locations |
| Commentary: Not relevant to cross cutting strategic policies that do not guide the location of development – but is relevant for strategic site policies. The Sustainability Appraisal process separately identified the most sustainable locations for strategic sites using the criteria above – consequently the Local Plan provides opportunities for growth which are well located for key facilities and amenities which are either already sufficient or could be improved without jeopardising the viability of development. | | |
| Likely evolution of the issue without implementation ('no change') of the Local Plan Review: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New development may not be directed to areas which have infrastructure capacity available. Potential funding for infrastructure improvements may not be available when required. Timely investment in crucial infrastructure may not be made. • No strategic assessment of the impacts on transport networks of development. Opportunities to minimise traffic impacts locally and across the wider Plan Area are reduced because development will be unplanned and without full consideration of infrastructure needs. Increased dependency on private transport. Congestion on local road network. Increases in journey times. • Opportunities to implement 'green transport' initiatives are reduced because development will be unplanned and without full consideration of infrastructure needs or of the potential to locate residential development close to existing transport hubs, employment centres and services and facilities. Increased dependency private transport. Congestion on local road network. Increase in journey times. | |
| Scoring basis: | What effect the proposed policy option would have relative to the 'no change' position (++ / - - etc) and why? | |
| ++ Significant positive impact | Directly provides facilities and services to meet the needs identified in the evidence base | |
| + Positive impact | Facilitates clear links to a variety of facilities and services already in the locality and facilities are adequate or can be made adequate to meet growth levels | |
| ?i Uncertain / Depends on implementation | Effects are uncertain and further information is required make a judgement / implementation requirements will remain unclear until development stage. | |
| +/- Mixed | Partially meets the objective (meets some need but is deficient in others) | |
| - Negative impact | Provides links to a variety of facilities and services already in the locality but facilities are in adequate or can't be adequately mitigated to meet growth levels | |
| -- Significant negative impact | Development will remove existing facilities / reduces the access to sustainable modes of transport / Significantly worsens the load on highway network with no mitigation possible /Offsite highway infrastructure improvements are required which might jeopardise the viability of development. | |
| 0 No effect | The policy has no effect on the objective. | |
| Assumptions: Regarding school places, ongoing consultation with Hampshire County Council about current and future school capacity will ensure that the provision of school places is implemented at the right point in time – this is therefore not scored in the objective assessment. Access to main bus routes (e.g. hourly 7 day service connecting to a town or city) and train stations are a snapshot in time and may change during the course of Plan production. The agreement by BT Openreach to provide fibre broadband for free to developments of 30+ dwellings means all strategic sites should have adequate provision; for smaller sites the level of provision will need to be assessed at the planning application stage with planning conditions attached if appropriate. | | |
| How adverse effects will be avoided or mitigated: Regarding areas where footpath and cycle access is deficient, development should enhance local connectivity to facilities by provision of new surfaced foot and cycle ways – by the masterplanning process and/or planning conditions. In relation to the road network, the strategic transport assessment undertaken for the Local Plan will identify where highways mitigation is required to achieve sufficient capacity, that meets the CIL tests of necessity and is viable to implement. Where adverse effects are identified in the production of the Local Plan and through the evidence base policies will set out where appropriate provision or mitigation is required and how it should be implemented. | | |

Objective 3. SAFE AND HEALTHY ENVIRONMENTS - To provide safe, healthy and secure living environments including by preventing, avoiding or managing pollution, other significant hazards and the potential for crime

| Criteria | Possible Indicators | Source of baseline information |
|---|---|---|
| <p>3A Provide for safe movement and safe access by vehicle and for cyclists and pedestrians, especially the young and less mobile?</p> <p>3B Ensure that potentially hazardous activities are appropriately located and managed, and to avoid locating sensitive uses where they would be adversely affected by safety hazards or pollution?</p> <p>3C Protect and where possible improve air quality</p> <p>3D Promote and contribute to personal safety and security in developments and in the public realm to help reduce crime and the fear of crime?</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Availability or provision of adequate public footpaths / cycleways / permissive paths etc. • Pedestrian and bicycle accident stats • Amount of completed leisure development • Areas of informal and formal open space per head of population by parish • Change in number of AQMA's, • HSE mapping • Recorded crime levels • Obesity levels | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highway Authority/ HCC records • Map-based surveys • Data from cycle counters • NFDC applications data • Nationally prescribed design standards (where applicable). • Natural England + NFDC Environmental Health • Informed by SA assessment of hazardous installations etc. |
| <p>Commentary: Policies will need to provide clear criteria to facilitate safe access to development proposals. Health or safety hazards (such as the presence of HSE and MoD blast zones, gas and oil pipelines, overhead pylons) will need to be avoided, contained, reduced or mitigated. Criteria to protect air quality and deliver improvements in air quality (where this is measured). The presence of Activities generating significant noise/light/odour/air pollution including Air Quality Management Areas (AQMA's), dust, and potentially contaminated land or water bodies. Measures to ensure personal safety and security in development will help reduce crime and the fear of crime, and set out design and implementation standards to enable secure neighbourhoods.</p> | | |
| <p>Likely evolution of the issue without implementation ('no change') of the Local Plan Review:</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opportunities to minimise traffic impacts and poor air quality locally and across the wider Plan Area would be reduced because development will be unplanned and without full consideration of cumulative infrastructure needs or environmental impacts. | |
| <p>Scoring basis:</p> | <p>What effect the proposed policy option would have relative to the 'no change' position (++ /- - etc) and why?</p> | |
| <p>++</p> | Significant positive impact | Policy significantly improves safety including removing or reducing to acceptable levels risks to public health or property |
| <p>+</p> | Positive impact | Policy provides strategy for safe vehicular access and promotes wider pedestrian and cycle routes / is compatible with present safety or pollution hazards / protects air quality / retains personal and public safety and security. |
| <p>?i</p> | Uncertain / Depends on implementation | Not enough information to make a judgement / implementation requirements will remain unclear until development stage. |
| <p>+/-</p> | Mixed | The policy has both positive and negative impacts on the issue. |
| <p>-</p> | Negative impact | Policy worsens the risk of unsafe movement / safety or pollution hazards are worsened by the policy / air quality worsened / compromises personal and public safety and security. |
| <p>--</p> | Significant negative impact | Policy severely worsens the ability to provide safe access / safety or pollution hazards are significantly worsened by the policy / air quality significantly worsened / severely impacts personal and public safety and security. |
| <p>0</p> | No effect | Policy has no effect on the objective. |
| <p>Assumptions: Significant protection provided by other regulations would remain in force with or without an adopted local plan e.g. the Health and Safety Executive (HSE) advises on the acceptability or otherwise of development within hazard zones. Sensitive development is generally restricted within areas at risk and was a key consideration in assessing the suitability of development sites. If a site is included in the Plan, and no circumstances have been identified which would inhibit the provision of a safe environment, it can be designed to achieve a safe environment.</p> | | |
| <p>How adverse effects will be avoided or mitigated: Masterplanning criteria / Planning conditions</p> | | |

| Objective 4. A THRIVING ECONOMY - Support a thriving, sustainable local economy making best use of local skills, assets and resources | | |
|---|--|---|
| Criteria | Possible Indicators | Source of baseline information |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4A Support businesses to start, grow and adapt to serve local markets and target wider opportunities. • 4B Support the vitality and viability of town, district and service centres? • 4C Support tourism opportunities and rural enterprises which are appropriate to the location and environmentally acceptable? • 4D Provide or improve opportunities for further education and skills training in accessible locations? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Total employment floor space amount and change by broad type and location • Total employment development land and change by broad type and location • Town centre commercial floorspace , occupancy rates and usage mix • Unemployment rates • Average earnings • Level of employment and ratio of jobs to economically active persons in the area • Level and change in business registrations in the area • Employment and Skills Plans (ESP) in construction sector (for sites above 50 dwellings) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employment land surveys / PUSH work • Property availability websites • Census • Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings • Annual Business Inquiry • VAT registrations • HCC Unemployment data • NFDC applications data • NFDC ESP data |
| <p>Commentary: Policies will need to allocate sufficient, suitable land in appropriate locations to meet additional business and employment needs with appropriate flexibility, and to enable existing businesses to change and expand. This includes safeguarding existing commercial and business/industrial locations that continue to serve a useful purpose. Policies should also set out a positive strategy for town and local centres to enable them to serve their communities and adapt to changing market conditions. The local plan can support the local economy and labour force by identifying accessible locations where further education and training facilities would be supported.</p> | | |
| <p>Likely evolution of the issue without implementation ('no change') of the Local Plan Review:</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential decline or loss of critical commercial mass within town and district centres. Policies become outdated and irrelevant. Provision is not made to meet future needs for town centre uses. • Land which is no longer suitable for employment / business needs will remain undeveloped. Inadequate supply of suitable sites to meet business/employers needs may result in unplanned releases of land in inappropriate locations. • No assessment is made of the future needs of local businesses and appropriate provision is not made. • Demand for tourism and rural enterprise is not appropriately planned for and managed, and may have an adverse effect on the social and economic sustainability of existing rural communities or the environment. | |
| Scoring basis: | | What effect the proposed policy option would have relative to the 'no change' position (++ /- - etc) and why? |
| ++ | Significant positive impact | Retains sufficient employment land in suitable locations and provides sufficient additional land where needed / Enhances the commercial role and offer of town and local centres / Provides sustainable opportunities for tourism and rural enterprise / Enables the provision of facilities to provide further education and training / Likely to provide local employment throughout the lifetime of the development. |
| + | Positive impact | Retains existing employment land / Protects commercial sites and premises in town and local centres / Promotes tourism opportunities or rural enterprise / Protects existing opportunities for education and skills / Likely to provide local employment throughout the construction of the development. |
| ?i | Uncertain / Depends on implementation | Not enough information to make a judgement / implementation requirements will remain unclear until development stage. |
| +/- | Mixed | The policy has both positive and negative impacts on the issue. |
| - | Negative impact | Loss of suitable employment land and or job opportunities / Partial loss of commercial sites and premises in town and local centres / Reduces tourism opportunities or rural enterprise / Reduces opportunities for education and skills |
| -- | Significant negative impact | Significant loss of suitable employment land and or jobs / Loss of commercial sites and premises in town and local centres / Significantly reduces tourism opportunities or rural enterprise / Significantly reduces opportunities for education and skills |
| 0 | No effect | Policy has no effect on the objective. |
| <p>Assumptions: Assessment allows for the operation of permitted development rights which limit scope for the retention of commercial uses in some locations or circumstances.</p> | | |
| <p>How adverse effects will be avoided or mitigated: The Local Plan will use the Employment Land Study and other evidence base sources to ensure that existing commercial land is protected where it is deemed appropriate for the market</p> | | |

| Objective 5. PROTECTING BIODIVERSITY AND WILDLIFE - Protect and enhance biodiversity and safeguard wildlife and the integrity of nature conservation sites | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|---|-----------|---|----------|--|-----------|--|------------|--|----------|---|-----------|---|----------|---|
| Criteria | Possible Indicators | Source of information | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 5A Protect and where possible enhance biodiversity and designated nature conservation sites (international, national and local), Ancient Woodlands and Priority Habitats and Species? 5B Avoid, limit or mitigate recreational or other pressures on designated Natura 2000 sites? 5C Maintain and enhance biodiversity and provide opportunities to create or join up habitats? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Area (total and change or loss) of sites subject to statutory nature conservation designations (Natura 2000 sites and SSSI) and local designations (SINC, LNR) Reported condition of national / international sites Changes in areas and populations of biodiversity importance Changes in priority habitats & species (by type) Biodiversity Action Plan Applications refused due to impact on local nature conservation interests Area of land provided or improved for the purposes of recreational habitat mitigation to New Forest SPA/SAC Developer contributions secured for management of impacts (New Forest & Solent SPA & SAC) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Natural England data HCC data HBIC data NFDC applications data HRA / SA HBIC desktop studies HBIC ecological network maps NFDC mitigation schemes | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>Commentary: New development allocations will need to be identified to housing and other needs. The HRA of the current Local Plan identified a requirement to mitigate the recreational impacts of new residential development on European sites to be mitigated. The identification of suitable sites for development is therefore linked to the identification of suitable mitigation land and projects. Following discussions with Natural England housing development is judged unsustainable on sites or parts of sites within 400m of the New Forest SPA and SAC (although we make allowance if there are significant existing built up areas within the 400m buffer between the land parcel and the SPA / SAC area). 400m is a general housing exclusion zone applied to the Thames Basin Heaths and Dorset Heaths to help manage pet predation risks to ground nesting birds. Land within 400m may be suitable for recreational mitigation or open space subject to masterplanning. An appropriate mitigation approach with Natural England will be agreed as part of the Local Plan Review submission process. Other enhancements for SINC and SSSI areas could be gained by joining up areas of habitat through the masterplanning process – such as Priority Habitats/SINCs immediately adjacent to development sites which present opportunities to enhance, as part of development.</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>Likely evolution of the issue without implementation ('no change') of the Local Plan Review:</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The NPPF seeks protection of sites of international and national importance; the current Local Plan policies may not provide an adequate framework to consider cumulative impact of pressures for higher levels of development within Plan Area on sites of nature conservation importance & local biodiversity. Without the Plan, there is greater potential for significant and adverse cumulative effects on European nature conservation sites. It would not be possible to direct development to locations where potential recreational impacts are easier to avoid. There will be no strategy to guide new development or the timely provision of recreational mitigation such as SANGS and other green infrastructure that could serve a SANGS/ recreational mitigation function. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>Scoring basis:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>What effect the proposed policy option would have relative to the 'no change' position (++ /- - etc) and why?</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>++</td> <td>Significant positive impact Enhances designated nature conservation sites / Provides full mitigation of recreational pressures / Enhances biodiversity</td> </tr> <tr> <td>+</td> <td>Positive impact Protects biodiversity and designated nature conservation sites / Avoids adverse impacts from recreational pressures / Protects biodiversity</td> </tr> <tr> <td>?i</td> <td>Uncertain / Depends on implementation Not enough information to make a judgement / implementation requirements will remain unclear until development stage.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>+/-</td> <td>Mixed The policy has both positive and negative impacts on the issue.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>-</td> <td>Negative impact Adverse effects on designated nature conservation sites / Does not provide mitigation for new recreational pressures / Adverse effects on biodiversity</td> </tr> <tr> <td>--</td> <td>Significant negative impact Significant adverse effects on designated nature conservation sites / Provides no mitigation for existing recreational pressures / Significant adverse effects on biodiversity</td> </tr> <tr> <td>0</td> <td>No effect Policy has no effect on the objective.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | | | | What effect the proposed policy option would have relative to the 'no change' position (++ /- - etc) and why? | ++ | Significant positive impact Enhances designated nature conservation sites / Provides full mitigation of recreational pressures / Enhances biodiversity | + | Positive impact Protects biodiversity and designated nature conservation sites / Avoids adverse impacts from recreational pressures / Protects biodiversity | ?i | Uncertain / Depends on implementation Not enough information to make a judgement / implementation requirements will remain unclear until development stage. | +/- | Mixed The policy has both positive and negative impacts on the issue. | - | Negative impact Adverse effects on designated nature conservation sites / Does not provide mitigation for new recreational pressures / Adverse effects on biodiversity | -- | Significant negative impact Significant adverse effects on designated nature conservation sites / Provides no mitigation for existing recreational pressures / Significant adverse effects on biodiversity | 0 | No effect Policy has no effect on the objective. |
| | What effect the proposed policy option would have relative to the 'no change' position (++ /- - etc) and why? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ++ | Significant positive impact Enhances designated nature conservation sites / Provides full mitigation of recreational pressures / Enhances biodiversity | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| + | Positive impact Protects biodiversity and designated nature conservation sites / Avoids adverse impacts from recreational pressures / Protects biodiversity | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ?i | Uncertain / Depends on implementation Not enough information to make a judgement / implementation requirements will remain unclear until development stage. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| +/- | Mixed The policy has both positive and negative impacts on the issue. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| - | Negative impact Adverse effects on designated nature conservation sites / Does not provide mitigation for new recreational pressures / Adverse effects on biodiversity | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| -- | Significant negative impact Significant adverse effects on designated nature conservation sites / Provides no mitigation for existing recreational pressures / Significant adverse effects on biodiversity | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0 | No effect Policy has no effect on the objective. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>Assumptions: It is understood that Natural England's position is that residential development within 400m of the New Forest SPA / SAC has the potential to have a significant impact on the nature conservation interests of the European site. Accessible natural greenspace provisions to mitigate impacts on the New Forest Natura 2000 sites consist of at least 8 hectares per 1,000 population. Public open space - informal recreation, play space and playing pitches to a standard of 3.5ha per 1000 population. Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) and Ancient Woodland SINCs are not legally protected, but support notable habitats and possibly notable or legally protected species and are given a measure of non-statutory protection in the planning system. There is the potential for a negative effect if a site is within 250m of a SSSI.</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>How adverse effects will be avoided or mitigated: Adverse effects are partly avoided through the SA process and site selection process. The council's HRA confirms how adverse effects are to be avoided / what mitigation is required & where - Local Plan policies & SPD guidance will reflect these requirements, as well as through masterplanning for strategic sites.</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Objective 6. ACCESSIBLE GREEN SPACE, COAST AND WATER BODIES - Protect and where possible provide and enhance public open spaces, green infrastructure and access to the countryside, coast and water bodies

| Criteria | | Possible Indicators | Source of baseline information |
|---|---------------------------------------|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 6A Protect open space and ensure development benefits from and/or provides sufficient outdoor play facilities and public open space for informal recreation? 6B Protect outdoor sports facilities and ensure development benefits from and/or provides sufficient local opportunities for outdoor sports 6C Protect and where possible enhance natural and semi natural open spaces, water bodies and features of green infrastructure value. 6D Enable public enjoyment of the countryside, coast and water bodies within environmental constraints? | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Areas of informal and formal open space per head of population by parish Length/ location of recreational footpaths/cycleways/ bridleways Community use of school sites Applications approved for new or improved community facilities | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> NFDC open space surveys |
| <p>Commentary: For strategic sites, suitable provision will be required by policy that can be delivered as part of the site development. Greenfield sites may contain features that should be retained for their future Green Infrastructure value. Potential development sites may have footpaths and Public Rights of Way (PROW) that should be retained and where possible enhanced for their future amenity, access and mitigation value - appropriate arrangements can be secured at masterplan stage to remove or mitigate the potential for loss or harm from proposed developments.</p> | | | |
| <p>Likely evolution of the issue without implementation ('no change') of the Local Plan Review:</p> | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of open space and sports provision will result in adverse impacts on amenity, health and local character. Increasing pressure for additional recreational use of sensitive sites, including the New Forest and coastal SPA/SACs. | |
| Scoring basis: | | What effect the proposed policy option would have relative to the 'no change' position (++ /- - etc) and why | |
| ++ | Significant positive impact | Incorporates provision of new open space or sports facilities to policy standard AND improves an existing local space deficit / Enhances natural and semi natural open spaces, water bodies or features of green infrastructure | |
| + | Positive impact | Encourages open space provision or sport facilities to policy standard but without increasing the deficit / improves an existing local space deficit / Protects natural and semi natural open spaces, water bodies or features of green infrastructure | |
| ?i | Uncertain / Depends on implementation | Not enough information to make a judgement / implementation requirements will remain unclear until development stage. | |
| +/- | Mixed | The policy has both positive and negative impacts on the issue. | |
| - | Negative impact | Loss of or adverse impacts on open space or sport facilities / loss of or adverse impact on natural and semi natural open spaces, water bodies or features of green infrastructure | |
| -- | Significant negative impact | Significant loss of open space or sport facilities / Significant loss of or adverse impact on natural and semi natural open spaces, water bodies or features of green infrastructure | |
| 0 | No effect | Policy has no effect on the objective. | |
| <p>Assumptions: Accessible natural greenspace provision to mitigate impacts on the New Forest Natura 2000 sites of at least 8 hectares per 1,000 population. Public open space - informal recreation, play space and playing pitches to a standard of 3.5ha per 1000 population.</p> | | | |
| <p>How adverse effects will be avoided or mitigated: Loss of any open space or outdoor facilities will be mitigated by the provision of alternative facilities in an equally accessible location. The council's site policies will set out the requirements for open space and connections / enhancements to natural and semi-natural green infrastructure so that recreational pressure on natural environment is minimised. Sensitive coastal habitats are managed by the council's partnership working on the Solent Recreational Management Strategy with active onsite management through rangers and related monitoring.</p> | | | |

| Objective 7a. PROTECTING LANDSCAPE AND TOWNSCAPE - To maintain, enhance and create high quality places. | | |
|--|--|---|
| Criteria | Possible Indicators | Source of baseline information |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 7A Maintain and where possible enhance local distinctiveness, townscape and the public realm? 7B Safeguard the setting and purposes of the New Forest National Park and the setting of the Cranborne Chase AONB? 7C Protect and where possible enhance the intrinsic character and beauty of the general countryside and coast? 7D Conserve and/or manage important geological sites and features? 7F Protect identified tranquil areas and areas of dark night skies? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> % of area designated as AONB Applications refused because of design and supported at appeal Applications refused due to landscape impacts Applications refused due to countryside / landscape / design impacts within the countryside Applications refused because of impact on trees/ woodland/ hedgerows Number of applications approved outside settlements for agricultural, business, tourist, community or essential residential use of new and existing rural buildings compared with other uses | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> HCC data NFDC data |
| <p>Commentary: For strategic sites, settlement edges and areas of emerging potential for housing were assessed through site visits, GIS and online photography alongside preparation of a Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Study by the Councils Landscape officer – this will inform site policies.</p> | | |
| <p>Likely evolution of the issue without implementation ('no change') of the Local Plan Review:</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Likely to be more difficult to avoid impacts in the absence of a strategy to guide new development to less sensitive locations. There are small villages within the AONB where development could adversely affect the sensitive landscape. | |
| <p>Scoring basis:</p> | <p>What effect the proposed policy option would have relative to the 'no change' position (++ / - - etc) and why?</p> | |
| <p>++ Significant positive impact</p> | <p>Enhances local distinctiveness and townscape / Improves setting and purposes of New Forest National Park and setting of Cranborne Chase AONB / Improves areas of low value or degraded landscape /</p> | |
| <p>+ Positive impact</p> | <p>Protects local distinctiveness and townscape / Safeguards setting and purposes of New Forest National Park and setting of Cranborne Chase AONB /</p> | |
| <p>?i Uncertain / Depends on implementation</p> | <p>Not enough information to make a judgement / implementation requirements will remain unclear until development stage</p> | |
| <p>+/- Mixed</p> | <p>The policy has both positive and negative impacts on the issue.</p> | |
| <p>- Negative impact</p> | <p>Potentially adverse effects on local distinctiveness and townscape / Harms setting of National Park or landscape character of AONB but acceptably mitigates /</p> | |
| <p>-- Significant negative impact</p> | <p>Significant adverse effects on local distinctiveness and townscape / Harms setting of National Park or landscape character of AONB and it is not possible to mitigate /</p> | |
| <p>0 No effect</p> | <p>Policy has no effect on the objective.</p> | |
| <p>Assumptions: If a greenfield site can be viewed from the National Park or AONB then it would have a negative impact on the setting of the National Park/AONB which would require mitigation. The development of most greenfield sites will have a negative impact on the character of the countryside. The intensification of residential development is likely to have a negative impact on the character of the towns and villages. Tranquil areas are defined by either or both of the CPRE map of tranquil areas and mapping work of tranquil areas by the New Forest National Park Authority. As there are no internationally or nationally designated dark sky areas in the NDFC Plan Area (the AONB is currently applying for Dark Sky status) the Council used tranquillity areas only but also considered possible light disturbance within them.</p> | | |
| <p>How adverse effects will be avoided or mitigated: Rural edge development will be expected to provide a Masterplan that sets out how the scheme will comply with the criteria set out in the strategic sites policy and other landscape / design policies in the Local Plan. Planning conditions would apply.</p> | | |

| Objective 7b. PROTECTING LANDSCAPE AND TOWNSCAPE – Green Belt | | |
|---|---|---|
| Criteria | Possible Indicators | Source of baseline information |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 7E Protect and where possible enhance the beneficial use of land that meets the statutory purposes of Green Belt? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applications refused due to Green Belt | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> NFDC applications data NFDC Sustainability Appraisal Green Belt Study |
| <p>Commentary: An independent Green Belt study was commissioned to provide a comprehensive review of the extent to which all the land within the Green Belt contributes to the five purposes of Green Belt as set out in paragraph 80 of the NPPF. Only part of the countryside in the Plan Area is designated Green Belt (south of Ringwood and the Southern Coastal area). Green Belt land is not necessarily the most environmentally sensitive land within the Plan Area. There will be modest opportunities for land which is not fulfilling Green Belt purposes to sustainably accommodate the development needs of local communities.</p> | | |
| <p>Likely evolution of the issue without implementation ('no change') of the Local Plan Review:</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Non Green Belt land may be subject to other significant development constraints or may not be in appropriate locations to address the needs of the relevant housing market area. Development may be directed to less sustainable locations to avoid Green Belt land, and un-planned releases of land from Green Belt could be in conflict with Green Belt purposes. Release of strongly performing Green Belt would have some local impact on the sense of open countryside, although Green Belt status is not an indicator of landscape or townscape quality. | |
| Scoring basis: | | What effect the proposed policy option would have relative to the 'no change' position (++ /- - etc) and why? |
| ++ | Significant positive impact | Enhances Green Belt land to better meet the purposes of Green Belt |
| + | Positive impact | Does not result in the loss of Green Belt land |
| ?i | Uncertain / Depends on implementation | Not enough information to make a judgement / implementation requirements will remain unclear until development stage |
| +/- | Mixed | Potential loss of Green Belt land that moderately meets the purposes of Green Belt but will provide landscape enhancement / Has both positive and negative impacts on the issue |
| - | Negative impact | Potential loss of Green Belt land that moderately meets the purposes of Green Belt but only limited enhancement possible |
| -- | Significant negative impact | Potential loss of Green Belt land that strongly meets the purposes of Green Belt |
| 0 | No effect | Policy has no effect on the objective. |
| <p>Assumptions: Potential development in Green Belt would include some land that borders or is very close to important landscape features including the New Forest National Park and Conservation Areas, increasing the potential for harmful impacts (unless adequately mitigated). We would expect more sensitive parts of development sites to be protected and enhanced within any development scheme, for example mitigating landscape impacts whilst also providing recreational mitigation for habitat impacts.</p> | | |
| <p>How adverse effects will be avoided or mitigated: Potential for harm does not mean that harm would be realised. New development would be to a high standard of design and appropriate to its context in terms of form and materials, with a layout, landscaping and planting that preserves and enhances the quality of the landscape and important landscape and townscape features. Much of the detail could only be judged at planning application stage.</p> | | |

| Objective 8. Conserving Heritage | | |
|--|--|--|
| Criteria | Possible Indicators | Source of baseline information |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 8A Conserve, manage and enhance historic buildings, sites, features, places, areas and landscapes, and where appropriate improve public access to them? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Heritage Statements (sites) Number and % of listed Buildings and archaeological sites at risk Applications refused for listed building/conservation area/ archaeological/ historic landscape reasons and supported at appeal | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> English Heritage data (e.g. Historic Environment Records) HCC data (archaeology) NFDC data: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Listed buildings and Conservation Areas At Risk register |
| <p>Commentary: Heritage Assets include listed buildings, conservation areas, historic parks and gardens, scheduled monuments and archaeological areas, including non-scheduled archaeological remains of demonstrably equivalent significance to scheduled monuments. Non-designated heritage assets, and unknown potential (e.g. from Historic Environment Records) also need to be factored into policy coverage and/or site master plans where appropriate.</p> <p>The following process was used to assess site policies:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identify the heritage assets on or within the vicinity of the potential site allocation at an appropriate scale 2. Assess the contribution of the site to the significance of heritage assets on or within its vicinity 3. Identify the potential impacts of development upon the significance of heritage asset 4. Consider how any harm might be removed or reduced, including reasonable alternatives sites 5. Consider how any enhancements could be achieved and maximised 6. Consider and set out the public benefits where harm cannot be removed or reduced. | | |
| <p>Likely evolution of the issue without implementation ('no change') of the Local Plan Review:</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opportunities to conserve and enhance the historic environment could be missed. More buildings and monuments at risk. | |
| Scoring basis: | | What effect the proposed policy option would have relative to the 'no change' position (++ /- - etc) and why? |
| ++ | Significant positive impact | Protects and enhances a designated heritage asset identified to be at risk |
| + | Positive impact | Protects or enhances a designated heritage asset or improves appropriate public access to it |
| ?i | Uncertain / Depends on implementation | Not enough information to make a judgement / implementation requirements will remain unclear until development stage |
| +/- | Mixed | The policy has both positive and negative impacts on the issue |
| - | Negative impact | Harms a designated heritage asset but acceptably mitigate |
| -- | Significant negative impact | Significant harm or loss of a designated heritage asset and it is not possible to adequately mitigate |
| 0 | No effect | Policy has no effect on the objective. |
| <p>Assumptions: Sites which include, or are adjacent to, a heritage asset, could have a negative effect on those assets. The SA process undertakes a strategic assessment to identify significant effects and therefore only takes account of designated features. A listed building is a building that has been placed on the Statutory List of Buildings of Special Architectural or Historic Interest. Conservation areas and historic landscapes are those defined in the current Local Plan.</p> | | |
| <p>How adverse effects will be avoided or mitigated: Where heritage assets are present, the development proposal would be expected to set out how the scheme will comply with the criteria set out in heritage / design policies in the Local Plan. Planning conditions would apply to ensure that enhancements are maximised.</p> | | |

Objective 9. SUSTAINABLE NATURAL RESOURCES - To conserve or manage natural resources and their sustainable use within environmental limits.

| Criteria | Possible Indicators | Source of baseline information |
|--|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 9A Protect soil quality and the best and most versatile agricultural land? 9B Ensure sufficient water supply, protect water sources and water bodies, and maintain and where possible enhance water quality and water use efficiency? 9C Encourage the beneficial re-use of previously developed land, redundant buildings and the restoration of contaminated or degraded land? 9D Enable the sustainable extraction of safeguarded and workable mineral resources? 9E Encourage recycling and minimise waste generation | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Condition of waterbodies, watercourses & coastal waters Daily domestic water consumption per person Applications refused on grounds of air/ water/soil pollution % new dwellings and / or amount of commercial floorspace on previously developed land Numbers / area of contaminated sites Production of secondary/recycled aggregates Amount of municipal waste arising/ managed by management method | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environment Agency data on air and water quality, including the River Basin Management Plan information and compliance against legislative requirements NFDC records HCC records Utilities companies' data DEFRA Annual Municipal Waste Management Survey Environment Agency Strategic Waste Management Assessments |
| <p>Commentary: Source Protection Zones (SPZs) have been defined by the Environment Agency for groundwater sources such as wells, boreholes and springs used for public drinking water supply. These zones show the risk of contamination from any activities that might cause pollution in the area. The council has worked closely with a number of bodies (Hampshire County Council, Natural England, Environment Agency and the water companies) to assess the cumulative effects of development on water issues (criteria 9B) and policies will ensure that any adverse impacts arising must be capable of satisfactory resolution. HCC strongly advises developers to make contact with mineral operators early on to establish the viability of physically extracting the resources and a view on the likely market for the specific material in situ. NFDC will take account the cumulative effect of development sites where they are neighbouring each other – potential for extraction will be greater.</p> | | |
| <p>Likely evolution of the issue without implementation ('no change') of the Local Plan Review:</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitoring of water quality shows impacts from phosphorus pollution arising from agricultural run-off and sewage treatment plants. The quality of water bodies is likely to decline further in the absence of measures to address this issue. Significant parts of the Plan Area are underlain with minerals reserves. Land released for development not in accordance with a Local Plan may result in loss of future workable deposits of mineral reserves. Requirements for prior extraction of mineral reserves can have impacts on timescales for site delivery. | |
| <p>Scoring basis:</p> | <p>What effect the proposed policy option would have relative to the 'no change' position (++ /- - etc) and why?</p> | |
| <p>++</p> | Significant positive impact | Restores grades 1-2 land to beneficial agricultural use / Seeks to remove or significantly reduce a pollution risk use in groundwater SPZ1 / Provides new or upgraded water supply infrastructure / Enhances water quality and water use efficiency / Improves water quality and provides water use efficiency / Restores contaminated land to beneficial use / Protects and enables the extraction of viable mineral resources |
| <p>+</p> | Positive impact | Protects grades 1-3 land for beneficial agricultural use / Seeks to reduce a pollution risk use in groundwater SPZ1 / Protects existing water supply infrastructure that is deemed sufficient for new development / Protects water quality and promotes water use efficiency / Reuses previously developed land or redundant buildings / Promotes the future extraction of viable mineral resources |
| <p>?i</p> | Uncertain / Depends on implementation | Not enough information to make a judgement / implementation requirements will remain unclear until development stage |
| <p>+/-</p> | Mixed | The policy has both positive and negative impacts on the issue. |
| <p>-</p> | Negative impact | Loss of medium quality agricultural land (Grade 3a and 3b) / Would lead to more development in SPZ2 / Increases the burden on existing water supply infrastructure with no mitigation possible / Promotes contaminated land where costs of mitigation endanger viability / Jeopardises the future extraction of viable mineral resources |
| <p>--</p> | Significant negative impact | Loss of high quality agricultural land (Grades 1 or 2) / Would lead to more development in SPZ1 / Significant increase in the burden on existing water supply infrastructure with no mitigation possible / Lead to development of contaminated land where no mitigation is possible / Sterilises the future extraction of viable mineral resources. |
| <p>0</p> | No effect | Policy has no effect on the objective. |
| <p>Assumptions: Best and Most Versatile land is Grades 1, 2 and 3a (High quality agricultural land). If the loss of land in grades 1 and 2 (BMV land) is a factor, it will not be given significant weight, but will form part of the planning judgement of any proposal. Suitability for mineral extraction based on evidence of active working on or adjacent to the site or site acquisition for mineral working, in consultation with HCC. In line with HCC SPD guidance, the LPA should consult on all relevant development proposals within Minerals Consultation Areas with the exception of developments that have no implications for mineral or waste safeguarding. A simple definition of what development requires consultation with the Minerals Authority (HCC) is where the proposal: involves an area which is over 3 hectares(ha); or is within or adjacent to an existing mineral or waste site; or is within or adjacent to a safeguarded or allocated mineral or waste site.</p> | | |
| <p>How adverse effects will be avoided or mitigated: Schemes that demonstrate the viability of prior extraction / incidental extraction of minerals will be dealt with through the Minerals Planning Authority (Hampshire County Council) through its development control process. Planning conditions would apply.</p> | | |

| Objective 10a. MANAGING CLIMATE CHANGE - To minimise contributions to climate change | | |
|---|---|---|
| Criteria | Possible Indicators | Source of baseline information |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 10A Locate development to help limit the emission of greenhouse gases by minimising the need to travel by private vehicle? 10B Encourage energy and resource efficiency and climate change resilience in the siting, construction and adaptability of development? 10C Encourage microgeneration and renewable and community-based energy projects in environmentally and visually appropriate locations? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use of different modes (car, bus, rail, ferry, bicycle, walking) Pedestrian and bicycle numbers on selected lengths of road/ paths New public transport routes / facilities Renewable energy generation by installed capacity and type % commercial development meeting BREEAM standards Average energy consumption per person Target for cutting CO2 emissions. Applications refused on basis of failure to incorporate energy generating infrastructure Travel to work data Car ownership data | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> HCC records/ data New surveys Data from permanent automated cycle counters NFDC applications records Building Control records |
| Commentary: | | |
| Likely evolution of the issue without implementation ('no change') of the Local Plan Review: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opportunities to implement 'green transport' initiatives are reduced because development will be unplanned and without full consideration of infrastructure needs or of the potential to locate residential development close to existing transport hubs, employment centres and services and facilities. Increased dependency private transport. Congestion and air pollution on local road network. Increase in journey times. | |
| Scoring basis: | What effect the proposed policy option would have relative to the 'no change' position (++ /- - etc) and why? | |
| ++ | Significant positive impact | Provides alternative modes of transport / Would limit emissions by setting criteria for energy efficient construction / Requires new buildings to incorporate energy generating infrastructure or connect to existing energy source where present |
| + | Positive impact | Encourages alternative modes of transport / Promotes energy efficient construction / Encourages new development to incorporate energy generating infrastructure or identifies suitable areas for renewable and community-based energy schemes |
| ?i | Uncertain / Depends on implementation | Not enough information to make a judgement / implementation requirements will remain unclear until development stage |
| +/- | Mixed | The policy has both positive and negative impacts on the issue. |
| - | Negative impact | Increases the need to travel by car / Impedes the development of renewable energy schemes |
| -- | Significant negative impact | Significantly increases the need to travel by car / Removes existing renewable energy scheme(s) |
| 0 | No effect | Policy has no effect on the objective. |
| Assumptions: Renewable energy could include solar panels, biomass heating and small scale wind turbines. All sites should be able to provide some renewable energy as part of a scheme. Larger sites may have the scope to provide a greater range of renewable energy projects e.g. community-based energy schemes such as combined heat and power installations. | | |
| How adverse effects will be avoided or mitigated: Not applicable (this objective relates to minimising contributions before they can have an adverse impact) | | |

| Objective 10b. MANAGING CLIMATE CHANGE - To mitigate and adapt to flood risk. | | |
|---|---|---|
| Criteria | Indicators | Source of baseline information |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 10D (3A) Avoid, reduce or manage the risk to people and property from flooding and erosion, taking into account the likely effects of climate change? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Properties at risk of flooding NFDC applications avoiding or managing flood risk New development situated in Flood Zone 2 and 3 % of new development incorporating SUDS | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Flood Risk mapping including climate change modelling - Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) NFDC applications data |
| <p>Commentary: Objective initial assessment based on Environment Agency risk mapping (flood risk mapping Zones 1, 2 and 3 and EA surface water flood risk mapping); and adopted Local Plan Climate Change Management Area which has been supplemented by Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) data where available on risks from ground water, ordinary watercourses, drains and sewers. Objective assessment based on Environment Agency flood risk zones 2 or 3, or land which has critical drainage problems such as EA surface water flood risk mapping (with supplemental information in the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment on any local level flood risks – in relation to risks from ground water, ordinary watercourses, drains and sewers). Local Plan Climate Change Management Areas (CCMA) have also been fully incorporated in the assessment. The overall aim is to steer new development to Flood Zone 1 and away from areas with a higher probability of flooding on-site or likely to cause consequential flooding elsewhere. Strategic Flood Risk Assessment findings identify any local level flood risk, and more detailed assessments of infrastructure requirements have incorporated feedback from public consultation including infrastructure providers.</p> | | |
| <p>Likely evolution of the issue without implementation ('no change') of the Local Plan Review:</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> People and property could be at risk if development is located in areas of flood risk or if development takes place that would increase the risk of flooding elsewhere, bearing in mind that national flood mapping does not fully cover all water courses and potential flooding sources. Up to date flood risk data will be an important consideration in assessing the suitability of locations for new development. | |
| Scoring basis: | | What effect the proposed policy option would have relative to the 'no change' position (++ +/- - etc) and why? |
| ++ | Significant positive impact | Development would be directed to Flood Zone 1 with no known flood risk issues / Would reduce or resolve flood risks over a wider area, and not in a CCMA. |
| + | Positive impact | Development would be directed to Flood Zone 1 / Would reduce flood risk elsewhere arising from onsite, and not in a CCMA. |
| ?i | Uncertain / Depends on implementation | Not enough information to make a judgement / implementation requirements will remain unclear until development stage. |
| +/- | Mixed | Development would be directed to Flood Zone 1 but local flood risks (e.g. groundwater flooding) remain present with mitigation uncertain or no policy direction for mitigation |
| - | Negative impact | Development would be within Flood Zones 2 & 3 with significant impacts on viability / Safety hazards are worsened / compromises personal and public safety and security / no policy direction to mitigate. |
| -- | Significant negative impact | Development would be within Flood Zones 2 & 3 with no possibility to mitigate impacts / Severely worsens the flood hazard / severely impacts personal and public safety and security / no policy direction to mitigate. |
| 0 | No effect | Has no effect on the objective. |
| <p>Assumptions: Sensitive development is generally restricted within areas at risk of flooding in flood zones 2 or 3 or land which has critical drainage problems, and this was a key consideration in assessing the suitability of development sites using the Sustainability Appraisal site selection process - sites wholly or predominantly within FZ 2 and 3 were screened out as critical criteria failures and not assessed further. See Sustainability Appraisal for further detail.</p> | | |
| <p>How adverse effects will be avoided or mitigated: There may be scope for development to improve level risk by mitigation including SUDs and land at flood risk may still be suitable for open space, SUDs or SANGs within a wider development. (Master planning criteria / Planning conditions)</p> | | |

Appendix 5

SA of Strategic Policies (including options/alternatives)

| | |
|-------------------|---|
| Policy STR1 | Achieving sustainable development |
| Policy STR2 | Protection of the countryside, Cranborne Chase Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the setting of the New Forest National Park |
| Policy STR3 | The strategy for locating new development |
| Policy STR4 | The settlement hierarchy |
| Policy STR5 | Meeting housing needs |
| Policy STR6 | Sustainable economic growth |
| Policy STR7 | Strategic transport Priorities |
| Policy STR8 | Community services and infrastructure development |
| Policy STR9 | Development on land within a Minerals Safeguarding Area or Minerals Consultation Area |
| Saved Policy DM2 | Nature conservation, biodiversity and geodiversity |
| Policy ENV1 | Mitigating the impact of development on Internationally designated Habitats |
| Saved Policy DM1 | Heritage and conservation |
| Policy ENV2 | The South West Hampshire Green Belt |
| Policy ENV3 | Design quality and local distinctiveness |
| Policy ENV4 | Landscape character and quality |
| Saved Policy CS7 | Open space, sport and recreation |
| Policy HOU1 | Housing type, size and choice |
| Policy HOU2 | Affordable housing |
| Policy HOU3 | Residential accommodation for older people |
| Policy HOU4 | Gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople |
| Policy HOU5 | Rural Housing Exception Sites and Community Led Housing Schemes |
| Policy ECON1 | Employment land and development |
| Policy ECON2 | Retention of employment sites and consideration of alternative uses |
| Policy ECON3 | Marchwood Port |
| Policy ECON4 | Port development at Dibden Bay |
| Policy ECON5 | Retail development and other main town centre uses |
| Policy ECON6 | Primary, secondary and local shopping frontages |
| Saved Policy CS19 | Tourism |
| Saved Policy CS21 | Rural economy |
| Policy CCC1 | Safe and healthy communities |
| Saved Policy DM6 | Coastal change management areas |
| Policy CCC2 | Safe and sustainable travel |
| Saved Policy DM26 | Development generating significant freight movement |
| Saved Policy DM4 | Renewable and low carbon energy generation |
| Policy IMPL1 | Developer contributions |
| Policy IMPL2 | Development standards |
| Policy IMPL3 | Monitoring |

Table A5.1: Summary of how strategic policies are assessed in the Sustainability Appraisal

NB. Commentary is provided in the tables only where impacts are noted (positive or negative)

| Chapter | Policy | Policy Topic | SA of policy required? |
|--|---|---|---|
| The spatial strategy | STR1 | Achieving sustainable development | Yes |
| | STR2 | Protection of the countryside, Cranborne Chase Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the setting of the New Forest National Park | Yes |
| | STR3 | The strategy for locating new development | Yes |
| | STR4 | The settlement hierarchy | Yes |
| | STR5 | Meeting housing needs | Yes |
| | STR6 | Sustainable economic growth | Yes + options appraised by SA |
| | STR7 | Strategic transport Priorities | Yes |
| | STR8 | Community services and infrastructure development | Yes |
| | STR9 | Development on land within a Minerals Safeguarding Area or Minerals Consultation Area | Yes |
| Protecting our special environment | DM2 | Nature conservation, biodiversity and geodiversity (Saved Policy DM2) | No (Saved Policy) – but options appraised by SA |
| | ENV1 | Mitigating the impact of development on Internationally designated Habitats | Yes |
| | DM1 | Heritage and conservation (Saved Policy DM1) | No (Saved Policy) – but options appraised by SA |
| | ENV2 | The South West Hampshire Green Belt | Yes |
| | ENV3 | Design quality and local distinctiveness | Yes |
| | ENV4 | Landscape character and quality | Yes |
| | CS7 | Open space, sport and recreation (Saved Policy CS7) | No (Saved Policy) – but options appraised by SA |
| Providing for our housing needs | HOU1 | Housing type, size and choice | Yes |
| | HOU2 | Affordable housing | Yes |
| | HOU3 | Residential accommodation for older people | Yes |
| | HOU4 | Gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople | Yes |
| | HOU5 | Rural Housing Exception Sites and Community Led Housing Schemes | Yes |
| Supporting the local economy | ECON1 | Employment land and development | Yes |
| | ECON2 | Retention of employment sites and consideration of alternative uses | Yes |
| | ECON3 | Marchwood Port | Yes |
| | ECON4 | Port development at Dibden Bay | Yes |
| | ECON5 | Retail development and other main town centre uses | Yes |
| | ECON6 | Primary, secondary and local shopping frontages | Yes |
| | CS19 | Tourism (Saved Policy CS19) | No (Saved Policy) – but options appraised by SA |
| | CS21 | Rural economy (Saved Policy CS21) | No (Saved Policy) – but options appraised by SA |
| Addressing Community safety and Climate Change | CCC1 | Safe and healthy communities | Yes |
| | | Flooding and flood risk | No (Rely on NPPF) - but options appraised by SA |
| | DM6 | Coastal change management areas (Saved Policy DM6) | No (Saved Policy) – but options appraised by SA |
| | CCC2 | Safe and sustainable travel | Yes |
| | DM26 | Development generating significant freight movement (Saved DM26) | No (Saved Policy) – but options appraised by SA |
| | Renewable and low carbon energy generation (Saved Policy DM4) | No (Saved Policy) – but options appraised by SA | |
| Implementation | IMPL1 | Developer contributions | Yes |
| | IMPL2 | Development standards | Yes |
| | IMPL3 | Monitoring | Yes |

Summary table for appraisal scoring

| | |
|------------|---------------------------------------|
| ++ | Significant positive impact |
| + | Positive impact |
| ?i | Uncertain / Depends on implementation |
| +/- | Mixed |
| - | Negative impact |
| -- | Significant negative impact |
| 0 | No effect |

NB. Commentary in the following tables is only provided where impacts are noted (positive or negative).

Table A5.2: Policy Appraisals – Summary Table (covering those policies that require Sustainability Appraisal)

| Policy | | SA Objectives | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------|---|---------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------|---------|-------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|------------|----------|-------------------|--------------------------------|------------|
| | | Housing | Accessible facilities | Safe & Healthy environments | Economy | Biodiversity & Wildlife | Accessible spaces | Landscape & Townscape | Green Belt | Heritage | Natural resources | Contribution to climate change | Flood risk |
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7a | 7b | 8 | 9 | 10a | 10b |
| STR1 | Sustainable Development | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| STR2 | Countryside, National Park and AONB | +/- | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | + | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| STR3 | Strategy for locating new development | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | + | + | + | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| STR4 | Settlement hierarchy | 0 | + | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | ?i | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| STR5 | Meeting housing need | ++ | + | ?i | + | ?i | ?i | ?i | +/- | ?i | ?i | + | +/- |
| STR6 | Sustainable economic growth | 0 | + | 0 | ++ | 0 | 0 | ?i | 0 | 0 | +/- | + | +/- |
| STR7 | Strategic transport proposals | 0 | ++ | + | ?i | + | + | + | + | + | ++ | + | ++ |
| STR8 | Community services, infrastructure and facilities | + | ++ | + | + | + | + | + | + | ?i | ?i | + | + |
| ENV1 | Mitigating impact of development on international nature conservation sites | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | ++ | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| ENV2 | South west Hampshire Green Belt | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | ?i | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| ENV3 | Design quality and local distinctiveness | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | + | ?i | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | 0 |
| ENV4 | Landscape character and quality | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | ++ | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| HOU1 | Housing type, size and choice | + | 0 | 0 | + | ?i | ?i | 0 | +/- | 0 | ?i | 0 | ?i |
| HOU2 | Affordable housing | ++ | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| HOU3 | Residential accommodation for older people | + | + | + | ++ | 0 | 0 | ?i | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| HOU4 | Gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople | ++ | + | ++ | ?i | 0 | 0 | ++ | ++ | + | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| HOU5 | Rural Housing Exception Sites and Community Led Housing Schemes | ++ | + | 0 | + | ?i | ?i | ?i | ?i | ?i | 0 | ?i | ?i |
| ECON1 | Employment land and development | 0 | + | + | ++ | ?i | 0 | ?i | 0 | ?i | + | + | 0 |
| ECON2 | Retention of employment sites and consideration of alternative uses | + | + | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | 0 |
| ECON3 | Marchwood Port | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | ?i | 0 | 0 | + | + | 0 |
| ECON4 | Port development at Dibden Bay | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | ?i | 0 | ?i | 0 | 0 | ?i | ?i | 0 |
| ECON5 | Retail development and other main town centre uses | 0 | + | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | ?i | 0 | ?i | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| Policy | | SA Objectives | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------|---|---------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------|---------|-------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|------------|----------|-------------------|--------------------------------|------------|
| | | Housing | Accessible facilities | Safe & Healthy environments | Economy | Biodiversity & Wildlife | Accessible spaces | Landscape & Townscape | Green Belt | Heritage | Natural resources | Contribution to climate change | Flood risk |
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7a | 7b | 8 | 9 | 10a | 10b |
| ECON6 | Primary, secondary and local shopping frontages | 0 | + | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | ?i | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| CCC1 | Safe and healthy communities | - | 0 | ++ | 0 | + | 0 | + | 0 | ?i | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| CCC2 | Safe and sustainable travel | 0 | + | + | ?i | ?i | ?i | ?i | ?i | ?i | + | ?i | + |
| IMPL1 | Developer contributions | ?i | ++ | + | + | + | + | ?i | ?i | ?i | ?i | ?i | ?i |
| IMPL2 | Development standards | ?i | + | + | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | ?i | + | + | 0 |
| IMPL3 | Monitoring | ?i | ?i | ?i | ?i | ?i | ?i | ?i | ?i | ?i | ?i | ?i | ?i |

Policy STR1: Achieving sustainable development (SA of Policy)

| Policy | 1 Meeting Housing Needs | 2 Accessible opportunities, facilities and services | 3 Safe and Healthy environments | 4 A thriving Economy | 5 Protecting Biodiversity and wildlife | 6 Accessible Greenspace, coast and water bodies | 7a Protecting landscape and townscape | 7b Protecting landscape and townscape | 8 Heritage | 9 Sustainable Natural Resources | 10a Managing Climate Change | 10b Managing Climate Change | Conclusion |
|--------|----------------------------|--|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|--|--|--|---------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|
| 1 | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | |

SA Commentary:

- **Objective 1:** Policy states that all new development needs to address the housing needs, with a mix, tenure and cost considerations.
- **Objective 2:** Policy states that all new development needs to be located within settlements where there is or will be sufficient supporting infrastructure or services.
- **Objective 3:** Policy states that all new development needs to ensure that communities are safe from hazards including pollution and that development is accessible by sustainable transport modes.
- **Objective 4:** Policy states that all new development needs to contribute towards a diverse and thriving economy.
- **Objective 5:** Policy states that all new development needs to achieve a net environmental gain for biodiversity and wildlife.
- **Objective 6:** Policy states that all new development needs to meet the needs of supporting infrastructure which includes open space, play facilities and water bodies.
- **Objective 7a:** Policy states that all new development needs to take a landscape base approach to deliver high quality landscapes, townscapes heritage and scenic and amenity value the New Forest National Park.
- **Objective 8:** Policy states that all new development needs to take a landscape base approach to deliver high quality landscapes, townscapes and heritage.
- **Objective 9:** Policy states that all new development needs to ensure that communities are safe from hazards including pollution and flooding.
- **Objective 10a:** Policy states that new development should be future proofed for climate change (including innovations in transport and communications technology)
- **Objective 10b:** Policy states that all new development needs to ensure that communities are safe from hazards including flooding.

Policy STR2: Protection of the countryside, Cranborne Chase Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the setting of the New Forest National Park (SA of Policy)

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------------------|--|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|--|--|--|---------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|--|
| Policy | 1 Meeting Housing Needs | 2 Accessible opportunities, facilities and services | 3 Safe and Healthy environments | 4 A thriving Economy | 5 Protecting Biodiversity and wildlife | 6 Accessible Greenspace, coast and water bodies | 7a Protecting landscape and townscape | 7b Protecting landscape and townscape | 8 Heritage | 9 Sustainable Natural Resources | 10a Managing Climate Change | 10b Managing Climate Change | Conclusion | |
| 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | + | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | |
| <p>SA Commentary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objective 6: The policy protects natural and semi natural spaces and the coast. • Objective 7a: The policy states that development needs to ensure that there are no unacceptable impacts on the AONB and National Park. • Objective 8: The policy states that development needs to ensure that there are no unacceptable impacts on the AONB and National Park. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Policy STR3: The strategy for locating new development (SA of Policy)

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------------------|--|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|--|--|--|---------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|--|
| Policy | 1 Meeting Housing Needs | 2 Accessible opportunities, facilities and services | 3 Safe and Healthy environments | 4 A thriving Economy | 5 Protecting Biodiversity and wildlife | 6 Accessible Greenspace, coast and water bodies | 7a Protecting landscape and townscape | 7b Protecting landscape and townscape | 8 Heritage | 9 Sustainable Natural Resources | 10a Managing Climate Change | 10b Managing Climate Change | Conclusion | |
| 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | + | + | + | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | |
| <p>SA Commentary: Objectives 4, 5, 6 7a and 7b: The policy states that all new development needs to sustain the vitality and viability of the towns and villages, and to be safe, attractive and accessible places to visit. Development is also expected to achieve a high standard of design. The primary objectives are to conserve and enhance the countryside and the natural environment.</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Policy STR4: The settlement hierarchy (SA of Policy)

| Policy | 1 Meeting Housing Needs | 2 Accessible opportunities, facilities and services | 3 Safe and Healthy environments | 4 A thriving Economy | 5 Protecting Biodiversity and wildlife | 6 Accessible Greenspace, coast and water bodies | 7a Protecting landscape and townscape | 7b Protecting landscape and townscape | 8 Heritage | 9 Sustainable Natural Resources | 10a Managing Climate Change | 10b Managing Climate Change | Conclusion |
|--|----------------------------|---|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|---|--|--|---------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|
| 4 | 0 | + | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | ?i | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + |
| SA Commentary: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objective 2: The settlement hierarchy sets out which settlements have the range of facilities and services, and encourages development into those towns and villages with the facilities. • Objective 4: The settlement hierarchy sets out which settlements have the range of facilities and services, and encourages employment into those towns and villages with the facilities. • Objective 7a: Uncertain / will depend on detailed implementation of the allocations / individual schemes | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Policy STR5: Meeting housing needs (SA of Policy)

| Policy | 1 Meeting Housing Needs | 2 Accessible opportunities, facilities and services | 3 Safe and Healthy environments | 4 A thriving Economy | 5 Protecting Biodiversity and wildlife | 6 Accessible Greenspace, coast and water bodies | 7a Protecting landscape and townscape | 7b Protecting landscape and townscape | 8 Heritage | 9 Sustainable Natural Resources | 10a Managing Climate Change | 10b Managing Climate Change | Conclusion |
|--------|----------------------------|--|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|--|--|--|---------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|
| 5 | ++ | + | ?i | + | ?i | ?i | ?i | +/- | ?i | ?i | + | +/- | + |

SA Commentary:

- **Objective 1:** The policy will be meeting the evidence based need for housing in the plan area.
- **Objective 2:** The policy allocates land in sustainable locations, with access to facilities and services.
- **Objectives 3, 5, 6, 7a, 8 and 9:** Uncertain / will depend on detailed implementation of the allocations / individual schemes.
- **Objective 4:** All housing developments will benefit the economy from construction jobs to increased spending in the local economy by new homeowners.
- **Objective 7b:** Some allocated sites include some weak to moderate Green Belt and development may provide some landscape enhancement.
- **Objective 10a:** Locating new development in sustainable locations helps to minimise the need to travel, and reduce greenhouse gas emissions.
- **Objective 10b:** Parts of some sites are within Flood Zone 2, but can be mitigated to be safe and resolve flood risks elsewhere.

Policy STR6: Sustainable Economic Growth (SA of Options) - main options/alternatives considered:

1. A policy which seeks to attract significant inward investment and large-scale business development. The policy will retain the land remaining from existing Local Plan employment allocations which will be saved and will additionally make new large-scale employment allocations
2. A policy which seeks to retain and enhance existing business sectors, support local employment opportunities and new employment development appropriate to the characteristics of the Plan Area. To address projected employment land needs, the policy will retain the land remaining from existing Local Plan employment allocations which will be saved
3. A policy which seeks to retain and enhance existing business sectors, support local employment opportunities and new employment development appropriate to the characteristics of the Plan Area. The policy will retain the land remaining from existing Local Plan employment allocations which will be saved and will also include a modest element of new employment provision as part of the proposed residential-led strategic site allocations at North Totton, East Ringwood and the former Fawley Power Station to enable future projected employment land needs to be fully addressed with a surplus to provide for uncertainties or loss of land to non-employment uses

| Option | 1 Meeting Housing Needs | 2 Accessible opportunities, facilities and services | 3 Safe and Healthy environments | 4 A thriving Economy | 5 Protecting Biodiversity and wildlife | 6 Accessible Greenspace, coast and water bodies | 7a Protecting landscape and townscape | 7b Protecting landscape and townscape | 8 Heritage | 9 Sustainable Natural Resources | 10a Managing Climate Change | 10b Managing Climate Change | Conclusion |
|--------|----------------------------|---|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|---|--|--|---------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|
| 1 | 0 | + | 0 | +/- | ?i | 0 | ?i | 0 | ?i | + | +/- | 0 | +/- |
| 2 | 0 | +/- | 0 | + | - | 0 | - | 0 | ?i | +/- | +/- | 0 | - |
| 3 | 0 | + | 0 | + | ?i | 0 | ?i | 0 | ?i | + | +/- | 0 | + |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|----------------------------|--|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|--|--|--|---------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|--|
| Option | 1 Meeting Housing Needs | 2 Accessible opportunities, facilities and services | 3 Safe and Healthy environments | 4 A thriving Economy | 5 Protecting Biodiversity and wildlife | 6 Accessible Greenspace, coast and water bodies | 7a Protecting landscape and townscape | 7b Protecting landscape and townscape | 8 Heritage | 9 Sustainable Natural Resources | 10a Managing Climate Change | 10b Managing Climate Change | Conclusion | |
| <p>Options Commentary:</p> <p>Option 1: This option would be appropriate to the environmental characteristics of the Plan Area and would encourage the efficient use of existing employment sites and premises. However, it would not provide sufficient flexibility for businesses to establish themselves or locate in the Plan Area and will overly restrict the choices and options available to businesses</p> <p>Option 2: This option would not be appropriate or sustainable in the context of this Plan Area given the high number of national and international environmental designations within or on the edge of the District. Supporting development in all locations without criteria will likely have a harmful impact on the landscape and risk adverse impacts on international designated sites</p> <p>Option3 : This option would remain appropriate to the environmental characteristics of the Plan Area as it seeks to ensure that new business and employment development is proportionate to the scale and nature of the settlement. The option supports employment development to occur within the towns and large villages, and for new small-scale built development to occur within rural villages. This provides choice and flexibility for businesses to establish themselves and be able to grow within the Plan Area. This policy would have a positive effect on the economy whilst remaining compatible with the sensitive environment of the Plan Area.</p> <p>Conclusion (Reasoning for Preferred Option): Option 3 is the most appropriate strategy as it provides flexibility for development to occur in a variety of locations and provides choice and flexibility for businesses. This approach will most benefit the local economy whilst ensuring that new development will be appropriately located and compatible with the sensitive environment of the Plan Area.</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Policy STR6: Sustainable Economic Growth (SA of Policy)

| Policy | 1 Meeting Housing Needs | 2 Accessible opportunities, facilities and services | 3 Safe and Healthy environments | 4 A thriving Economy | 5 Protecting Biodiversity and wildlife | 6 Accessible Greenspace, coast and water bodies | 7a Protecting landscape and townscape | 7b Protecting landscape and townscape | 8 Heritage | 9 Sustainable Natural Resources | 10a Managing Climate Change | 10b Managing Climate Change | Conclusion |
|--------|----------------------------|--|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|--|--|--|---------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|
| 6 | 0 | + | 0 | ++ | 0 | 0 | ?i | 0 | 0 | +/- | + | +/- | + |

SA Commentary:

- **Objective 2:** Positive impact. The policy provides for small new employment land provision as part of residential-led mixed use developments and will provide convenient access to services and facilities. New employment provision is located in areas that have good access to the main road networks
- **Objective 4:** Significant positive impact. The policy will retain sufficient employment land in suitable locations and provide sufficient additional land to provide choice and flexibility, support existing business sectors, encourage higher value, knowledge-based businesses and promote proposals that provide training and mentoring. This will support new and existing businesses, create job opportunities and enhance workforce skills
- **Objective 7a:** Uncertain impact / will depend on detailed implementation of the allocations / individual schemes. However, landscape and design related policies in the Local Plan would not allow development that unacceptably harms the character of the area
- **Objective 9:** Mixed positive and negative impacts. New employment provision as part of mixed-use residential-led strategic site allocations will result in the loss of some medium quality agricultural land. However, the policy encourages the use of brownfield land and redundant buildings which will have a positive effect on the objective and provides for new employment development as part of a comprehensive mixed use redevelopment of the former Fawley Power Station site
- **Objective 10a:** Positive impact. New employment provision as part of mixed use residential-led strategic site allocations in sustainable locations will provide jobs close to people’s homes and will minimise the need to travel.
- **Objective 10b:** Parts of the east of Ringwood and former Fawley Power Station site are within Flood Zone 2 and 3, but can be mitigated to be safe and not worsen flood risks elsewhere

Policy STR7: Strategic Transport Priorities (SA of Options) - main options/alternatives considered:

1. Save existing policy
2. Delete policy relating to strategic aspirations and rely on Hampshire Local Transport Plan Long Term Strategy and New Forest Transport Statement
3. Aspirations for the district will be identified within the local plan and where there is evidence to support the strategic aspirations where they are relevant to proposed housing growth these will be included within the policy.

| Option | 1 Meeting Housing Needs | 2 Accessible opportunities, facilities and services | 3 Safe and Healthy environments | 4 A thriving Economy | 5 Protecting Biodiversity and wildlife | 6 Accessible Greenspace, coast and water bodies | 7a Protecting landscape and townscape | 7b Protecting landscape and townscape | 8 Heritage | 9 Sustainable Natural Resources | 10a Managing Climate Change | 10b Managing Climate Change | Conclusion |
|--------|----------------------------|--|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|--|--|--|---------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|
| 1 | 0 | + | ?i | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| 2 | 0 | ?i | ?i | ?i | ?i | ?i | ?i | ?i | ?i | ?i | - | ?i | - |
| 3 | 0 | ++ | + | ?i | + | + | + | + | + | + | ++ | + | ++ |

Options Commentary:

- The purpose of options 1 and 3 are to support improvements that reduce congestion, improve accessibility and improve road safety. In both options improvements to public transport provision specific to the district are sought.
- Having regard to option 2, it is not considered that the Council could rely on the Hampshire Transport Plan and New Forest Transport Statement to reflect high transport priorities for the District specifically and use them to deliver these. As they are matters of strategic importance to NFDC they should be included within the Local Plan to give them appropriate weight.
- Option 3 incorporates additional and up to date matters for improvements on the strategic road network.

Conclusion (Reasoning for Preferred Option):

All options directly seek to provide services such as pedestrian and cycle routes. Option 2 and 3 seeks to require specific requirements for strategic sites such as access arrangements and pedestrian/cycle routes. Options 1 and 3 score positively across most of the Sustainability Appraisal criteria. Based on the SA scoring Option 3 is deemed the preferred option as it provides an updated policy based on the most recent assessment of need.

Policy STR7: Strategic Transport Priorities (SA of Policy)

| Policy | 1 Meeting Housing Needs | 2 Accessible opportunities, facilities and services | 3 Safe and Healthy environments | 4 A thriving Economy | 5 Protecting Biodiversity and wildlife | 6 Accessible Greenspace, coast and water bodies | 7a Protecting landscape and townscape | 7b Protecting landscape and townscape | 8 Heritage | 9 Sustainable Natural Resources | 10a Managing Climate Change | 10b Managing Climate Change | Conclusion |
|--------|----------------------------|--|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|--|--|--|---------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|
| 7 | 0 | ++ | + | ?i | + | + | + | + | + | + | ++ | + | ++ |

SA Commentary:

- **Objective 2** - Directly provides facilities and services to meet the needs identified in the evidence base
- **Objective 3** - Policy provides strategy for safe vehicular access and promotes wider pedestrian and cycle routes
- **Objective 4** – Depending on implementation it is uncertain what direct effects this will have on the economy, but they are not considered significant.
- **Objective 5** – Policy ensures that major projects can be achieved without an unacceptable impact on the local environment
- **Objective 6** - Policy ensures that major projects can be achieved without an unacceptable impact on the local environment and local communities
- **Objectives 7a and 7b** - Policy ensures that major projects can be achieved without an unacceptable impact on the local environment
- **Objective 8** - Policy ensures that major projects can be achieved without an unacceptable impact on the local environment
- **Objective 9** - Policy ensures that major projects can be achieved without an unacceptable impact on the local environment
- **Objective 10a** - Provides alternative modes of transport
- **Objective 10b** - Policy ensures that major projects can be achieved without an unacceptable impact on the local environment

Policy STR8: Community services and infrastructure development (SA of Options) - main options/alternatives considered:

1. Renew policy CS8 unchanged
2. Policy to require communications infrastructure, utilities and transport infrastructure provision, community facilities and services.
3. No policy

| Option | 1 Meeting Housing Needs | 2 Accessible opportunities, facilities and services | 3 Safe and Healthy environments | 4 A thriving Economy | 5 Protecting Biodiversity and wildlife | 6 Accessible Greenspace, coast and water bodies | 7a Protecting landscape and townscape | 7b Protecting landscape and townscape | 8 Heritage | 9 Sustainable Natural Resources | 10a Managing Climate Change | 10b Managing Climate Change | Conclusion |
|--------|----------------------------|--|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|--|--|--|---------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|
| 1 | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | ?i | ?i | + | + | + |
| 2 | + | ++ | + | + | + | + | + | + | ?i | ?i | + | + | ++ |
| 3 | ?i | - | ?i | ?i | ?i | ?i | ?i | ?i | ?i | ?i | ?i | ?i | - |

Options Commentary:

Option 1 facilitates clear links to a variety of facilities and services and would ensure that facilities can be made adequate to meet growth. There is a presumption against loss of facilities but this is only for publically provided services and a policy should potentially include all facilities.

Option 2 would ensure that the needs identified in the evidence are met by the council ensuring service and infrastructure providers’ support and enable the delivery of facilities and services to meet the needs of proposed development. There is a presumption against any loss of any community infrastructure services unless redundant or implemented as part of a wider plan following service review.

Option 3 would not ensure that growth levels are adequately mitigated as there would be no mechanism to ensure that supporting infrastructure is provided.

Conclusion (Reasoning for Preferred Option):

Based on the SA scores Option 2 is deemed the preferred option for the positive contribution it will make to growth.

Policy STR8: Community service and infrastructure development (SA of Policy)

| Policy | 1 Meeting Housing Needs | 2 Accessible opportunities, facilities and services | 3 Safe and Healthy environments | 4 A thriving Economy | 5 Protecting Biodiversity and wildlife | 6 Accessible Greenspace, coast and water bodies | 7a Protecting landscape and townscape | 7b Protecting landscape and townscape | 8 Heritage | 9 Sustainable Natural Resources | 10a Managing Climate Change | 10b Managing Climate Change | Conclusion | |
|--------|--|--|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|--|--|--|---------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|--|
| 8 | + | ++ | + | + | + | + | + | + | ?i | ?i | + | + | ++ | |
| | <p>SA Commentary :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objective 1: The policy has no adverse effect on housing provision based on the assumption within the SA framework that housing development must be designed to provide access to facilities via existing amenities or the provision of new facilities. • Objective 2: Directly provides facilities and services to meet the needs identified in the evidence base • Objective 3: The policy has a positive effect by helping to avoid or minimise and adequately mitigate any adverse environmental impacts. • Objective 4: The policy supports the vitality and viability of the town and service centres and provide education skills and employment • Objective 5: The policy has a positive effect by helping to avoid or minimise and adequately mitigate any adverse environmental impacts • Objective 6: The policy seeks to retain provision of accessible open space and outdoor facilities • Objective 7a: The policy seeks to minimise adverse landscape impacts of new infrastructure • Objective 8: Implementation requirements will remain unclear until development stage • Objective 9: Implementation requirements will remain unclear until development stage • Objective 10a: encourages alternative modes of transport • Objective 10b: The policy has a positive effect by helping to avoid or minimise and adequately mitigate any adverse environmental impacts | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Policy STR9: Development on land within a Minerals Safeguarding Area or Minerals Consultation Area

| Policy | 1 Meeting Housing Needs | 2 Accessible opportunities, facilities and services | 3 Safe and Healthy environments | 4 A thriving Economy | 5 Protecting Biodiversity and wildlife | 6 Accessible Greenspace, coast and water bodies | 7a Protecting landscape and townscape | 7b Protecting landscape and townscape | 8 Heritage | 9 Sustainable Natural Resources | 10a Managing Climate Change | 10b Managing Climate Change | Conclusion |
|--------|----------------------------|---|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|---|--|--|---------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|
| | ?i | 0 | + | + | ?i | + | ?i | ?i | ?i | + | ?i | ?i | + |

SA Commentary:

- **Objective 1:** Implementation requirements and their effects on meeting housing need are provided in the policy and will help to minimise any possible delays in delivering housing on strategic sites. However, the restoration of land and net environmental gain requirements related to that restoration could affect final housing provision.
- **Objective 3:** Policy states that appropriate extraction will depend on amenity and other relevant considerations; the policy provides the framework for assessing the implementation requirements (e.g. assessment of amenity and environmental considerations arising from extraction)
- **Objective 4:** Protects existing opportunities for education and skills, especially local employment opportunities.
- **Objective 5:** The policy seeks a net environmental gain and the protection of features of biodiversity interest (and can be addressed together with providing recreational mitigation) but the implementation requirements will be unclear until development stage
- **Objective 6:** Enhancements to open space and access to it could be achieved in combination with providing recreational mitigation and the restoration of land.
- **Objective 7a:** Implementation requirements remain unclear until development stage, but the policy requires the protection of features of landscape and other relevant considerations.
- **Objective 7b:** New development expected to be a high design standard and appropriate to its context; the opportunity to protect and enhance green belt purposes can only be judged at planning application stage.
- **Objective 8:** The impacts & implementation requirements in relation to heritage features & assets will remain unclear until development proposals come forward.
- **Objective 9:** Protects the prior extraction of viable mineral resources (following a minerals assessment).
- **Objective 10a:** Impacts on this objective will depend on the scale and nature of any mineral workings, e.g. whether the site is close to local processing plants.
- **Objective 10b:** Policy clear that extraction will only be appropriate if the mineral workings do not adversely affect ground water levels and the re-use of the land.

Policy ENV1: Nature conservation, biodiversity and geodiversity (SA of Options) - main options/alternatives considered:

1. Retain approach in policies CS3 and DM2 to protecting biodiversity and nature conservation sites but update and combine the policies into a single new policy.
2. Retain existing approach in policy DM2 with no changes and delete policy CS3 (but incorporating relevant design/masterplanning and heritage elements to new policies relating to design and heritage)
3. Replace the policies with a single policy which leaves it to promoters of development to identify / mitigate any adverse impacts on nature conservation sites.
4. Not to have policies on nature conservation or habitat mitigation.

| Option | 1 Meeting Housing Needs | 2 Accessible opportunities, facilities and services | 3 Safe and Healthy environments | 4 A thriving Economy | 5 Protecting Biodiversity and wildlife | 6 Accessible Greenspace, coast and water bodies | 7a Protecting landscape and townscape | 7b Protecting landscape and townscape | 8 Heritage | 9 Sustainable Natural Resources | 10a Managing Climate Change | 10b Managing Climate Change | Conclusion |
|--------|----------------------------|--|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|--|--|--|---------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | ++ | + | + | i? | i? | + | + | + | + |
| 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | ++ | + | + | i? | i? | 0 | 0 | + | + |
| 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | i? | i? | i? | i? | i? | i? | i? | i? |
| 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | - | - | i? | - | - | -- | - |

Options commentary:

Option 1 would safeguard wildlife and the integrity of nature conservation sites (especially in relation to Natura 2000 sites) and would provide sufficient coverage that the Habitat Regulation Assessment requires of the development plan

Option 2 would safeguard wildlife and the integrity of nature conservation sites (especially in relation to Natura 2000 sites) and would provide sufficient coverage that the Habitat Regulation Assessment requires of the development plan. Would resolve some unnecessary duplication evident between the two policies.

Option 3 would not provide sufficient certainty that the full mitigation required across the plan area would be delivered (especially adverse in-combination effects).

Option 4 would give rise to development which provides no mitigation for adverse effects on designated nature conservation sites - would result in unsound plan.

Conclusion (Reasoning for Preferred Option):

Option 2 is the most appropriate policy. This will save Policy DM2 (Nature conservation, biodiversity and geodiversity) and delete Policy CS3 (Protecting and enhancing our special environment) but incorporate relevant design / masterplanning and heritage elements into new policies relating to design and heritage. Would resolve some unnecessary duplication evident between the two policies and provide greater clarity in the approach between natural features and the built environment.

Policy ENV1: Mitigating the impact of development on Internationally designated Habitats (SA of Options)**(1) The amount and type of mitigation required - main options/alternatives considered:**

1. Remove policy. Whilst the Habitat Regulations will still be in force it will be difficult for the Council to secure any contribution to mitigation, specifically the onsite SANGS requirements.
2. Retain existing policy. The existing policy appears to be working well and developers continue to contribute to the scheme.
3. Amend existing policy. Natural England has suggested that the mitigation requirement should be retained at 8ha per 1,000 population but that the informal open space element no longer makes a contribution to this. This would give an overall increase to the amount of natural green space provided on site.

| Option | 1 Meeting Housing Needs | 2 Accessible opportunities, facilities and services | 3 Safe and Healthy environments | 4 A thriving Economy | 5 Protecting Biodiversity and wildlife | 6 Accessible Greenspace, coast and water bodies | 7a Protecting landscape and townscape | 7b Protecting landscape and townscape | 8 Heritage | 9 Sustainable Natural Resources | 10a Managing Climate Change | 10b Managing Climate Change | Conclusion |
|--------|----------------------------|---|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|---|--|--|---------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|
| 1 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | + | + | + | 0 | + | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + |
| 3 | + | ++ | + | 0 | ++ | ++ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | ++ |

Options Commentary:

Option 1: Likely that if Option 1 were pursued the plan would be likely to be found unsound at examination and not in conformity with NPPF or Habitat Regulations.

Option 2: A sound option as Natural England are proposing an increase to the standard (with the removal of the informal element) and this is supported by the HRA then Option 3 would seem the most logical approach and is supported by SA analysis

Option 3: CIL (or its replacement) would continue to fund the off-site element of the infrastructure elements whilst developers would still be required to provide the onsite element on top of CIL for sites over 50 (although the CIL policy documents would continue to reflect the fact that the land could be offered to the Council as a payment in kind against the CIL liability).

Conclusion (Reasoning for Preferred Option): Option 3 is deemed the most appropriate policy as it reflects the latest discussions with Natural England.

Policy ENV1: Mitigating the impact of development on Internationally designated Habitats (SA of Options)

(2) SANG maintenance and management - main options/alternatives considered:

1. Remove policy. Whilst the Habitat Regulations will still be in force it will be difficult for the Council to secure any contribution to mitigation, specifically the onsite SANGS requirements.
2. Retain existing policy. The existing policy appears to be working well and developers continue to contribute to the scheme.
3. Amend existing policy. Natural England has suggested that the mitigation requirement should be retained at 8ha per 1,000 population but that the informal open space element no longer makes a contribution to this. This would give an overall increase to the amount of natural green space provided on site.

| Option | 1 Meeting Housing Needs | 2 Accessible opportunities, facilities and services | 3 Safe and Healthy environments | 4 A thriving Economy | 5 Protecting Biodiversity and wildlife | 6 Accessible Greenspace, coast and water bodies | 7a Protecting landscape and townscape | 7b Protecting landscape and townscape | 8 Heritage | 9 Sustainable Natural Resources | 10a Managing Climate Change | 10b Managing Climate Change | Conclusion |
|--------|----------------------------|--|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|--|--|--|---------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | + | + | + | 0 | + | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + |
| 3 | + | + | + | 0 | + | ++ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + |

Options Commentary:

Option 1 would likely return an objection from Natural England as the Council would be unable to secure the future availability of the site. Whilst Natural England have stated that they will support a stance that all SANGS should be transferred to the Council, it is likely that option 3 is the only option that will allow some sites to come forward and this could also result in better SANGS being provided. Appropriate guidance would need to be included within an SPD which sets out in detail the requirements for each tier.

Conclusion (Reasoning for Preferred Option):

Option 3 is deemed the most appropriate policy as it reflects the latest discussions with Natural England.

Policy ENV1: Mitigating the impact of development on Internationally designated Habitats (SA of Options)

(3) Types of Mitigation: non-infrastructure - main options/alternatives considered:

1. Remove policy. This would remove the requirement for access management and monitoring. .
2. Retain existing policy. The existing policy appears to be working well and developers continue to contribute to the scheme. However, an increase of housing development would suggest a larger Ranger provision would be required.
3. Amend existing policy. Natural England have suggested that all new development should contribute to access management (including those sites providing SANGS on site) this is to help provide education and behavioural advise to those who do not visit the SANGS provided as part of the development. The SRMP is also proposing an increase of their contribution from £178 (index linked) to £426 (for Ranger activities only). Natural England have strongly suggested that this Council continues to contribute and be part of this partnership.

| Option | 1 Meeting Housing Needs | 2 Accessible opportunities, facilities and services | 3 Safe and Healthy environments | 4 A thriving Economy | 5 Protecting Biodiversity and wildlife | 6 Accessible Greenspace, coast and water bodies | 7a Protecting landscape and townscape | 7b Protecting landscape and townscape | 8 Heritage | 9 Sustainable Natural Resources | 10a Managing Climate Change | 10b Managing Climate Change | Conclusion |
|--------|----------------------------|--|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|--|--|--|---------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|
| 1 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | +/- |
| 2 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + |
| 3 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | ++ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + |

Options Commentary:

- **Option 1:** If this were pursued it is likely the plan would be found unsound at examination and not in conformity with the NPPF or Habitat Regulations. If the Council is unable to monitor the effects of any mitigation it is unlikely to be able to demonstrate that there are no impacts on the SPA.
- **Option 2:** Possible, although the points raised by Natural England that not all new residents will visit the SANGS is valid and therefore it makes sense that these developments should also contribute to access management as well as monitoring.
- **Option 3:** Natural England has stated that the Ranger provision should be secured in-perpetuity (has accepted 80 years as this figure). As more dwellings will be provided during the plan period more Rangers should be provided. An increase in Rangers and the in-perpetuity fund will likely increase the contributions sought.

Conclusion (Reasoning for Preferred Option):

Option 3 is deemed the most appropriate policy as it reflects the latest discussions with Natural England.

Policy ENV1: Mitigating the impact of development on International Nature Conservation sites (SA of Policy)

| Policy | 1 Meeting Housing Needs | 2 Accessible opportunities, facilities and services | 3 Safe and Healthy environments | 4 A thriving Economy | 5 Protecting Biodiversity and wildlife | 6 Accessible Greenspace, coast and water bodies | 7a Protecting landscape and townscape | 7b Protecting landscape and townscape | 8 Heritage | 9 Sustainable Natural Resources | 10a Managing Climate Change | 10b Managing Climate Change | Conclusion |
|--|----------------------------|---|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|---|--|--|---------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|
| 10 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | ++ | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + |
| <p>SA Commentary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objective 1: The policy has no adverse effect on housing provision, and will provide the framework for mitigation that is statutorily required to accompany housing delivery over the plan period. • Objective 5: The policy provides full mitigation of recreational pressures, and provides a framework for protecting and enhancing biodiversity. • Objective 6: Protects natural and semi natural open spaces, water bodies or features of green infrastructure. Natural England has suggested that the mitigation requirement should be retained at 8ha per 1,000 population but that the informal open space element in the previous adopted policy no longer makes a contribution to this. This would give an overall increase to the amount of natural green space provided on site. <p>The policy has positive effects and meets Natural England’s guidance on the provision of mitigation and refines the existing policy which appears to be working well.</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Heritage and conservation (SA of Options) - main options/alternatives considered:

1. Have no policy and rely entirely on the NPPF
2. Save Policy DM1: Heritage and Conservation

| Option | 1 Meeting Housing Needs | 2 Accessible opportunities, facilities and services | 3 Safe and Healthy environments | 4 A thriving Economy | 5 Protecting Biodiversity and wildlife | 6 Accessible Greenspace, coast and water bodies | 7a Protecting landscape and townscape | 7b Protecting landscape and townscape | 8 Heritage | 9 Sustainable Natural Resources | 10a Managing Climate Change | 10b Managing Climate Change | Conclusion |
|--------|----------------------------|---|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|---|--|--|---------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | +/- | 0 | 0 | 0 | +/- |
| 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | + |

Options Commentary:

- **Option 2** is the most appropriate would retain a policy that was prepared and adopted post-NPPF, and still meets the requirements of the NPPF.

Conclusion (Reasoning for Preferred Option):

Saving the policy (with minor updates as suggested by Historic England) is deemed the preferred option due to the continued positive planning for heritage and conservation.

Policy ENV2: The South West Hampshire Green Belt (SA of Policy)

| Policy | 1 Meeting Housing Needs | 2 Accessible opportunities, facilities and services | 3 Safe and Healthy environments | 4 A thriving Economy | 5 Protecting Biodiversity and wildlife | 6 Accessible Greenspace, coast and water bodies | 7a Protecting landscape and townscape | 7b Protecting landscape and townscape | 8 Heritage | 9 Sustainable Natural Resources | 10a Managing Climate Change | 10b Managing Climate Change | Conclusion |
|--------|----------------------------|---|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|---|--|--|---------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|
| 12 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | ?i | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + |

The options regarding green belt are set out in detail in Chapter 9 of the SA report.

SA Commentary:

- **Objective 1:** Negative impact as the policy restricts residential development within the green belt.
- **Objective 5:** Uncertain / will depend on requirements of individual applicants.
- **Objective 7b:** The policy explicitly states that the openness and permanence of the Green Belt will be preserved and where possible enhanced.

Policy ENV3: Design quality and local distinctiveness (SA of Policy)

| Policy | 1 Meeting Housing Needs | 2 Accessible opportunities, facilities and services | 3 Safe and Healthy environments | 4 A thriving Economy | 5 Protecting Biodiversity and wildlife | 6 Accessible Greenspace, coast and water bodies | 7a Protecting landscape and townscape | 7b Protecting landscape and townscape | 8 Heritage | 9 Sustainable Natural Resources | 10a Managing Climate Change | 10b Managing Climate Change | Conclusion |
|--------|----------------------------|--|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|--|--|--|---------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|
| 13 | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | + | ?i | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | + |

SA Commentary:

- **Objective 3:** The policy states that all development will be required to create buildings, streets and spaces which are accessible to those with disabilities and of reduced mobility, are safe and easy to navigate, and that minimise opportunities for anti-social and criminal behaviour. To integrate car and cycle spaces so that needs are that is not prejudicial to the character and quality of the street, highway safety, emergency or service access or to pedestrian convenience and comfort;
- **Objective 6:** The policy requires that development should provide green spaces including planting and where applicable, provision for play, sports and natural greenspace and mitigation.
- **Objective 7a:** Uncertain / will depend on detailed implementation of the allocations / individual schemes.
- **Objective 10a:** The policy states development should incorporate design measures that improve resource efficiency and climate change resilience, such as grey water recycling, natural heating and cooling and the use of Suds.

Policy ENV4: Landscape character and quality (SA of Policy)

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------|----------------------------|--|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|--|--|--|---------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|--|
| Policy | 1 Meeting Housing Needs | 2 Accessible opportunities, facilities and services | 3 Safe and Healthy environments | 4 A thriving Economy | 5 Protecting Biodiversity and wildlife | 6 Accessible Greenspace, coast and water bodies | 7a Protecting landscape and townscape | 7b Protecting landscape and townscape | 8 Heritage | 9 Sustainable Natural Resources | 10a Managing Climate Change | 10b Managing Climate Change | Conclusion | |
| 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | ++ | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | ++ | |

SA Commentary:

- **Objective 7a:** The policy states that new development is required retain and or enhance landscape features.
- **Objective 8:** The policy will protect or enhance landscape features

Open Space sport and recreation (SA of Options) - main options/alternatives considered:

1. Roll forward the current policy regarding open space (CS7) with any factual changes
2. Roll forward the current policy amending the wording of the current open space policy (CS7) to include the actual open space standard and remove references to recreational pressures on designated nature conservation sites.
3. Have no policy on open space, relying solely on the NPPF.

| Option | 1 Meeting Housing Needs | 2 Accessible opportunities, facilities and services | 3 Safe and Healthy environments | 4 A thriving Economy | 5 Protecting Biodiversity and wildlife | 6 Accessible Greenspace, coast and water bodies | 7a Protecting landscape and townscape | 7b Protecting landscape and townscape | 8 Heritage | 9 Sustainable Natural Resources | 10a Managing Climate Change | 10b Managing Climate Change | Conclusion |
|--------|----------------------------|---|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|---|--|--|---------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|
| 1 | 0 | + | + | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | + |
| 2 | 0 | ++ | + | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | + |
| 3 | 0 | - | ?- | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | ?i | 0 | - |

Options Commentary:

Options 1 and 2 are supported by the evidence received within the Formal Open Space Study and based upon the existing levels of open space provided within parishes across the district. Option 3 would be reliant on the NPPF, which states that LAs must assess their own needs for open space sport and recreation facilities. The NPPF states that existing open space should not be built unless certain criteria are met which does offer some protection to existing open space.

Whilst the open space requirement of 3.5 ha per 1000 population set out in Policy CS7 predates and is below Fields in Trust guidelines, it is supported by the evidence. Additional provision of at least 8 hectares of recreational open space per 1000 population to mitigate the impact of development on European nature conservation sites (and will continue to do so) is also required. As mitigation is on or adjoining development it also provides a significant level of informal open space over and above Field In Trust benchmarks.

Conclusion (Reasoning for Preferred Option):

Option 1 is deemed the preferred option due to there being little evidence to suggest that a significant update is required.

Open Space sport and recreation cont.

Provision and location of open space supporting strategic sites (SA of Options) - main options/alternatives considered:

1. Do nothing
2. On site formal and informal open space provision on all strategic sites
3. On site formal and informal open space provision on selected locations taking account of what exists already in the local area and any deficits in local provision with the use of greenbelt land for formal and informal open space provision, where appropriate, and contributions to improvements of existing provision (will be included within the SA of each of the strategic site policies)

| Option | 1 Meeting Housing Needs | 2 Accessible opportunities, facilities and services | 3 Safe and Healthy environments | 4 A thriving Economy | 5 Protecting Biodiversity and wildlife | 6 Accessible Greenspace, coast and water bodies | 7a Protecting landscape and townscape | 7b Protecting landscape and townscape | 8 Heritage | 9 Sustainable Natural Resources | 10a Managing Climate Change | 10b Managing Climate Change | Conclusion |
|--------|----------------------------|---|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|---|--|--|---------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|
| 1 | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - |
| 2 | 0 | + | + | 0 | + | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | ++ | 0 | + |
| 3 | 0 | ++ | + | 0 | + | + | 0 | ?i | 0 | 0 | ++ | 0 | ++ |

Options Commentary (provision and location of open space supporting strategic sites):

Option 1 would not result in the loss of open space, but would not contribute to meeting the requirement to directly support residential development. In options 2 and 3 the open space requirement would be provided and would reduce the need to travel to other areas as open space would be located in close proximity to development. However Option 2 does not respond to local need and for formal open space, the advice given in the Formal Open Space study. Additionally using Green Belt land for open space provision could seek to enhance it and better meet the purposes of Green Belt depending on type of open space/facility provided.

Conclusion (Reasoning for Preferred Option): Option 3 is deemed the preferred option due to the way it provides clear space requirements and ensures that significant elements of housing growth receive provision for open space.

Accessible green space and coast / Green infrastructure (SA of Options) - main options/alternatives considered:

1. Renew Policy DM9 Green Infrastructure Linkages which provides general guidance for Green Infrastructure features and linkages (but remove reference to SPD which has not been produced)
2. Only identify and provide policy guidance for specific Green Infrastructure features and linkages in site allocations policies.
3. Delete policy DM9 and incorporate the Green Infrastructure elements into other policies that provide more specific guidance on how to deliver GI in relation to landscape, nature conservation assets and open space.

| Option | 1 Meeting Housing Needs | 2 Accessible opportunities, facilities and services | 3 Safe and Healthy environments | 4 A thriving Economy | 5 Protecting Biodiversity and wildlife | 6 Accessible Greenspace, coast and water bodies | 7a Protecting landscape and townscape | 7b Protecting landscape and townscape | 8 Heritage | 9 Sustainable Natural Resources | 10a Managing Climate Change | 10b Managing Climate Change | Conclusion |
|--------|----------------------------|--|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|--|--|--|---------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|
| 1 | 0 | 0 | i? | 0 | i? | i? | i? | 0 | 0 | 0 | i? | i? | i? |
| 2 | 0 | 0 | i? | 0 | + | + | i? | 0 | 0 | 0 | i? | + | + |
| 3 | 0 | 0 | i? | 0 | ++ | ++ | + | + | 0 | 0 | i? | ++ | + |

Options Commentary (Green Infrastructure):

- Option 1 would not sufficiently address the pressures from increased levels of growth or meet the needs arising from new development. Policy DM9 would not provide the detail required for implementing residential schemes.
- Option 2 would provide for the enhancement of GI features but only at specific strategic sites. It would not maximise the opportunities for networks of habitats and enhancements in the wider plan area.
- Option 3 gives the opportunity to address the specific links between different Green Infrastructure assets. It would provide a cohesive approach to Green Infrastructure (GI), biodiversity, and recreational open space which addresses the pressures that increased levels of growth will bring.

Policy HOU1: Housing type, size and choice (SA of Options) –

(1) Housing type and size - main options/alternatives considered:

1. To have a policy requirement that delivers the size of market and affordable homes in accordance with the current or any future SHMA. This could either be a signpost to the SHMA or a table in the policy showing the mix required.
2. To have a policy guideline that delivers the size of market and affordable homes in accordance with the current or any future SHMA.
3. Have no policy on the size of market and affordable housing and leave the detail to the negotiations at the planning application stage.

| Policy or option | 1 Meeting Housing Needs | 2 Accessible opportunities, facilities and services | 3 Safe and Healthy environments | 4 A thriving Economy | 5 Protecting Biodiversity and wildlife | 6 Accessible Greenspace, coast and water bodies | 7a Protecting landscape and townscape | 7b Protecting landscape and townscape | 8 Heritage | 9 Sustainable Natural Resources | 10a Managing Climate Change | 10b Managing Climate Change | Conclusion |
|------------------|----------------------------|--|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|--|--|--|---------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|
| 1 | ++ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | ++ |
| 2 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + |
| 3 | -- | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | -- |

Options Commentary:

If Option 1 was taken forward, this would deliver the mix of housing required, based on the evidence put forward in the SHMAA. This would still allow for flexibility on a case by case basis. If the table was included in the policy, this would be out of date when a new SHMA or its successor is published.

Option 2 deliver a mix of affordable housing, and will be a start point for all negotiations. However, it will not provide certainty for developers as to what is expected on any housing scheme, which could lead to issues of viability depending on the mix the developers assume to calculate what they can purchase the site for. This could also lead to protracted negotiations at the application state, which could slow down the delivery of sites.

If Option 3 were pursued, then the council would not be in conformity with National Planning Policy, and it is likely that the plan would be found unsound at the

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------|--|--|--|---------------------------------------|---|--|--|--|-----------------------------|--|--|--|-------------------|
| Policy or option | 1 Meeting Housing Needs | 2 Accessible opportunities, facilities and services | 3 Safe and Healthy environments | 4 A thriving Economy | 5 Protecting Biodiversity and wildlife | 6 Accessible Greenspace, coast and water bodies | 7a Protecting landscape and townscape | 7b Protecting landscape and townscape | 8 Heritage | 9 Sustainable Natural Resources | 10a Managing Climate Change | 10b Managing Climate Change | Conclusion |
|-------------------------|--|--|--|---------------------------------------|---|--|--|--|-----------------------------|--|--|--|-------------------|

examination stage.

Conclusion (Reasoning for Preferred Option):

- If option 1 was taken forward, this would deliver the mix of housing required, based on the evidence put forward in the SHMAA. This would still allow for flexibility on a case by case basis. If the table was included in the policy, this would be out of date when a new SHMA or its successor is published.
- Option 2 deliver a mix of affordable housing, and will be a start point for all negotiations. However, it will not provide certainty for developers as to what is expected on any housing scheme, which could lead to issues of viability depending on the mix the developers assume to calculate what they can purchase the site for. This could also lead to protracted negotiations at the application state, which could slow down the delivery of sites.
- If Option 3 were pursued, then the council would not be in conformity with National Planning Policy, and it is likely that the plan would be found unsound at the examination stage.

The Preferred Option is number 1

Policy HOU1 cont: Housing type, size and choice (SA of Options) –

(2)Diversifying Housing Choice - main options/alternatives considered:

1. To have a policy requirement for sites of 10 or more dwellings for the different housing types that has the flexibility to be negotiated on a site by site basis. This approach could be incorporated into policies for the housing target or for housing type and mix.
2. To have a policy requirement for sites of 100 or more dwellings for the different housing types that has the flexibility to be negotiated on a site by site basis. This approach could be incorporated into policies for the housing target or for housing type and mix.
3. Have no policy on the diversifying housing choice and leave it to the negotiations at the planning application stage.

| Policy or option | 1 Meeting Housing Needs | 2 Accessible opportunities, facilities and services | 3 Safe and Healthy environments | 4 A thriving Economy | 5 Protecting Biodiversity and wildlife | 6 Accessible Greenspace, coast and water bodies | 7a Protecting landscape and townscape | 7b Protecting landscape and townscape | 8 Heritage | 9 Sustainable Natural Resources | 10a Managing Climate Change | 10b Managing Climate Change | Conclusion |
|------------------|----------------------------|--|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|--|--|--|---------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|
| 1 | + | 0 | 0 | ?i | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + |
| 2 | +/- | 0 | 0 | ?i | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | +/- |
| 3 | -- | 0 | 0 | ?i | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | -- |

Options Commentary:

Preferred Option is number 2

Conclusion (Reasoning for Preferred Option):

- Given the demand in the district for a range of different types of homes, it is reasonable to allow for such sites to come forward. The preferred option is a

| Policy or option | 1 Meeting Housing Needs | 2 Accessible opportunities, facilities and services | 3 Safe and Healthy environments | 4 A thriving Economy | 5 Protecting Biodiversity and wildlife | 6 Accessible Greenspace, coast and water bodies | 7a Protecting landscape and townscape | 7b Protecting landscape and townscape | 8 Heritage | 9 Sustainable Natural Resources | 10a Managing Climate Change | 10b Managing Climate Change | Conclusion |
|---|----------------------------|--|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|--|--|--|---------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|
| <p>pragmatic way of helping deliver these projects, and a percentage of these homes could be allocated via a housing type and mix policy, subject to viability issues.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Option 1 will enable a range of homes to be delivered on any site that comes forward for residential development however, it will be difficult for developers to incorporate the mix required on sites between 11 and 99, as when looked at in combination with the affordable housing policies, there will be less market homes from which to deliver this mix. As for Option 2, sites of 100 or more are considered to be strategic sites, and therefore should have the critical mass to be able to deliver the range of policy requirements that the plan will be requiring. If option 3 were pursued, then the council would not be in conformity with National Planning Policy, and it is likely that the plan would be found unsound at the examination stage. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Policy HOU1: Housing type, size and choice (SA of Policy)

| Policy | 1 Meeting Housing Needs | 2 Accessible opportunities, facilities and services | 3 Safe and Healthy environments | 4 A thriving Economy | 5 Protecting Biodiversity and wildlife | 6 Accessible Greenspace, coast and water bodies | 7a Protecting landscape and townscape | 7b Protecting landscape and townscape | 8 Heritage | 9 Sustainable Natural Resources | 10a Managing Climate Change | 10b Managing Climate Change | Conclusion |
|---|----------------------------|---|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|---|--|--|---------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|
| 16 | + | 0 | 0 | + | ?i | ?i | 0 | +/- | 0 | ?i | 0 | ?i | + |
| SA Commentary: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objective 1: The policy provides for a mix of size and diversity type, including a mix of affordable housing that will have a positive impact. • Objective 4: Plots for self-builders will provide employment for the developers and will help with skills. • Objective 5, 6, 9 and 10b: Uncertain / will depend on detailed implementation of the allocations / individual schemes. • Objective 7b: some allocated sites include some weak to moderate Green Belt and development may provide some landscape enhancement. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Policy HOU2: Affordable housing threshold (SA of Options) - main options/alternatives considered:

1. To comply with the Written Ministerial Statement to have new text or a policy that states that the affordable housing requirement will only apply on schemes of 11 or more new dwellings.
2. Not to have a policy on what the threshold is in the district and leave it to the Government guidance at the time to dictate the threshold.

| Policy or option | 1 Meeting Housing Needs | 2 Accessible opportunities, facilities and services | 3 Safe and Healthy environments | 4 A thriving Economy | 5 Protecting Biodiversity and wildlife | 6 Accessible Greenspace, coast and water bodies | 7a Protecting landscape and townscape | 7b Protecting landscape and townscape | 8 Heritage | 9 Sustainable Natural Resources | 10a Managing Climate Change | 10b Managing Climate Change | Conclusion |
|------------------|----------------------------|--|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|--|--|--|---------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|
| 1 | + | 0 | 0 | ?i | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + |
| 2 | - | 0 | 0 | ?i | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |

Options Commentary:

- Option 1 will provide clarity with the approach that the council are taking.
- Option 2 will achieve the same outcome, but will rely on applicants being aware of the current government approach to the threshold.
- Therefore option 1 will provide clarity and is the favoured option

The Preferred Option is number 1

Policy HOU2: Affordable housing Tenures mix - main options/alternatives considered:

1. Based on the evidence in the SHMA, that of the affordable housing to be delivered, that a district wide policy for 75% is for affordable and social rent and 25% is intermediate housing. However updated evidence in from the whole plan viability report is recommending that in order to assist with overall site viability that the split should be 70% rent and 30% intermediate housing. To accord with the Housing White Paper there will be a requirement of a minimum of 10% of the intermediate housing to be affordable home ownership.
2. Have no policy on affordable housing mix and leave it to the housing market to deliver.

| Policy or option | 1 Meeting Housing Needs | 2 Accessible opportunities, facilities and services | 3 Safe and Healthy environments | 4 A thriving Economy | 5 Protecting Biodiversity and wildlife | 6 Accessible Greenspace, coast and water bodies | 7a Protecting landscape and townscape | 7b Protecting landscape and townscape | 8 Heritage | 9 Sustainable Natural Resources | 10a Managing Climate Change | 10b Managing Climate Change | Conclusion |
|------------------|----------------------------|--|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|--|--|--|---------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|
| 1 | + | 0 | 0 | ?i | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + |
| 2 | - | 0 | 0 | ?i | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |

Options Commentary:

Option 1 will deliver the best mix of affordable housing as evidenced in the SHMA and the Whole Plan Viability Report. If Option 2 were pursued, then the council would not be in conformity with National Planning Policy, and it is likely that the plan would be found unsound at the examination stage.

Policy HOU2: Affordable housing requirement (SA of Options) - main options/alternatives considered:

1. Set a 35% district wide requirement.
2. Set a 50% district wide requirement.
3. Set a requirement for each sub area, depending on the viability. Based on evidence, this could be:
 - 35% in Totton and the Waterside, and
 - 50% in the rest of the Plan Area.
4. Not to have a policy on affordable housing requirement and leave it to the registered providers and the market to deliver affordable homes.

| Policy or option | 1 Meeting Housing Needs | 2 Accessible opportunities, facilities and services | 3 Safe and Healthy environments | 4 A thriving Economy | 5 Protecting Biodiversity and wildlife | 6 Accessible Greenspace, coast and water bodies | 7a Protecting landscape and townscape | 7b Protecting landscape and townscape | 8 Heritage | 9 Sustainable Natural Resources | 10a Managing Climate Change | 10b Managing Climate Change | Conclusion |
|------------------|----------------------------|--|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|--|--|--|---------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|
| 1 | + | 0 | 0 | ?i | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + |
| 2 | + / + | 0 | 0 | ?i | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + / + |
| 3 | + / + | 0 | 0 | ?i | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + / + |
| 4 | -- | 0 | 0 | ?i | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | -- |

Comments:

Options 2 and 3 will deliver the highest percentage of affordable housing across the district, taking viability into consideration, and therefore should proceed to the policy stage.

Based on the available evidence, option three is the best option in terms of delivering the optimum percentage of affordable housing, taking locational viability factors into account.

If option 4 were pursued, then the council would not be in conformity with National Planning Policy, and it is likely that the plan would be found unsound at the examination stage.

Conclusion (Reasoning for Preferred Option): The Preferred Options are 2 or 3.

Policy HOU3: Residential accommodation for older people (SA of Options) - main options/alternatives considered:

Extensions / Annexes

1. To take a flexible approach to the modification of or extension to existing homes (where planning permission is required), where it enables people to live in their homes for longer or adapt them to accommodate and care for friends or relatives. This could be addressed in a policy or in the supporting text to the relevant development management policies.
2. To leave the delivery of extensions / annexes through the current national and local policies, thereby removing the need for a new policy or supporting text.

Older persons affordable housing

3. To apply the affordable housing requirement to all forms of accommodation including that for older people, with the usual discretion in relation to development viability. This would mirror current policy CS15. This is in recognition of the projected scale of growth of population in the district in the oldest age bands.
4. To exempt all forms of older persons housing from the affordable housing requirement

Older persons market homes

5. To require provision of a sufficient quantity and choice of market homes that are suitable for older people. This could include low-maintenance homes suitable for households looking to downsize including bungalows and well-specified apartments where appropriate.
6. To not require provision of a sufficient quantity and choice of market homes that are suitable for older people.

Housing accessibility standards

7. To adopt the optional building regulations and set a policy requirement for all new homes to meet Building Regulations optional standard M4(2) Category 2, Accessible and Adaptable Dwellings (replacing the previous 'lifetimes homes' standard).
8. No to not adopt the optional building regulations and set a policy requirement for all new homes to meet Building Regulations optional standard M4(2) Category 2, Accessible and Adaptable Dwellings (replacing the previous 'lifetimes homes' standard)

Sheltered housing, care homes and extra care

9. To require a reasonable proportion of the homes provided in the form of sheltered or extra care housing. There is a need-based case for seeking a proportion of these in affordable tenures suitable for low income older households, if suitable delivery and management arrangements can be identified.
10. To have a criteria-based policy for the provision of registered care homes in appropriate locations, where additional provision can be justified on the basis of locally arising need. This will need to be in the context of the scale of existing care home provision in the locality.

| Policy or option | 1 Meeting Housing Needs | 2 Accessible opportunities, facilities and services | 3 Safe and Healthy environments | 4 A thriving Economy | 5 Protecting Biodiversity and wildlife | 6 Accessible Greenspace, coast and water bodies | 7a Protecting landscape and townscape | 7b Protecting landscape and townscape | 8 Heritage | 9 Sustainable Natural Resources | 10a Managing Climate Change | 10b Managing Climate Change | Conclusion |
|------------------|----------------------------|--|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|--|--|--|---------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|
| 1 | +/- | 0 | 0 | ?i | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | +/- |
| 2 | +/- | 0 | 0 | ?i | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | +/- |
| 3 | ++ | 0 | 0 | ?i | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | ++ |
| 4 | - | 0 | 0 | ?i | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |
| 5 | + | 0 | 0 | ?i | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + |
| 6 | - | 0 | 0 | ?i | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |
| 7 | ++ | 0 | 0 | ?i | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | ++ |
| 8 | - | 0 | 0 | ?i | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |
| 9 | ++ | 0 | 0 | ?i | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | ++ |
| 10 | + | 0 | 0 | ?i | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + |

Options Commentary:

Options 1 and 2 concern extensions and annexes – both options score the same in the SA. Given the mixed score of both options, it is considered appropriate to include as either policy or supporting text wording to support the extensions and annexes for older residents.

Options 3 and 4 concern affordable housing for the ageing population. The option 3 which would apply affordable housing to all accommodation scores more favourably, however, there needs to be an acknowledgement of the issue of viability – the policy could deal with this by acknowledging that some specialised forms of accommodation may require flexibility on this issue.

| Policy or option | 1 Meeting Housing Needs | 2 Accessible opportunities, facilities and services | 3 Safe and Healthy environments | 4 A thriving Economy | 5 Protecting Biodiversity and wildlife | 6 Accessible Greenspace, coast and water bodies | 7a Protecting landscape and townscape | 7b Protecting landscape and townscape | 8 Heritage | 9 Sustainable Natural Resources | 10a Managing Climate Change | 10b Managing Climate Change | Conclusion |
|---|----------------------------|--|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|--|--|--|---------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|
| <p>Options 5 and 6 cover market homes. Unsurprisingly, both the options that adopt the optional standards score positively in the assessment and given the ageing population and their increasing needs over time, it is appropriate that this forms part of the policy for all new dwellings built in the district.</p> <p>Options 7 and 8 relate to accessibility standards. Given the aging population, and that this policy will only apply to new housing stock, it is reasonable that the standards are applied to all new housing in the Plan area, to assist older persons with more choices of living independently for longer.</p> <p>Likewise options 9 and 10 cover sheltered, extra care and residential homes and given the ageing population and their increasing needs over time, it is appropriate that the issue of sheltered housing, extra care and care homes are covered in a policy.</p> <p>The Preferred Options are 1,3,5,7 and 9</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Policy HOU3: Residential accommodation for older people (SA of Policy)

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|--|--|--|---------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|--|
| 1 Meeting Housing Needs | 2 Accessible opportunities, facilities and services | 3 Safe and Healthy environments | 4 A thriving Economy | 5 Protecting Biodiversity and wildlife | 6 Accessible Greenspace, coast and water bodies | 7a Protecting landscape and townscape | 7b Protecting landscape and townscape | 8 Heritage | 9 Sustainable Natural Resources | 10a Managing Climate Change | 10b Managing Climate Change | Conclusion | |
| + | + | + | ++ | 0 | 0 | ?i | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | |
| <p>SA Commentary:</p> <p>Objective 1: The policy ensure that the housing needs of older residents will be met, including affordable housing in the supporting text.</p> <p>Objective 2: Accommodation for older residents will need to be in sustainable locations, with access to a range of facilities and services.</p> <p>Objective 3: adapting existing and building new homes to meet the needs of older residents will help with slips and trips and therefore retains personal safety.</p> <p>Objective 4: Provision of registered care homes will bring employment opportunities throughout the lifetime of the development.</p> <p>Objective 7a: Uncertain / will depend of detailed implementation of the allocations / individual schemes.</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Policy HOU4: Gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople (SA of Options)

1. Review the wording of policy CS16 to comply with the latest government guidance and GTAA.
2. Not to review the wording of policy CS16 to comply with the latest government guidance and GTAA.

| Policy or option | 1 Meeting Housing Needs | 2 Accessible opportunities, facilities and services | 3 Safe and Healthy environments | 4 A thriving Economy | 5 Protecting Biodiversity and wildlife | 6 Accessible Greenspace, coast and water bodies | 7a Protecting landscape and townscape | 7b Protecting landscape and townscape | 8 Heritage | 9 Sustainable Natural Resources | 10a Managing Climate Change | 10b Managing Climate Change | Conclusion |
|------------------|----------------------------|--|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|--|--|--|---------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|
| 1 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + |
| 2 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |

Options Commentary:

Option 1 states that there is a requirement for the Local Plan to have a policy relating to Gypsy and travellers and travelling show people. In order to comply with the PPTS, the plan will also need a criteria based policy to allow for other sites that may come forward to be assessed against.

If option 2 were pursued, then the council would not be in conformity with National Planning Policy, and it is likely that the plan would be found unsound at the examination stage.

Conclusion (Reasoning for Preferred Option):

Preferred Option 1: Review the wording of policy CS16 to comply with the latest Government guidance and GTAA.

There is a requirement for the Local Plan to have a policy relating to Gypsy and travellers and travelling show people. The evidence from the GTAA shows that there is a need to provide 1 pitch for gypsy and travellers and 4 plots for travelling show people for the first 5 years of the plan. The allocation TOT10 at Little Testwood Farm in the Local Plan Part 2 can accommodate the arising need in the short term. In order to comply with the PPTS, the plan will also need a criteria based policy to allow for other sites that may come forward to be assessed against

Policy HOU4: Gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople (SA of Policy)

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|--|--|--|---------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|--|
| 1 Meeting Housing Needs | 2 Accessible opportunities, facilities and services | 3 Safe and Healthy environments | 4 A thriving Economy | 5 Protecting Biodiversity and wildlife | 6 Accessible Greenspace, coast and water bodies | 7a Protecting landscape and townscape | 7b Protecting landscape and townscape | 8 Heritage | 9 Sustainable Natural Resources | 10a Managing Climate Change | 10b Managing Climate Change | Conclusion | |
| ++ | + | ++ | ?i | 0 | 0 | ++ | ++ | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | |
| <p>SA Commentary</p> <p>Objective 1: The policy makes provision for pitches and plots for the traveller community, which in themselves can be considered as affordable accommodation for these groups.</p> <p>Objective 2: The policy explicitly states that for permanent sites, they have to be in close proximity to facilities and services.</p> <p>Objective 3: The policy explicitly states that the site needs to provide a safe and healthy living environment.</p> <p>Objective 4: Uncertain / will depend on requirements of individual applicants, but could include employment opportunities.</p> <p>Objective 7a: The policy explicitly states that development will not result in harm to the environment, heritage assets, protected landscapes and the Green Belt.</p> <p>Objective 7b: The policy explicitly states that development will not result in harm to the environment, heritage assets, protected landscapes and the Green Belt.</p> <p>Objective 8: The policy explicitly states that development will not result in harm to the environment, heritage assets, protected landscapes and the Green Belt</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Policy HOU5: Rural Housing Exception Sites and Community Led Housing Schemes (SA of Options) - main options/alternatives considered:

(1) Rural Housing Exception Sites:

1. To have an exceptions housing policy.
2. Have no policy on exceptions sites

| Policy or option | 1 Meeting Housing Needs | 2 Accessible opportunities, facilities and services | 3 Safe and Healthy environments | 4 A thriving Economy | 5 Protecting Biodiversity and wildlife | 6 Accessible Greenspace, coast and water bodies | 7a Protecting landscape and townscape | 7b Protecting landscape and townscape | 8 Heritage | 9 Sustainable Natural Resources | 10a Managing Climate Change | 10b Managing Climate Change | Conclusion |
|------------------|----------------------------|--|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|--|--|--|---------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|
| 1 | + | 0 | 0 | ?i | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + |
| 2 | - | 0 | 0 | ?i | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |

Options Commentary:

Option 1 will ensure that the council delivers housing in rural areas while supporting the local economy. It will also enable Neighbourhood plans to bring forward exceptions sites for those with a local connection. Further consideration needs to be given as to whether a separate policy is put forward, or whether it can be combined into a broader general housing policy.

If option 2 were pursued, then the council would not be in conformity with National Planning Policy, and it is likely that the plan would be found unsound at the examination stage.

Conclusion (Reasoning for Preferred Option):

Preferred Option 1: To have an exceptions housing policy to cover the issue of exceptions housing outside built up areas and to combine it with a general affordable housing policy.

Policy HOU5: Rural Housing Exception Sites and Community Led Housing Schemes (SA of policy)

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|--|--|--|---------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|--|
| 1 Meeting Housing Needs | 2 Accessible opportunities, facilities and services | 3 Safe and Healthy environments | 4 A thriving Economy | 5 Protecting Biodiversity and wildlife | 6 Accessible Greenspace, coast and water bodies | 7a Protecting landscape and townscape | 7b Protecting landscape and townscape | 8 Heritage | 9 Sustainable Natural Resources | 10a Managing Climate Change | 10b Managing Climate Change | Conclusion | |
| ++ | + | 0 | + | ?i | ?i | ?i | ?i | ?i | 0 | ?i | ?i | + | |
| <p>SA Commentary:</p> <p>Objective 1: The policy promotes 100% affordable housing schemes in rural areas, and therefore is a significant positive impact.</p> <p>Objective 2: The policy requires sites need to be within or adjoining a settlement or safely accessible to a larger settlement with a wide range of services and facilities.</p> <p>Objective 4: All housing developments will benefit the economy from construction jobs to increased spending in the local economy by new homeowners.</p> <p>Objectives 5, 6, 7a, 7b, 8, 10a and 10b: Uncertain / will depend of detailed implementation of the individual schemes</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Policy ECON1: Policy options for supporting new employment development (SA of Options) - main options/alternatives considered:

1. A policy that will only support employment development and the appropriate intensification of employment uses on existing employment sites and premises
2. A policy that will support employment development in all locations across the Plan Area
3. A policy that will support employment development and the appropriate intensification of employment uses on employment sites/premises, support employment development appropriate to its location on unallocated land within the defined built-up areas that it is proportionate in scale to the settlement hierarchy, support small-scale built development for employment purposes in rural settlements, and allow for the re-use / conversion of buildings in rural areas

| Option | 1 Meeting Housing Needs | 2 Accessible opportunities, facilities and services | 3 Safe and Healthy environments | 4 A thriving Economy | 5 Protecting Biodiversity and wildlife | 6 Accessible Greenspace, coast and water bodies | 7a Protecting landscape and townscape | 7b Protecting landscape and townscape | 8 Heritage | 9 Sustainable Natural Resources | 10a Managing Climate Change | 10b Managing Climate Change | Conclusion |
|--------|----------------------------|--|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|--|--|--|---------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|
| 1 | 0 | + | 0 | +/- | ?i | 0 | ?i | 0 | ?i | + | +/- | 0 | +/- |
| 2 | 0 | +/- | 0 | + | - | 0 | - | 0 | ?i | +/- | +/- | 0 | - |
| 3 | 0 | + | 0 | + | ?i | 0 | ?i | 0 | ?i | + | +/- | 0 | + |

Options Commentary:

- Option1: This option would be appropriate to the environmental characteristics of the Plan Area and would encourage the efficient use of existing employment sites and premises. However, it would not provide sufficient flexibility for businesses to establish themselves or locate in the Plan Area and will overly restrict the choices and options available to businesses
- Option 2: This option would not be appropriate or sustainable in the context of this Plan Area given the high number of national and international environmental designations within or on the edge of the District. Supporting development in all locations without criteria will likely have a harmful impact on the landscape and risk adverse impacts on international designated sites
- Option 3: This would remain appropriate to the environmental characteristics of the Plan Area as it seeks to ensure that new business and employment development is proportionate to the scale and nature of the settlement. The option supports employment development to occur within the towns and large villages, and for new small-scale built development to occur within rural villages. This provides choice and flexibility for businesses to establish themselves and be able to grow within the Plan Area. This policy would have a positive effect on the economy whilst remaining compatible with the sensitive environment of the Plan Area.

Conclusion (Reasoning for Preferred Option):

Option 3 is the most appropriate strategy as it provides flexibility for development to occur in a variety of locations and provides choice and flexibility for businesses. This approach

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------|--|--|--|---|---|--|--|--|-------------------------------------|--|--|--|--------------------------|---|
| <p>Option</p> | <p>1 Meeting Housing Needs</p> | <p>2 Accessible opportunities, facilities and services</p> | <p>3 Safe and Healthy environments</p> | <p>4 A thriving Economy</p> | <p>5 Protecting Biodiversity and wildlife</p> | <p>6 Accessible Greenspace, coast and water bodies</p> | <p>7a Protecting landscape and townscape</p> | <p>7b Protecting landscape and townscape</p> | <p>8 Heritage</p> | <p>9 Sustainable Natural Resources</p> | <p>10a Managing Climate Change</p> | <p>10b Managing Climate Change</p> | <p>Conclusion</p> | <p>will most benefit the local economy whilst ensuring that new development will be appropriately located and compatible with the sensitive environment of the Plan Area.</p> |
|----------------------|--|--|--|---|---|--|--|--|-------------------------------------|--|--|--|--------------------------|---|

Policy ECON1: Employment land and development (SA of Policy)

| Policy | 1 Meeting Housing Needs | 2 Accessible opportunities, facilities and services | 3 Safe and Healthy environments | 4 A thriving Economy | 5 Protecting Biodiversity and wildlife | 6 Accessible Greenspace, coast and water bodies | 7a Protecting landscape and townscape | 7b Protecting landscape and townscape | 8 Heritage | 9 Sustainable Natural Resources | 10a Managing Climate Change | 10b Managing Climate Change | Conclusion | Commentary |
|---|----------------------------|--|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|--|--|--|---------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|------------|
| 21 | 0 | + | + | ++ | ?i | 0 | ?i | 0 | ?i | + | + | 0 | + | |
| <p>SA Commentary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objective 2: Positive impact. The policy requires proposals to have suitable connections to the road network. The policy supports proposals for new employment within town centres and on existing employment land. These locations are most likely to have good access to a range of facilities and services, and to sustainable modes of transport such as bus/train/cycling/walking. Objective 3: Positive impact. The policy sets out how proposals must have or provide safe access for pedestrians, cyclists and all types of vehicles likely to use the site and that proposals should not have unacceptable impacts on the amenity of nearby occupiers. Objective 4: Significant positive effects. The policy supports employment development to occur within the towns and large villages, and exceptionally with rural areas where the specific criteria of the policy and/or Saved Policy CS21 (Rural Economy) are met. This approach will support local businesses, and encourage and support appropriate employment development Objective 5: Uncertain impact as it will depend on the applications that come forward. However, this policy (together with mitigation policies in the Plan) ensures the impacts of new development are minimised and effectively mitigated. Objective 7a: Uncertain impact as it will depend on the applications that come forward. There is therefore uncertainty at this stage as to what the exact effects on the landscape and townscape will be. However, the policy (along with other policies in the Local Plan) would not allow development that unacceptably harms the character of the area Objective 8: Uncertain impact as it will depend on the applications that come forward. There is the potential for this policy to allow development in areas of historic importance; however the policy (along with other policies in the Local Plan) would not allow development that would have an unacceptable impact on heritage assets. Objective 9: Positive impact. The policy supports the development, redevelopment and intensification of employment uses on existing suitable brownfield sites Objective 10a: Positive impact. Whilst more development may result in increased car usage, the policy primarily supports employment development within built-up areas where there are greater alternative modes of transport (buses, trains, cycling, walking) available which should provide jobs close to where people live and will minimise the need to travel by private car. Additionally, new Policy 35 (Development Standards) in the Local Plan will ensure that new employment development is required to meet BREEAM excellent standards. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Policy ECON2: Retention of employment sites & consideration of alternative uses (SA of Options)- main options/alternatives considered:

1. A policy which seeks to retain existing employment sites in all circumstances, and will place a presumption against the loss of any employment site and will not support alternative uses.
2. A policy which will seek to retain employment sites where they remain suitable and viable but will support alternative uses where it is demonstrated that a site is no longer suitable and viable for any employment use.
3. A policy which will not seek to retain employment sites and will allow alternative non-employment uses on any existing employment site regardless of its continued suitability and viability for employment uses.

| Option | 1 Meeting Housing Needs | 2 Accessible opportunities, facilities and services | 3 Safe and Healthy environments | 4 A thriving Economy | 5 Protecting Biodiversity and wildlife | 6 Accessible Greenspace, coast and water bodies | 7a Protecting landscape and townscape | 7b Protecting landscape and townscape | 8 Heritage | 9 Sustainable Natural Resources | 10a Managing Climate Change | 10b Managing Climate Change | Conclusion | Commentary |
|--------|----------------------------|--|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|--|--|--|---------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|------------|
| 1 | - | ?i | 0 | +/- | 0 | 0 | ?i | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | - | |
| 2 | + | + | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | + | |
| 3 | + | ?i | 0 | -- | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | - | |

Options Commentary:

- **Option 1:** Whilst this option offers the most protection in terms of retaining existing employment sites it could also result in land and which is no longer suitable and viable for employment / business needs remaining undeveloped (potentially having a negative impact on providing new dwellings, and on the local townscape and landscape), and the unplanned releases of land still suitable for employment use in other locations. It is too rigid and inflexible in light of the requirements of paragraph 22 of the NPPF.
- **Option 2:** This option will protect sites that continue to be suitable and viable but provide opportunities for sites to be put to another use should employment uses prove to be no longer a suitable and viable use of the site. This has the potential to provide positive effects against objectives 1 (non-viable employment land could become housing to meet local housing needs) and objective 7a (redevelopment of poor quality, not suitable and viable employment sites could bring visual enhancements).
- **Option 3:** This option provides no protection for employment sites and would risk the loss of land that continues to be suitable and viable, reduce the choice, mix and quantity of land, opportunities for businesses to develop, expand or locate and have detrimental impacts on the strength of the local economy

Conclusion (Reasoning for Preferred Option):

Option 2 represents the best policy approach as it will seek to retain employment sites where reasonable but accepts that over a sustained period there may be sites that become no longer suitable for employment uses or where an alternative would deliver overriding benefits to an area. It would protect employment sites that continue to serve a function whilst also enabling those sites that are genuinely no longer appropriate for employment use to be re-used, either in part or in whole, for other alternative uses that could bring significant visual or environmental benefits. This would therefore meet the requirements of the NPPF to promote sustainable development and economic growth.

Policy ECON2: Retention of employment sites and consideration of alternative uses (SA of Policy)

| Policy | 1 Meeting Housing Needs | 2 Accessible opportunities, facilities and services | 3 Safe and Healthy environments | 4 A thriving Economy | 5 Protecting Biodiversity and wildlife | 6 Accessible Greenspace, coast and water bodies | 7a Protecting landscape and townscape | 7b Protecting landscape and townscape | 8 Heritage | 9 Sustainable Natural Resources | 10a Managing Climate Change | 10b Managing Climate Change | Conclusion |
|--|----------------------------|--|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|--|--|--|---------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|
| 22 | + | + | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | + |
| <p>SA Commentary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objective 1: Positive impact. Provided the criteria in the policy are met, this policy does provide some scope for demonstrably not suitable/not viable employment sites to be redeveloped for housing. • Objective 2: Positive impact. The policy supports proposals in accordance with the criteria that will provide support services to businesses in the locality. This will improve the quantity and quality of local facilities and services that are accessible to the local workforce • Objective 4: Positive impact. The policy protects employment sites which remain suitable and viable for employment use which will help businesses and maintain job opportunities, and provides some scope for ancillary facilities and supporting services to be provided in accordance with the criteria set out in the policy. • Objective 7a: Positive impact. The redevelopment of poor quality, not suitable and not viable employment sites could bring visual enhancements to the landscape/townscape. • Objective 9: Positive impact. The policy encourages the use of brownfield sites | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Policy ECON3: Marchwood Port (SA of Options)

1. Save existing policy (policy MAR7) with minor factual updates
2. Revise and update the existing policy to address revised circumstances, new development potential and changes in the wider and site context

| Option | 1 Meeting Housing Needs | 2 Accessible opportunities, facilities and services | 3 Safe and Healthy environments | 4 A thriving Economy | 5 Protecting Biodiversity and wildlife | 6 Accessible Greenspace, coast and water bodies | 7a Protecting landscape and townscape | 7b Protecting landscape and townscape | 8 Heritage | 9 Sustainable Natural Resources | 10a Managing Climate Change | 10b Managing Climate Change | Conclusion |
|--------|----------------------------|---|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|---|--|--|---------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | + | 0 | + |
| 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | + | 0 | + |

Options Commentary:

- **Option 1:** This option is an insufficient response to the significantly changed circumstances of the site, albeit the current policy provides broadly adequate development guidance.
- **Option 2:** This option enables proposals for Marchwood Port to be understood and considered in their strategic context which may in the future include port development on Dibden Bay, and provides a consistent approach to consideration of NSIP scale proposals on both sites.

Conclusion (Reasoning for Preferred Option):

Option 2 is the most appropriate option as it provides a useful update to an area of the district facing potentially significant change over the plan period if Dibden Bay port proposals come forward.

Policy ECON3: Marchwood Port (SA of Policy)

| Policy | 1 Meeting Housing Needs | 2 Accessible opportunities, facilities and services | 3 Safe and Healthy environments | 4 A thriving Economy | 5 Protecting Biodiversity and wildlife | 6 Accessible Greenspace, coast and water bodies | 7a Protecting landscape and townscape | 7b Protecting landscape and townscape | 8 Heritage | 9 Sustainable Natural Resources | 10a Managing Climate Change | 10b Managing Climate Change | Conclusion | |
|--------|----------------------------|--|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|--|--|--|---------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|--|
| 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | ?i | 0 | 0 | + | + | 0 | + | |

SA Commentary:

- **Objective 3:** Neutral impact. The policy seeks to ensure that unacceptable impacts on the local communities and the health, safety and amenity of local residents are avoided
- **Objective 4:** The policy provides potential for significant employment opportunities
- **Objective 7a:** Uncertain impact. Depending on the scale and nature of development proposals that come forward on the site there is potential for an impact on the wider landscape. However, the policy contains safeguards to ensure any impacts are minimised and mitigated
- **Objective 9:** Positive impact. The policy encourages the effective and efficient use of brownfield land
- **Objective 10a:** Positive impact. The policy seeks to avoid additional traffic generation in residential areas, and directs traffic and freight movements through the most direct routes. The policy encourages effective use of a site which is reasonably close to a main bus route and is accessible by foot reducing the need to travel by car.

Policy ECON4: Port development at Dibden Bay (SA of Options) - main options/alternatives considered:

1. Do nothing (no policy)
2. Oppose port expansion
3. Include a policy which allocates the site for port development
4. Include a criteria-based policy identifying issues to be addressed if a port development proposal is submitted

| Option | 1 Meeting Housing Needs | 2 Accessible opportunities, facilities and services | 3 Safe and Healthy environments | 4 A thriving Economy | 5 Protecting Biodiversity and wildlife | 6 Accessible Greenspace, coast and water bodies | 7a Protecting landscape and townscape | 7b Protecting landscape and townscape | 8 Heritage | 9 Sustainable Natural Resources | 10a Managing Climate Change | 10b Managing Climate Change | Conclusion |
|--------|----------------------------|---|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|---|--|--|---------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | +/- | - | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - |
| 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | ?i | + | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 3 | 0 | 0 | ?i | + | -- | 0 | -- | 0 | 0 | ?i | - | 0 | -- |
| 4 | 0 | 0 | ?i | + | ?i | 0 | ?i | 0 | 0 | ?i | ?i | 0 | + |

Conclusions:

Option 1: This option fails to plan positively and would ignore the port operator's stated ambitions which are strategic and nationally significant in scale and in terms of potential positive and negative impacts.

Option 2: Port development would most likely be a Nationally Strategic Infrastructure Project (NSIP) whereby the Planning Inspectorate would assess the proposal for a decision by the Secretary of State. There is therefore no point in opposing port development within the local plan. The NPPF requires that local plan policies be 'positively prepared'

Option 3: We cannot allocate the site in the Local Plan as the information necessary to determine whether port development in whatever form it might take would be deliverable and on balance sustainable, has not been produced. The National Policy Statement for Ports (section 3.3.1) explicitly promotes a market-led approach to port development, where individual port operators make commercial judgements about when and where new developments might be proposed (national strategy does not identify or allocate port development locations).

Option 4: This option fits with the defined role of local authorities in the NSIP process. This is to prepare a Local Impact Report, identifying the local impacts (positive and negative) of an NSIP proposal. A policy setting out the relevant considerations would help us seek the best outcome for the district and in particular for directly affected communities.

Conclusion (Reasoning for Preferred Option): Option 4 is deemed the most appropriate option – it fits with the NSIP process and provides an appropriate framework to plan for an uncertain development.

Policy ECON4: Port development at Dibden Bay (SA of Policy)

| Policy | 1 Meeting Housing Needs | 2 Accessible opportunities, facilities and services | 3 Safe and Healthy environments | 4 A thriving Economy | 5 Protecting Biodiversity and wildlife | 6 Accessible Greenspace, coast and water bodies | 7a Protecting landscape and townscape | 7b Protecting landscape and townscape | 8 Heritage | 9 Sustainable Natural Resources | 10a Managing Climate Change | 10b Managing Climate Change | Conclusion | |
|--|----------------------------|---|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|---|--|--|---------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|--|
| 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | ?i | 0 | ?i | 0 | 0 | ?i | ?i | 0 | + | |
| SA Commentary: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objective 4: Positive impact. Whilst it will depend on the port development proposal that comes forward, the policy plans positively and seeks to ensure that local business and employment opportunities are enhanced • Objectives 5 / 7a / 9 / 10a: Uncertain impacts. It will depend on whether a proposal/application for port development at Dibden Bay comes forward and the scale of the proposal. The policy (in conjunction with other policies in the Local Plan) seeks to ensure that adverse effects are identified, minimised and mitigated. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Policy ECON5: Retail development and other main town centre uses (SA of Options) - main options/alternatives considered:

1. A policy which sets out how proposals for main town centre uses (as defined in the NPPF) will be determined in the Plan Area. The policy will support proposals for main town centre uses within a defined primary or secondary frontage or other appropriate commercial location with the Town Centre boundaries and which are in keeping with the scale and character of the area. The policy will also state that applications for main town centre uses which are not in an existing centre and are not in accordance with the Local Plan, will need to follow the sequential approach and demonstrate that there no suitable town centre or edge-of-town centre sites are area available to address the need identified

2. A policy which will permit development proposals for main town centre uses outside of the defined town centre boundaries without a requirement to demonstrate a local need or follow the sequential approach

| Option | 1 Meeting Housing Needs | 2 Accessible opportunities, facilities and services | 3 Safe and Healthy environments | 4 A thriving Economy | 5 Protecting Biodiversity and wildlife | 6 Accessible Greenspace, coast and water bodies | 7a Protecting landscape and townscape | 7b Protecting landscape and townscape | 8 Heritage | 9 Sustainable Natural Resources | 10a Managing Climate Change | 10b Managing Climate Change | Conclusion |
|--------|----------------------------|--|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|--|--|--|---------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|
| 1 | 0 | + | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | ?i | 0 | ?i | 0 | 0 | 0 | + |
| 2 | 0 | +/- | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | ?i | 0 | ?i | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |

Options Commentary:

- **Option 1:** This option will promote and support the provision of a range of retail and appropriate non-retail uses within town centre boundaries and shopping frontages. This will have a positive effect on increasing access to facilities and services, and will help to maintain vibrant and viable town centres.
- **Option 2:** This option would have potential significant adverse impacts on the viability and vitality of existing town centres, harming local businesses and the economy. Whilst this policy would support the provision of facilities it may also result in the loss of facilities in town centres close to people’s homes.

Conclusion (Reasoning for Preferred Option):

Option 1 is the most appropriate strategy as it will best maintain and enhance the vibrancy and viability of town centres.

Policy ECON5: Retail development and other main town centre uses (SA of Policy)

| Policy | 1 Meeting Housing Needs | 2 Accessible opportunities, facilities and services | 3 Safe and Healthy environments | 4 A thriving Economy | 5 Protecting Biodiversity and wildlife | 6 Accessible Greenspace, coast and water bodies | 7a Protecting landscape and townscape | 7b Protecting landscape and townscape | 8 Heritage | 9 Sustainable Natural Resources | 10a Managing Climate Change | 10b Managing Climate Change | Conclusion |
|--|----------------------------|---|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|---|--|--|---------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|
| 25 | 0 | + | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | ?i | 0 | ?i | 0 | 0 | 0 | + |
| SA Commentary: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objective 2: Positive impact. Supporting development for main-town centre uses within defined town centre boundaries and shopping frontages will increase the level and variety of facilities/services • Objective 4: Positive impact. The policy steers new development for main-town centre uses to within the defined town centre boundaries and requires proposals that depart from this (particular for large-scale retail/leisure developments to follow the sequential approach to site selection) • Objective 7a: Uncertain impact. There is potential for an impact on townscape but this could be positive or negative depending on the nature of the proposals that come forward and their design. Design related policies in the Local Plan would provide criteria to ensure proposals are appropriate to the character of the area • Objective 8: Uncertain impact. The town centres contain a significant number of heritage assets. However, other policies in the Local Plan will ensure that development/redevelopment will not have unacceptable impacts on heritage assets | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Policy ECON6: Primary, secondary and local shopping frontages (SA of Options) - main options/alternatives considered:

1. Save the existing primary, secondary and local shopping frontage policies (DM14, DM15, DM17 and DM18)
2. Update the policies to reflect the changes to Permitted Development rights whilst ensuring that defined shopping frontages remain active, viable and provide a healthy level of facilities

| Option | 1 Meeting Housing Needs | 2 Accessible opportunities, facilities and services | 3 Safe and Healthy environments | 4 A thriving Economy | 5 Protecting Biodiversity and wildlife | 6 Accessible Greenspace, coast and water bodies | 7a Protecting landscape and townscape | 7b Protecting landscape and townscape | 8 Heritage | 9 Sustainable Natural Resources | 10a Managing Climate Change | 10b Managing Climate Change | Conclusion |
|--------|----------------------------|---|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|---|--|--|---------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|
| 1 | 0 | +/- | 0 | +/- | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | +/- |
| 2 | 0 | + | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + |

Options Commentary:

- **Option 1:** Given the changes to Permitted Development rights this option is no longer fully effective and is insufficiently flexible. The saved policies will not necessarily now be effective in responding to changing High Streets and ensuring the vibrancy of defined shopping frontages and is more likely have a mixed impact on objectives 2 and 4.
- **Option 2:** This option is the most appropriate to respond to changes in Permitted Development rights whilst seeking to ensure that frontages remain active and provide a healthy mix of facilities. This should have positive effects on objective 2 (the option seeks to ensure a range of shopping and other facilities and services that are conveniently accessible), and objective 4 (the option supports and seeks to maintain the vitality and viability of primary, secondary and local shopping frontages)

Conclusion (Reasoning for Preferred Option): Option 2 is the most appropriate strategy as it will best maintain and enhance the vibrancy and viability of the defined primary, secondary and local shopping frontages

Policy ECON6: Primary, secondary and local shopping frontages (SA of Policy)

| Policy | 1 Meeting Housing Needs | 2 Accessible opportunities, facilities and services | 3 Safe and Healthy environments | 4 A thriving Economy | 5 Protecting Biodiversity and wildlife | 6 Accessible Greenspace, coast and water bodies | 7a Protecting landscape and townscape | 7b Protecting landscape and townscape | 8 Heritage | 9 Sustainable Natural Resources | 10a Managing Climate Change | 10b Managing Climate Change | Conclusion |
|--|----------------------------|---|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|---|--|--|---------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|
| 26 | 0 | + | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | ?i | 0 | 0 | 0 | + |
| <p>SA Commentary:</p> <p>Objective 2: Positive impact. The policy seeks to maintain active, vibrant and viable primary, secondary and local shopping frontages which will ensure they provide a healthy level of shopping facilities and services conveniently accessible to surrounding residential areas</p> <p>Objective 4: Positive impact. The policy seeks to maintain active, vibrant and viable primary, secondary and local shopping frontages which will support a strong local economy and provide opportunities for jobs</p> <p>Objective 7a: Neutral impact. The policy relates to the change of use of uses within existing buildings rather than new built development.</p> <p>Objective 8: Uncertain impact as it will depend on the applications that come forward. The town centres contain a significant number of heritage assets. However, other policies in the Local Plan will ensure that development/redevelopment will not have unacceptable impacts on heritage assets</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Tourism (SA of Options) - main options/alternatives considered:

1. Save existing policy CS19
2. Have no policy covering tourism

| Option | 1 Meeting Housing Needs | 2 Accessible opportunities, facilities and services | 3 Safe and Healthy environments | 4 A thriving Economy | 5 Protecting Biodiversity and wildlife | 6 Accessible Greenspace, coast and water bodies | 7a Protecting landscape and townscape | 7b Protecting landscape and townscape | 8 Heritage | 9 Sustainable Natural Resources | 10a Managing Climate Change | 10b Managing Climate Change | Conclusion |
|---|----------------------------|---|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|---|--|--|---------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + |
| 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |
| <p>Options Commentary: Option 1: This option involves saving the existing policy in its current form. The objectives of Policy CS19 are still consistent with the NPPF and would continue to support rural economic development where it is sustainable and appropriate to the local context. Option 2: This option would not provide a local strategy that would support and encourage sustainable tourism in the context of this Plan Area. This could have adverse effects on both the tourism economy and on the environment.</p> <p>Conclusion (Reasoning for Preferred Option): Option 1 is the most appropriate option to positively plan for the tourism sector.</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Rural Economy (SA of Options) - main options/alternatives considered:

- 1. Save existing policy CS21
- 2. Have no policy covering the rural economy.

| Option | 1 Meeting Housing Needs | 2 Accessible opportunities, facilities and services | 3 Safe and Healthy environments | 4 A thriving Economy | 5 Protecting Biodiversity and wildlife | 6 Accessible Greenspace, coast and water bodies | 7a Protecting landscape and townscape | 7b Protecting landscape and townscape | 8 Heritage | 9 Sustainable Natural Resources | 10a Managing Climate Change | 10b Managing Climate Change | Conclusion |
|--------|----------------------------|--|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|--|--|--|---------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + |
| 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |

Options Commentary:

Option 1: This option involves retaining the existing policy in its current form. The objectives of Policy CS21 are still consistent with the NPPF and would continue to support rural economic development where it is sustainable and appropriate to the local context.

Option 2: This option would not provide a local strategy that would support and encourage sustainable rural economic growth in the context of this Plan Area and would also risk the possibility of development being permitted in locations or in a form that are not appropriate or sustainable in the context of this Plan Area.

Conclusion (Reasoning for Preferred Option):

Option 1 is the most appropriate option.

Flood Risk (SA of Options) - main options/alternatives considered:

1. Roll forward the current policy regarding flood risk (CS6) with minor changes to reflect the latest guidance in the NPPF and NPPG.
2. Delete Policy CS6 and rely on NPPF together with strategic site policies to ensure site specific risks are dealt with appropriately.
3. Replace current policy with a criteria based policy, letting scheme promoters demonstrate appropriate mitigation measures.
4. Allow the Local Plan to be wholly silent regarding flood risk, relying solely on the NPPF.

| Option | 1 Meeting Housing Needs | 2 Accessible opportunities, facilities and services | 3 Safe and Healthy environments | 4 A thriving Economy | 5 Protecting Biodiversity and wildlife | 6 Accessible Greenspace, coast and water bodies | 7a Protecting landscape and townscape | 7b Protecting landscape and townscape | 8 Heritage | 9 Sustainable Natural Resources | 10a Managing Climate Change | 10b Managing Climate Change | Conclusion |
|--------|----------------------------|---|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|---|--|--|---------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|
| 1 | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | + |
| 2 | 0 | 0 | ++ | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | ++ | ++ |
| 3 | 0 | 0 | ?i | 0 | ?i | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | +/- |
| 4 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - |

Options Commentary:

Options 1 & 2: Options 1 and 2 would prevent inappropriate development in areas at current or future risk from flooding, and ensure that development does not worsen flood risk elsewhere. Option 2 scores higher than Option 1 due to the fact that it would provide more specific protection from flood risk in terms of site policies informed by the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.

Options 3 & 4: Options 3 and 4 would reduce the ability of the district council to manage the risk of flooding or minimise vulnerability to climate change, and developments could be implemented that are potentially not safe for their intended life.

Conclusion (Reasoning for Preferred Option): Option 2 is considered a sustainable option and is the preferred approach.

Policy CCC1: Safe and healthy communities (SA of Options) - main options/alternatives considered:

1. 'Save' the current policy approach (Policies CS5 and DM5) for pollution hazardous elements with no changes.
2. Revise the current policy approach to separate hazardous elements from the design criteria (placing the design elements within a revised design policy). Save Policy DM6 as it is effective and NPPF compliant.
3. Have no policy relating to hazardous elements.

| Option | 1 Meeting Housing Needs | 2 Accessible opportunities, facilities and services | 3 Safe and Healthy environments | 4 A thriving Economy | 5 Protecting Biodiversity and wildlife | 6 Accessible Greenspace, coast and water bodies | 7a Protecting landscape and townscape | 7b Protecting landscape and townscape | 8 Heritage | 9 Sustainable Natural Resources | 10a Managing Climate Change | 10b Managing Climate Change | Conclusion | |
|---|----------------------------|---|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|---|---|---|---------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|--|
| 1 | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | + | + | |
| 2 | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | i? | + | |
| 3 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - | i? | 0 | 0 | 0 | i? | 0 | i? | - | |
| Options Commentary: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>Option 1: Option 1 would provide the necessary provisions for identifying local hazards and reduce the risk of development being exposed to those hazards</p> <p>Option 2: Option 2 would provide the necessary provisions for identifying local hazards and reduce the risk of development being exposed to those hazards</p> <p>Option 3: Option 3 would leave communities and businesses at an increased risk from hazards, with no control over where development is located in relation to hazardous sites and uses.</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Conclusion (Reasoning for Preferred Option): | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Options 2 would provide clear positive impacts and ensure a sound plan in compliance with the NPPF. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Policy CCC1: Safe and healthy communities (SA of Policy)

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------------------|--|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|--|--|--|---------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|--|
| Policy | 1 Meeting Housing Needs | 2 Accessible opportunities, facilities and services | 3 Safe and Healthy environments | 4 A thriving Economy | 5 Protecting Biodiversity and wildlife | 6 Accessible Greenspace, coast and water bodies | 7a Protecting landscape and townscape | 7b Protecting landscape and townscape | 8 Heritage | 9 Sustainable Natural Resources | 10a Managing Climate Change | 10b Managing Climate Change | Conclusion | |
| 29 | - | 0 | ++ | 0 | + | 0 | + | 0 | ?i | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | |
| <p>SA Commentary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objective 1: Negative impact. The policy restricts residential development within the Climate Change Area, areas at risk of flooding, contaminated land, and various hazard zones. Objective 3: Significant Positive impact. The policy will provide protection from hazardous risks. Objective 8: Uncertain impact as it will depend on the location and scale of applications that come forward | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Coastal change management areas (SA of Options) - main options/alternatives considered:

1. Roll forward Policy DM6 as this is a strategic policy and 'Save' Policy DM7 to be reviewed under Part 2 of the Local Plan.
2. Delete and have no policy relating to mitigating the effects of climate change in this location, relying solely on the NPPF.

| Option | 1 Meeting Housing Needs | 2 Accessible opportunities, facilities and services | 3 Safe and Healthy environments | 4 A thriving Economy | 5 Protecting Biodiversity and wildlife | 6 Accessible Greenspace, coast and water bodies | 7a Protecting landscape and townscape | 7b Protecting landscape and townscape | 8 Heritage | 9 Sustainable Natural Resources | 10a Managing Climate Change | 10b Managing Climate Change | Conclusion |
|--------|----------------------------|---|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|---|--|--|---------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|
| 1 | - | 0 | ++ | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | + | + | + |
| 2 | - | 0 | -- | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | - | -- | - |

Options Commentary:

Option 1: This would continue to protect communities around New Milton and Barton on Sea from natural hazards (likely to be exacerbated by climate change) so providing safe and healthy environments.

Option 2: This would likely lead to a reduction in the protection and safety of some parts of the plan area around New Milton and Barton on Sea. This would lead to direct hazards relating to the coast and an increase in the number of people living in a property at risk from the effects of coastal erosion.

Conclusion (Reasoning for Preferred Option):

There have been no material changes regarding government policy or guidance, and the Shoreline Management Plans for the district coastline remain unchanged. No significant changes have been shown by the SFRA in regard to erosion risk. The policies relating to this element of climate change remain consistent with the NPPF and should be saved for review under Local Plan Part 2.

Policy CCC2: Safe and Sustainable Travel (SA of Options) - main options/alternatives considered:

1. Policy CS24 is generally in conformity with the NPPF and promotes sustainable transport methods – save policy
2. Amend policy CS24 to ensure new development provides proportionate highway measures to ensure safe and sustainable development and prioritises sustainable transport methods such as dedicated pedestrian/cycle routes and sufficient car parking.
3. Roll forward existing policy CS24 with factual update removing the reference to maximum parking standards and ‘site’ travel plans, include specific requirements relating to sustainable transport such as pedestrian/cycle routes and access within the separate strategic site policies. Incorporate table in the supporting text setting out projects to cross reference with separate strategic site policies.

| Option | 1 Meeting Housing Needs | 2 Accessible opportunities, facilities and services | 3 Safe and Healthy environments | 4 A thriving Economy | 5 Protecting Biodiversity and wildlife | 6 Accessible Greenspace, coast and water bodies | 7a Protecting landscape and townscape | 7b Protecting landscape and townscape | 8 Heritage | 9 Sustainable Natural Resources | 10a Managing Climate Change | 10b Managing Climate Change | Conclusion |
|--|----------------------------|--|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|--|--|--|---------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|
| 1 | 0 | + | + | ?i | ?i | ?i | ?i | ?i | ?i | ?i | + | ?i | + |
| 2 | 0 | ++ | + | ?i | ?i | ?i | ?i | ?i | ?i | ?i | ++ | ?i | ++ |
| 3 | 0 | + | + | ?i | ?i | ?i | ?i | ?i | ?i | ?i | + | ?i | + |
| Options Commentary: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All the options directly seek to provide sustainable transport methods associated with local plan development including pedestrian and cycle routes. Option 2 and 3 seeks to require specific requirements for strategic sites such as access arrangements and pedestrian/cycle routes. It is considered that a requirement for specific access arrangements and cycle and pedestrian routes should be included within each of the separate strategic site policies. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Policy CCC2: Safe and sustainable travel (SA of Policy)

| Policy | 1 Meeting Housing Needs | 2 Accessible opportunities, facilities and services | 3 Safe and Healthy environments | 4 A thriving Economy | 5 Protecting Biodiversity and wildlife | 6 Accessible Greenspace, coast and water bodies | 7a Protecting landscape and townscape | 7b Protecting landscape and townscape | 8 Heritage | 9 Sustainable Natural Resources | 10a Managing Climate Change | 10b Managing Climate Change | Conclusion | |
|---|----------------------------|---|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|---|--|--|---------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|--|
| 31 | 0 | + | + | ?i | ?i | ?i | ?i | ?i | ?i | ?i | + | ?i | + | |
| <p>SA Commentary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objective 2: Directly provides facilities and services to meet the needs identified in the evidence base • Objective 3: Policy provides strategy for safe vehicular access and promotes wider pedestrian and cycle routes • Objective 4: Depending on implementation there could be positive or negative impacts • Objective 5: Depending on implementation there could be positive or negative impacts • Objective 6: Depending on implementation there could be positive or negative impacts • Objective 7a and 7b: Depending on implementation there could be positive or negative impacts • Objective 8: Depending on implementation there could be positive or negative impacts • Objective 9: Depending on implementation there could be positive or negative impacts • Objective 10a: Provides alternative modes of transport • Objective 10b: Depending on implementation there could be positive or negative impacts | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Policy IMPL1: Developer Contributions (SA of Options) - main options/alternatives considered:

1. Rely on government policy documents and national policy
2. Retain a similar developer contribution policy for the collection of monies from developer contributions, updated to support planned growth

| Policy or option | 1 Meeting Housing Needs | 2 Accessible opportunities, facilities and services | 3 Safe and Healthy environments | 4 A thriving Economy | 5 Protecting Biodiversity and wildlife | 6 Accessible Greenspace, coast and water bodies | 7a Protecting landscape and townscape | 7b Protecting landscape and townscape | 8 Heritage | 9 Sustainable Natural Resources | 10a Managing Climate Change | 10b Managing Climate Change | Conclusion |
|------------------|----------------------------|--|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|--|--|--|---------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|
| 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | ?i | ?i | ?i | ?i | ?i | ?i | - |
| 2 | ?i | ++ | + | + | + | + | ?i | ?i | ?i | ?i | ?i | ?i | + |

Options Commentary:

The SA scoring suggests that a criteria based policy is still required to set out that the Council will collect contributions from development as without a local development contributions policy there would be no mechanism to meet the SA objectives. The policy should set out that the method used to collect contributions will be in line with Government guidance at the time.

Policy IMPL1: Developer Contributions (SA of Policy)

| Policy | 1 Meeting Housing Needs | 2 Accessible opportunities, facilities and services | 3 Safe and Healthy environments | 4 A thriving Economy | 5 Protecting Biodiversity and wildlife | 6 Accessible Greenspace, coast and water bodies | 7a Protecting landscape and townscape | 7b Protecting landscape and townscape | 8 Heritage | 9 Sustainable Natural Resources | 10a Managing Climate Change | 10b Managing Climate Change | Conclusion |
|--------|----------------------------|--|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|--|--|--|---------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|
| 34 | ?i | ++ | + | + | + | + | ?i | ?i | ?i | ?i | ?i | ?i | + |

SA Commentary:

- **Objective 1:** implementation requirements will remain unclear until development stage
- **Objective 2:** Directly provides facilities and services to meet the needs identified in the evidence base
- **Objective 3:** Policy provides strategy for safe vehicular access and promotes wider pedestrian and cycle routes
- **Objective 4:** Protects existing opportunities for education and skills
- **Objective 5:** Avoids adverse impacts from recreational pressures
- **Objective 6:** Encourages open space provision or sports facilities to policy standard but without increasing the deficit
- **Objective 7a:** implementation requirements remain unclear until development stage
- **Objective 7b:** implementation requirements remain unclear until development stage
- **Objective 8:** implementation requirements remain unclear until development stage
- **Objective 9:** implementation requirements remain unclear until development stage
- **Objective 10a:** implementation requirements remain unclear until development stage
- **Objective 10b:** implementation requirements remain unclear until development stage

Policy IMPL2: Development standards (SA of Options) - main options/alternatives considered:

1. Update CS4 & DM4 separately to simply reflect latest position in NPPF, remove the Code for Sustainable Homes standard, with updated references.
2. Update CS4 and roll forward DM4 unchanged to reflect the latest position in the NPPF, remove the Code for Sustainable Homes standard, but adopt National Technical Standards in relation to water use to all residential development in the strategic sites (Optional standard for water stressed areas at 110litres/person per day).
3. Combine CS4 and DM4 into a single policy to cover all elements of energy and resource use. Apply new National Technical Standards in relation to water use (Optional standard for water stressed areas at 110litres/person per day); incorporate charging points for electric vehicles; and Part M4(3) accessible dwelling standards for wheelchair users.
4. Have no policy on energy or resource use.

| Option | 1 Meeting Housing Needs | 2 Accessible opportunities, facilities and services | 3 Safe and Healthy environments | 4 A thriving Economy | 5 Protecting Biodiversity and wildlife | 6 Accessible Greenspace, coast and water bodies | 7a Protecting landscape and townscape | 7b Protecting landscape and townscape | 8 Heritage | 9 Sustainable Natural Resources | 10a Managing Climate Change | 10b Managing Climate Change | Conclusion |
|--------|----------------------------|---|---------------------------------------|-------------------------|--|---|---|---|---------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------|
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | +/- | 0 | +/- |
| 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | +/- | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | + | 0 | + |
| 3 | 0 | 0 | + | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | ++ | 0 | + |
| 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | -- | 0 | - |

Conclusions:

Option 1: would reduce the contribution that residential development can make to minimising climate change due to the removal of the Code for Sustainable Homes standard (or equivalent), but retains the policy for renewable energy proposals in the district. Mixed impacts overall.

Option 2: would reduce the contribution that residential development can make to minimising climate change due to the removal of the Code for Sustainable Homes standard (or equivalent), but would make a useful relative contribution to resource use in relation to water resources. Positive impact overall.

Option 3: would make a useful contribution to resource use in relation to both natural resources (water resources) and managing climate change (energy use). Which standards to adopt should be explored further in the policy. Positive impact overall.

Option 4: could result in lower employment rates / local knowledge in relation to construction techniques, and would likely lead to an increase in the districts contribution to climate change. Negative impact overall.

Options 2 and 3 would provide improvements to the way that energy and resource use is implemented within new developments. They would provide positive impacts on the use of natural resources.

Conclusion (Reasoning for Preferred Option):

Option 3 would provide improvements to the way that energy and resource use is implemented within new development. It would provide standards that are positive for future residents and facilitate energy efficiency.

Policy IMPL2: Development standards (SA of Policy)

| Policy | 1 Meeting Housing Needs | 2 Accessible opportunities, facilities and services | 3 Safe and Healthy environments | 4 A thriving Economy | 5 Protecting Biodiversity and wildlife | 6 Accessible Greenspace, coast and water bodies | 7a Protecting landscape and townscape | 7b Protecting landscape and townscape | 8 Heritage | 9 Sustainable Natural Resources | 10a Managing Climate Change | 10b Managing Climate Change | Conclusion |
|---|----------------------------|---|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|---|--|--|---------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|
| 35 | 0 | 0 | + | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | ++ | 0 | + |
| SA Commentary: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objective 3: The policy promotes and contributes to personal safety in developments through the installation of accessible buildings for sheltered and extra care homes. • Objective 4: Policy provides opportunities to provide positive impacts on employment as development construction will require local skills to implement the various standards into development schemes. • Objective 9: This policy promotes water use efficiency • Objective 10a: Provides alternative modes of transport and will limit emissions by the setting of criteria for energy efficient construction. This will require new buildings to incorporate energy generating infrastructure (BREEAM) and the provision of electric charging points to reduce adverse impacts (poor air quality and use of natural oil resources) on the environment. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Policy IMPL3: Monitoring (SA of Policy)

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--------|----------------------------|--|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|--|--|--|---------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|--|
| | Policy | 1 Meeting Housing Needs | 2 Accessible opportunities, facilities and services | 3 Safe and Healthy environments | 4 A thriving Economy | 5 Protecting Biodiversity and wildlife | 6 Accessible Greenspace, coast and water bodies | 7a Protecting landscape and townscape | 7b Protecting landscape and townscape | 8 Heritage | 9 Sustainable Natural Resources | 10a Managing Climate Change | 10b Managing Climate Change | Conclusion | |
| 1 | | ?i | ?i | ?i | ?i | ?i | ?i | ?i | ?i | ?i | ?i | ?i | ?i | | |

SA Commentary:

- **For all objectives:** Depending on implementation there could be positive or negative impacts.

Appendix 6

Sustainability Appraisal of Strategic Site Policies

List of site-specific policies:

- Policy SS 1 Land to the north of Totton
- Policy SS 2 Land south of Bury Road, Marchwood
- Policy SS 3 Land at Cork's Farm, Marchwood
- Policy SS 4 The former Fawley Power Station (mixed-use)
- Policy SS 5 Land at Milford Road, Lymington
- Policy SS 6 Land to the east of Lower Pennington Lane, Lymington
- Policy SS 7 Land north of Manor Road, Milford-on-Sea
- Policy SS 8 Land at Hordle Lane, Hordle
- Policy SS 9 Land east of Everton Road, Hordle
- Policy SS 10 Land to the east of Brockhills Lane, New Milton
- Policy SS 11 Land to the south of Gore Road, New Milton
- Policy SS 12 Land to the south of Derritt Lane, Bransgore
- Policy SS 13 Land at Moortown Lane, Ringwood
- Policy SS 14 Land to the north of Hightown Road, Ringwood
- Policy SS 15 Land at Snails Lane, Ringwood
- Policy SS 16 Land to the north of Station Road, Ashford
- Policy SS 17 Land at Whitsbury Road, Fordingbridge
- Policy SS 18 Land at Burgate, Fordingbridge

Site-specific policy appraisals summary table (excludes 'saved' site policies)

| Strategic Site | | SA Objectives | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|--|---------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|---------|-------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|------------|----------|-------------------|--------------------------------|------------|
| | | Housing | Accessible facilities | Safe & Healthy environment | Economy | Biodiversity & Wildlife | Accessible spaces | Landscape / Townscape | Green Belt | Heritage | Natural resources | Contribution to climate change | Flood risk |
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7a | 7b | 8 | 9 | 10a | 10b |
| 1 | Land to the North of Totton | ++ | + | + | + | ++ | + | ?i | 0 | + | ?i | + | ?i |
| 2 | Land south of Bury Road, Marchwood | ++ | + | + | + | ++ | + | ?i | 0 | 0 | ++ | + | ?i |
| 3 | Land at Cork's Farm, Marchwood | ++ | + | + | + | ++ | + | + | 0 | ?i | ?i | + | ?i |
| 4 | The former Fawley Power Station (mixed-use) | ++ | ++ | + | ++ | ++ | + | ?i | 0 | ?i | ++ | + | ?i |
| 5 | Land at Milford Road, Lymington | ++ | + | + | + | ++ | + | ?i | +/- | 0 | ?i | + | + |
| 6 | Land to the east of Lower Pennington Lane, Lymington | ++ | + | + | + | ++ | + | ?i | +/- | 0 | ?i | + | + |
| 7 | Land north of Manor Road, Milford-on-Sea | ++ | + | + | + | ++ | + | ?i | +/- | 0 | ?i | + | ++ |
| 8 | Land at Hordle Lane, Hordle | ++ | + | + | + | ++ | + | + | +/- | 0 | ?i | + | + |
| 9 | Land east of Everton Road, Hordle | ++ | + | + | + | ++ | + | + | +/- | 0 | 0 | + | ++ |
| 10 | Land to the east of Brockhills Lane, New Milton | ++ | + | + | + | ++ | + | + | +/- | 0 | ?i | + | + |
| 11 | Land to the south of Gore Road, New Milton | ++ | + | + | + | ++ | + | + | +/- | ?i | ?i | + | + |
| 12 | Land to the south of Derritt Lane, Bransgore | ++ | + | + | + | ++ | + | + | +/- | 0 | ?i | + | ?i |
| 13 | Land at Moortown Lane, Ringwood | ++ | + | + | + | ++ | + | + | +/- | 0 | ?i | + | ?i |
| 14 | Land to the north of Hightown Road, Ringwood | ++ | + | + | + | ++ | + | + | 0 | ?i | 0 | + | ?i |
| 15 | Land at Snails Lane, Ringwood | ++ | + | + | + | ++ | + | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | ?i |
| 16 | Land to the north of Station Road, Ashford | ++ | + | + | + | ++ | + | + | 0 | 0 | ?i | + | ?i |
| 17 | Land at Whitsbury Road, Fordingbridge | ++ | + | + | + | ++ | + | + | 0 | 0 | ?i | + | ?i |
| 18 | Land at Burgate, Fordingbridge | ++ | + | + | + | ++ | + | + | 0 | + | ?i | + | +/- |

Strategic Site 1: Land to the north of Totton

| 1 Meeting Housing Needs | 2 Accessible opportunities, facilities and services | 3 Safe and Healthy environments | 4 A thriving Economy | 5 Protecting Biodiversity and wildlife | 6 Accessible Greenspace, coast and water bodies | 7a Protecting landscape and townscape | 7b Protecting landscape and townscape | 8 Heritage | 9 Sustainable Natural Resources | 10a Managing Climate Change | 10b Managing Climate Change | Conclusion |
|--|--|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|--|--|--|---------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|
| ++ | + | + | + | ++ | + | ?i | 0 | + | ?i | + | ?i | + |
| <p>Commentary</p> <p>Objective 1: The policy will deliver at least 1000 homes 35% of which will be affordable, which is a significant provision of affordable housing, when taking viability into account.</p> <p>Objective 2: The policy states that a community and commercial core including 5ha of land for business and employment use will be delivered. There is also the potential provision of a primary school, depending on future need. The site is located adjacent to the existing settlement and will have access to the range of facilities within Totton. This will be a positive impact.</p> <p>Objective 3: The policy states traffic calming and crossing points will need to be provided on the A36 and Pauletts Lane suitable for buses pedestrians and cyclists, which will be a positive impact.</p> <p>Objective 4: The policy allocates land for employment and community uses. All housing developments will also benefit the economy from construction jobs to increased spending in the local economy by new homeowners which will be a positive impact.</p> <p>Objective 5: The site will have to provide mitigation land to the policy standard as part of the development and therefore this will have a significant positive impact.</p> <p>Objective 6: All Strategic sites will have to provide public open space and children’s play to the policy standard and therefore will have a positive impact.</p> <p>Objective 7a: Uncertain / will depend on detailed implementation of the allocation..</p> <p>Objective 9: Uncertain / will depend on detailed implementation of the allocation (whether the landowner wishes to extract any minerals from the site prior to construction and where environmentally suitable).</p> <p>Objective 10a: The site is located in a sustainable and accessible location and this helps to minimise the need to travel, and reduce greenhouse gas emissions.</p> <p>Objective 10b: A detailed site-specific FRA will ensure that there will be no inappropriate development in Flood Zone 3 (taking into consideration the latest climate changes requirements) but the conclusion for this objective is uncertain – full details will only be known at development stage.</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Strategic site 2: Land south of Bury Road, Marchwood

| 1 Meeting Housing Needs | 2 Accessible opportunities, facilities and services | 3 Safe and Healthy environments | 4 A thriving Economy | 5 Protecting Biodiversity and wildlife | 6 Accessible Greenspace, coast and water bodies | 7a Protecting landscape and townscape | 7b Protecting landscape and townscape | 8 Heritage | 9 Sustainable Natural Resources | 10a Managing Climate Change | 10b Managing Climate Change | Conclusion |
|--|--|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|--|--|--|---------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|
| ++ | + | + | + | ++ | + | ?i | 0 | 0 | ++ | + | ?i | + |
| <p>Commentary</p> <p>Objective 1: The policy will deliver at least 700 homes 35% of which will be affordable, which is a significant provision of affordable housing, when taking viability into account. This is a significant positive impact.</p> <p>Objective 2: The policy states that a community hub will be provided and that there is also the potential provision of a primary school, depending on future need. The site is located adjacent to the existing settlement and will have access to the range of facilities within Marchwood. This will be a positive impact.</p> <p>Objective 3: The policy requires a spinal access route with connections into the local area which will be a positive impact.</p> <p>Objective 4: The policy allocates land for housing and community uses. All housing developments will also benefit the economy from construction jobs to increased spending in the local economy by new homeowners which will be a positive impact.</p> <p>Objective 5: The site will have to provide mitigation land to the policy standard as part of the development and therefore this will have a significant positive impact.</p> <p>Objective 6: The site will have to provide public open space and children’s play to the policy standard and therefore will have a positive impact.</p> <p>Objective 7a: The policy requires a well-designed extension to Marchwood by creating a transition in character from low density to a more active central core, and will use lower densities greenspace and planning to create a strong rural edge. This will have a positive impact but it depends on details provided at development stage.</p> <p>Objective 9: Part of the site is already used for mineral extraction, which will continue, with the development being phased around the extraction and the land restoration. This is a positive impact. Overall this is judged to be Significant Positive impact as the policy supports the extraction of viable minerals resources.</p> <p>Objective 10a: The site is located in a sustainable and accessible location and this helps to minimise the need to travel, and reduce greenhouse gas emissions.</p> <p>Objective 10b: A detailed site-specific FRA will ensure that there will be no inappropriate development in Flood Zone 3 (taking into consideration the latest climate changes requirements) but the conclusion for this objective is uncertain – full details will only be known at development stage.</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Strategic site 3: Land at Corks Farm, Marchwood

| 1 Meeting Housing Needs | 2 Accessible opportunities, facilities and services | 3 Safe and Healthy environments | 4 A thriving Economy | 5 Protecting Biodiversity and wildlife | 6 Accessible Greenspace, coast and water bodies | 7a Protecting landscape and townscape | 7b Protecting landscape and townscape | 8 Heritage | 9 Sustainable Natural Resources | 10a Managing Climate Change | 10b Managing Climate Change | Conclusion |
|---|--|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|--|--|--|---------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|
| ++ | + | + | + | ++ | + | + | 0 | ?i | ?i | + | ?i | + |
| <p>Commentary</p> <p>Objective 1: The policy will deliver at least 200 homes 35% of which will be affordable, which is a significant provision of affordable housing, when taking viability into account.</p> <p>Objective 2: The site is located adjacent to the existing settlement and will have access to the range of facilities within Marchwood. This will be a positive impact.</p> <p>Objective 3: The policy requires highway improvements and enhancements, which will be a positive impact.</p> <p>Objective 4: All housing developments benefit the economy from construction jobs to increased spending in the local economy by new homeowners which will be a positive impact.</p> <p>Objective 5: The site will have to provide mitigation land to the policy standard as part of the development and therefore this will have a significant positive impact.</p> <p>Objective 6: The site will have to provide public open space and children’s play to the policy standard and therefore will have a positive impact.</p> <p>Objective 7a: The policy requires a high quality residential area by creating a strong settlement edge and providing a well-designed seaward frontage that responds positively to the waterside location and that conserves and enhances the setting of the conservation area. This will have a positive impact.</p> <p>Objective 8: Uncertain / will depend on detailed implementation of the allocation.</p> <p>Objective 9: Policy promotes the future extraction of viable mineral resources, but depends on implementation.</p> <p>Objective 10a: The site is located in a sustainable and accessible location and this helps to minimise the need to travel, and reduce greenhouse gas emissions.</p> <p>Objective 10b: Small areas are within Flood Zones 2+3. Policy ensures that development does not exacerbate risks to other developments or interests in the vicinity and seeks to address the future vulnerability of adjoining developed areas from flooding that might otherwise arise. Full details won’t be known until development stage.</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Strategic site 4: The former Fawley Power Station

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|--|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|--|--|--|---------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|--|
| 1 Meeting Housing Needs | 2 Accessible opportunities, facilities and services | 3 Safe and Healthy environments | 4 A thriving Economy | 5 Protecting Biodiversity and wildlife | 6 Accessible Greenspace, coast and water bodies | 7a Protecting landscape and townscape | 7b Protecting landscape and townscape | 8 Heritage | 9 Sustainable Natural Resources | 10a Managing Climate Change | 10b Managing Climate Change | Conclusion | |
| ++ | ++ | + | ++ | ++ | + | ?i | 0 | ?i | ++ | + | ?i | + | |

Commentary

Objective 1: The policy will deliver at least 1380 homes 35% of which will be affordable, which is a significant provision of affordable housing, when taking viability into account.

Objective 2: The policy states that a 10,000 sqm of community, retail leisure and service uses will be delivered on site as well as 10ha of land for business and industrial uses. This is a significant positive impact for the site and the local area.

Objective 3: The policy states there will be public access to the waterfront and that highways improvements will be required, which will be a positive impact.

Objective 4: The policy allocates a significant amount land for employment and community uses. All housing developments will also benefit the economy from construction jobs to increased spending in the local economy by new homeowners. Both together will be a significant positive impact.

Objective 5: The site will have to provide mitigation land to the policy standard as part of the development and therefore this will have a significant positive impact.

Objective 6: The site will have to provide public open space and children’s play to the policy standard and therefore will have a positive impact.

Objective 7a: Uncertain / will depend on detailed implementation of the allocation.

Objective 8: Uncertain / will depend on detailed implementation of the allocation.

Objective 9: The site is previously developed land and will have some degree of contamination, which redevelopment of the site will remediate so that the land can be reused for a beneficial use. This is a significant positive impact.

Objective 10a: The site is located in a sustainable and accessible location and this helps to minimise the need to travel, and reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

Objective 10b: Significant parts of the site are situated within coastal Flood Zones 2&3. Mitigation measures and other flood defence works to address future flood risks must be undertaken in a manner that does not exacerbate risks to other developments in the vicinity. Therefore impacts are uncertain until development stage,

Strategic site 5: Land at Milford Road, Lymington

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|--|--|--|---------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|--|
| 1 Meeting Housing Needs | 2 Accessible opportunities, facilities and services | 3 Safe and Healthy environments | 4 A thriving Economy | 5 Protecting Biodiversity and wildlife | 6 Accessible Greenspace, coast and water bodies | 7a Protecting landscape and townscape | 7b Protecting landscape and townscape | 8 Heritage | 9 Sustainable Natural Resources | 10a Managing Climate Change | 10b Managing Climate Change | Conclusion | |
| ++ | + | + | + | ++ | + | ?i | +/- | 0 | ?i | + | + | + | |
| <p>Commentary</p> <p>Objective 1: The policy will deliver at least 185 homes 50% of which will be affordable, which is a significant provision of affordable housing, when taking viability into account.</p> <p>Objective 2: The site is located adjacent to the existing settlement and will have access to the range of facilities within Lymington. This will be a positive impact.</p> <p>Objective 3: The policy states that the site will be integrated into the surrounding area by connecting to its footpath networks, which will be a positive impact.</p> <p>Objective 4: All housing developments will benefit the economy from construction jobs to increased spending in the local economy by new homeowners which will be a positive impact.</p> <p>Objective 5: The site will have to provide mitigation land to the policy standard as part of the development and therefore this will have a significant positive impact.</p> <p>Objective 6: The site will have to provide public open space and children’s play to the policy standard and therefore will have a positive impact.</p> <p>Objective 7a: Uncertain / will depend on detailed implementation of the allocation.</p> <p>Objective 7b: The site includes weak to moderate Green Belt and development may provide some landscape enhancement.</p> <p>Objective 9: Uncertain / will depend on detailed implementation of the allocation and whether the landowner wishes to extract any deposits from the site prior to construction.</p> <p>Objective 10a: The site is located in a sustainable and accessible location and this helps to minimise the need to travel, and reduce greenhouse gas emissions.</p> <p>Objective 10b: Development is within Flood Zone 1, and therefore has a positive impact</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Strategic site 6: Land to the east of Lower Pennington Lane, Lymington

| 1 Meeting Housing Needs | 2 Accessible opportunities, facilities and services | 3 Safe and Healthy environments | 4 A thriving Economy | 5 Protecting Biodiversity and wildlife | 6 Accessible Greenspace, coast and water bodies | 7a Protecting landscape and townscape | 7b Protecting landscape and townscape | 8 Heritage | 9 Sustainable Natural Resources | 10a Managing Climate Change | 10b Managing Climate Change | Conclusion |
|---|--|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|--|--|--|---------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|
| ++ | + | + | + | ++ | + | ?i | +/- | 0 | ?i | + | + | + |
| <p>Commentary</p> <p>Objective 1: The policy will deliver at least 100 homes 50% of which will be affordable, which is a significant provision of affordable housing, when taking viability into account.</p> <p>Objective 2: The site is located adjacent to the existing settlement and will have access to the range of facilities within Lymington. This will be a positive impact.</p> <p>Objective 3: The policy states that the site will be integrated into the surrounding area by connecting to its footpath networks, as well as connecting the site with vehicular access from Lower Pennington Lane and Ridgeway Lane. This will have a positive impact.</p> <p>Objective 4: All housing developments will also benefit the economy from construction jobs to increased spending in the local economy by new homeowners which will be a positive impact.</p> <p>Objective 5: The site will have to provide mitigation land to the policy standard as part of the development and therefore this will have a significant positive impact.</p> <p>Objective 6: The site will have to provide public open space and children’s play to the policy standard and therefore will have a positive impact.</p> <p>Objective 7a: Uncertain / will depend on detailed implementation of the allocation.</p> <p>Objective 7b: The site includes weak to moderate Green Belt and development may provide some landscape enhancement.</p> <p>Objective 9: Uncertain / will depend on detailed implementation of the allocation and whether the landowner wishes to extract any deposits from the site prior to construction..</p> <p>Objective 10a: The site is located in a sustainable and accessible location and this helps to minimise the need to travel, and reduce greenhouse gas emissions.</p> <p>Objective 10b: The site is within Flood Zone 1, and therefore has a positive impact</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Strategic site 7: Land to the north of Manor Road, Milford on Sea

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|--|--|--|---------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|--|
| 1 Meeting Housing Needs | 2 Accessible opportunities, facilities and services | 3 Safe and Healthy environments | 4 A thriving Economy | 5 Protecting Biodiversity and wildlife | 6 Accessible Greenspace, coast and water bodies | 7a Protecting landscape and townscape | 7b Protecting landscape and townscape | 8 Heritage | 9 Sustainable Natural Resources | 10a Managing Climate Change | 10b Managing Climate Change | Conclusion | |
| ++ | + | + | + | ++ | + | ?i | +/- | 0 | ?i | + | ++ | + | |
| <p>Commentary</p> <p>Objective 1: The policy will deliver at least 110 homes 50% of which will be affordable, which is a significant provision of affordable housing, when taking viability into account.</p> <p>Objective 2: The site is located adjacent to the existing settlement and will have access to the range of facilities within Milford on Sea. This will be a positive impact.</p> <p>Objective 3: The policy states that access to the site will be from Manor Road and highway improvements will be required on the junction of the B3058 and A336, which will be a positive impact.</p> <p>Objective 4: All housing developments will benefit the economy from construction jobs to increased spending in the local economy by new homeowners which will be a positive impact.</p> <p>Objective 5: The site will have to provide mitigation land to the policy standard as part of the development and therefore this will have a significant positive impact.</p> <p>Objective 6: The site will have to provide public open space and children's play to the policy standard and therefore will have a positive impact.</p> <p>Objective 7a: Uncertain / will depend on detailed implementation of the allocation.</p> <p>Objective 7b: The site includes weak to moderate Green Belt and development may provide some landscape enhancement.</p> <p>Objective 9: Uncertain / will depend on detailed implementation of the allocation and whether the landowner wishes to extract any deposits from the site prior to construction.</p> <p>Objective 10a: The site is located in a sustainable and accessible location and this helps to minimise the need to travel, and reduce greenhouse gas emissions.</p> <p>Objective 10b: The site is within Flood Zone 1 with no known flood risk issues, and therefore has a significant positive impact</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Strategic site 8: Land at Hordle Lane, Hordle

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|--|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|--|--|--|---------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|
| 1 Meeting Housing Needs | 2 Accessible opportunities, facilities and services | 3 Safe and Healthy environments | 4 A thriving Economy | 5 Protecting Biodiversity and wildlife | 6 Accessible Greenspace, coast and water bodies | 7a Protecting landscape and townscape | 7b Protecting landscape and townscape | 8 Heritage | 9 Sustainable Natural Resources | 10a Managing Climate Change | 10b Managing Climate Change | Conclusion |
| ++ | + | + | + | ++ | + | + | +/- | 0 | ?i | + | + | + |

Commentary

Objective 1: The policy will deliver at least 160 homes 50% of which will be affordable, which is a significant provision of affordable housing, when taking viability into account.

Objective 2: The site is located adjacent to the existing settlement and will have access to the range of facilities within Hordle. This will be a positive impact.

Objective 3: The policy states that a recreational amenity area and corridor will be provided which will provide a north south pedestrian access to the adjacent areas, which will be a positive impact.

Objective 4: All housing developments will benefit the economy from construction jobs to increased spending in the local economy by new homeowners which will be a positive impact.

Objective 5: The site will have to provide mitigation land to the policy standard as part of the development and therefore this will have a significant positive impact.

Objective 6: The site will have to provide public open space and children’s play to the policy standard and therefore will have a positive impact.

Objective 7a: The policy states that development will need to protect and enhance the rural character of Hordle and Vicarage Lanes, and that parts of the site will be required to define a high quality rural edge identity of the locality and that development will need to retain and or enhance landscape characteristics or features.

Objective 7b: The site includes weak to moderate Green Belt and development may provide some landscape enhancement.

Objective 9: Uncertain / will depend on detailed implementation of the allocation and whether the landowner wishes to extract any deposits from the site prior to construction.

Objective 10a: The site is located in a sustainable and accessible location and this helps to minimise the need to travel, and reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

Objective 10b: The site is within Flood Zone 1, and therefore has a positive impact

Strategic site 9: Land to the east of Everton Lane, Hordle

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|--|--|--|---------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|--|
| 1 Meeting Housing Needs | 2 Accessible opportunities, facilities and services | 3 Safe and Healthy environments | 4 A thriving Economy | 5 Protecting Biodiversity and wildlife | 6 Accessible Greenspace, coast and water bodies | 7a Protecting landscape and townscape | 7b Protecting landscape and townscape | 8 Heritage | 9 Sustainable Natural Resources | 10a Managing Climate Change | 10b Managing Climate Change | Conclusion | |
| ++ | + | + | + | ++ | + | + | +/- | 0 | 0 | + | ++ | + | |
| Commentary | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>Objective 1: The policy will deliver at least 100 homes 50% of which will be affordable, which is a significant provision of affordable housing, when taking viability into account.</p> <p>Objective 2: The site is located adjacent to the existing settlement and will have access to the range of facilities within Hordle. This will be a positive impact.</p> <p>Objective 3: The policy states that access to the site will be from Everton Road, with footpaths will connect through the site linking to the central Hordle site. There is also the requirement for pedestrian crossing point on Everton Lane to link to the footpath and cycle routes, which will be a positive impact.</p> <p>Objective 4: All housing developments will benefit the economy from construction jobs to increased spending in the local economy by new homeowners which will be a positive impact.</p> <p>Objective 5: The site will have to provide mitigation land to the policy standard as part of the development and therefore this will have a significant positive impact.</p> <p>Objective 6: The site will have to provide public open space and children's play to the policy standard and therefore will have a positive impact.</p> <p>Objective 7a: The policy states that development will need to provide a well-defined edge and enhanced rural character to the Green Belt which will be a positive impact.</p> <p>Objective 7b: The site includes weak to moderate Green Belt and development may provide some landscape enhancement.</p> <p>Objective 10a: The site is located in a sustainable and accessible location and this helps to minimise the need to travel, and reduce greenhouse gas emissions.</p> <p>Objective 10b: The site is within Flood Zone 1 with no flood risk issues, and therefore has a significant positive impact</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Strategic site 10: Land to the east of Brockhills Lane, New Milton

| 1 Meeting Housing Needs | 2 Accessible opportunities, facilities and services | 3 Safe and Healthy environments | 4 A thriving Economy | 5 Protecting Biodiversity and wildlife | 6 Accessible Greenspace, coast and water bodies | 7a Protecting landscape and townscape | 7b Protecting landscape and townscape | 8 Heritage | 9 Sustainable Natural Resources | 10a Managing Climate Change | 10b Managing Climate Change | Conclusion |
|--|---|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|---|--|--|---------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|
| ++ | + | + | + | ++ | + | + | +/- | 0 | ?i | + | + | + |
| <p>Commentary</p> <p>Objective 1: The policy will deliver at least 130 homes 50% of which will be affordable, which is a significant provision of affordable housing, when taking viability into account.</p> <p>Objective 2: The site is located adjacent to the existing settlement and will have access to the range of facilities within New Milton. This will be a positive impact.</p> <p>Objective 3: The policy that access will be from Brockhills Lane, which will be a positive impact.</p> <p>Objective 4: All housing developments will benefit the economy from construction jobs to increased spending in the local economy by new homeowners which will be a positive impact.</p> <p>Objective 5: The site will have to provide mitigation land to the policy standard as part of the development and therefore this will have a significant positive impact.</p> <p>Objective 6: The site will have to provide public open space and children’s play to the policy standard and therefore will have a positive impact.</p> <p>Objective 7a: The policy states that development will need to create a compact pattern of irregular perimeter blocks with well-designed buildings and streets comparable with the character of the development in the area. This will have a positive impact.</p> <p>Objective 7b: The site includes weak to moderate Green Belt and development may provide some landscape enhancement.</p> <p>Objective 9: Uncertain / will depend on detailed implementation of the allocation and whether the landowner wishes to extract any deposits from the site prior to construction.</p> <p>Objective 10a: The site is located in a sustainable and accessible location and this helps to minimise the need to travel, and reduce greenhouse gas emissions.</p> <p>Objective 10b: The site is within Flood Zone 1, and therefore has a positive impact</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Strategic site 11: Land to the south of Gore Road, New Milton

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|--|--|--|---------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|--|
| 1 Meeting Housing Needs | 2 Accessible opportunities, facilities and services | 3 Safe and Healthy environments | 4 A thriving Economy | 5 Protecting Biodiversity and wildlife | 6 Accessible Greenspace, coast and water bodies | 7a Protecting landscape and townscape | 7b Protecting landscape and townscape | 8 Heritage | 9 Sustainable Natural Resources | 10a Managing Climate Change | 10b Managing Climate Change | Conclusion | |
| ++ | + | + | + | ++ | + | + | +/- | ?i | 0 | + | + | + | |
| <p>Commentary</p> <p>Objective 1: The policy will deliver at least 160 homes 50% of which will be affordable, which is a significant provision of affordable housing, when taking viability into account.</p> <p>Objective 2: The site is located adjacent to the existing settlement and will have access to the range of facilities within New Milton. This will be a positive impact.</p> <p>Objective 3: The policy states that access will be from Gore Road, which will be a positive impact.</p> <p>Objective 4: All housing developments will benefit the economy from construction jobs to increased spending in the local economy by new homeowners which will be a positive impact.</p> <p>Objective 5: The site will have to provide mitigation land to the policy standard as part of the development and therefore this will have a significant positive impact.</p> <p>Objective 6: The site will have to provide public open space and children's play to the policy standard and therefore will have a positive impact.</p> <p>Objective 7a: The policy states that development will create a well-designed area of the town, with a central greenspace for higher densities. This will be a positive impact.</p> <p>Objective 7b: The site includes weak to moderate Green Belt and development may provide some landscape enhancement.</p> <p>Objective 8: Uncertain / will depend on detailed implementation of the allocations / individual scheme.</p> <p>Objective 10a: The site is located in a sustainable and accessible location and this helps to minimise the need to travel, and reduce greenhouse gas emissions.</p> <p>Objective 10b: The site is within Flood Zone 1, and therefore has a positive impact</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Strategic site 12: Land to the South of Derritt Lane , Bransgore

| 1 Meeting Housing Needs | 2 Accessible opportunities, facilities and services | 3 Safe and Healthy environments | 4 A thriving Economy | 5 Protecting Biodiversity and wildlife | 6 Accessible Greenspace, coast and water bodies | 7a Protecting landscape and townscape | 7b Protecting landscape and townscape | 8 Heritage | 9 Sustainable Natural Resources | 10a Managing Climate Change | 10b Managing Climate Change | Conclusion |
|---|---|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|---|--|--|---------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|
| ++ | + | + | + | ++ | + | + | +/- | 0 | ?i | + | ?i | + |
| <p>Commentary</p> <p>Objective 1: The policy will deliver at least 100 homes 50% of which will be affordable, which is a significant provision of affordable housing, when taking viability into account.</p> <p>Objective 2: The site is located adjacent to the existing settlement and will have access to the range of facilities within Bransgore. This will be a positive impact.</p> <p>Objective 3: Access will be from Derritt Lane and the policy requires safer pedestrian access for the wider locality. This will be a positive impact.</p> <p>Objective 4: All housing developments will benefit the economy from construction jobs to increased spending in the local economy by new homeowners which will be a positive impact.</p> <p>Objective 5: The site will have to provide mitigation land to the policy standard as part of the development and therefore this will have a significant positive impact.</p> <p>Objective 6: The site will have to provide public open space and children’s play to the policy standard and therefore will have a positive impact.</p> <p>Objective 7a: The policy states that development will create a well designed village extension, including protecting the rural qualities of Derritt Lane, and by creating a new village green. This will be a positive impact.</p> <p>Objective 7b: The site includes weak to moderate Green Belt and development may provide some landscape enhancement.</p> <p>Objective 9: Uncertain / will depend on detailed implementation of the allocation and whether the landowner wishes to extract any deposits from the site prior to construction.</p> <p>Objective 10a: The site is located in a sustainable and accessible location and this helps to minimise the need to travel, and reduce greenhouse gas emissions.</p> <p>Objective 10b: The site is partially within Flood Zones 2+3 in southern parts of the site, but with appropriate measures the flood issues can be mitigated. Policy would reduce flood risk through the measures set out. But full impacts and mitigation are uncertain until development stage.</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Strategic site 13 : Land at Moortown Lane, Ringwood

| 1 Meeting Housing Needs | 2 Accessible opportunities, facilities and services | 3 Safe and Healthy environments | 4 A thriving Economy | 5 Protecting Biodiversity and wildlife | 6 Accessible Greenspace, coast and water bodies | 7a Protecting landscape and townscape | 7b Protecting landscape and townscape | 8 Heritage | 9 Sustainable Natural Resources | 10a Managing Climate Change | 10b Managing Climate Change | Conclusion |
|---|--|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|--|--|--|---------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|
| ++ | + | + | + | ++ | + | + | +/- | 0 | ?i | + | ?i | + |
| <p>Commentary</p> <p>Objective 1: The policy will deliver at least 480 homes 50% of which will be affordable, which is a significant provision of affordable housing, when taking viability into account.</p> <p>Objective 2: The policy states that a community and commercial core including Xha of land for small business and employment use will be delivered. There is also the potential provision of a primary school, depending on future need. The site is located adjacent to the existing settlement and will have access to the range of facilities within Ringwood. This will be a positive impact.</p> <p>Objective 3: The policy states that the site should offer a choice of routes linking local traffic with the A31. It also lists a number of highway improvements that will be required in the locality and also the need to consider how pedestrians cyclists and horse riders use the network. All of these measures will have a positive impact.</p> <p>Objective 4: The policy allocates land for employment and community uses. All housing developments will also benefit the economy from construction jobs to increased spending in the local economy by new homeowners which will be a positive impact.</p> <p>Objective 5: The site will have to provide mitigation land to the policy standard as part of the development and therefore this will have a significant positive impact.</p> <p>Objective 6: The site will have to provide public open space and children’s play to the policy standard and therefore will have a positive impact.</p> <p>Objective 7a: The policy states that development will create a well-designed and integrated extension to Ringwood, including strengthening the character and neighbourhood of Crow with a distinct and separate settlement expansion. This will be a positive impact.</p> <p>Objective 7b: The site includes weak to moderate Green Belt and development may provide some landscape enhancement.</p> <p>Objective 9: Uncertain / will depend on detailed implementation of the allocation and whether the landowner wishes to extract any deposits from the site prior to construction.</p> <p>Objective 10a: The site is located in a sustainable and accessible location and this helps to minimise the need to travel, and reduce greenhouse gas emissions.</p> <p>Objective 10b: The site is partially within Flood Zones 2+3, but with appropriate measures the flood issues can be mitigated. Policy requires FRA and that there is no increase in flood risk elsewhere over the lifetime of the development. Provides opportunity for development to reduce the impacts of flooding around the locality (e.g. with SS14). But full impacts and mitigation are uncertain until development stage</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Strategic site 14: Land to the north of Hightown Road, Ringwood

| 1 Meeting Housing Needs | 2 Accessible opportunities, facilities and services | 3 Safe and Healthy environments | 4 A thriving Economy | 5 Protecting Biodiversity and wildlife | 6 Accessible Greenspace, coast and water bodies | 7a Protecting landscape and townscape | 7b Protecting landscape and townscape | 8 Heritage | 9 Sustainable Natural Resources | 10a Managing Climate Change | 10b Managing Climate Change | Conclusion |
|--|---|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|---|--|--|---------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|
| ++ | + | + | + | ++ | + | + | 0 | ?i | 0 | + | ?i | + |
| Commentary | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>Objective 1: The policy will deliver at least 270 homes 50% of which will be affordable, which is a significant provision of affordable housing, when taking viability into account.</p> <p>Objective 2: The policy states that around 3ha of land for business and employment use will be delivered. Then site is located adjacent to the existing settlement and will have access to the range of facilities within Ringwood. This will be a positive impact.</p> <p>Objective 3: The policy states that the site should offer a choice of routes linking local traffic with the A31. It also lists a number of highway improvements that will be required in the locality. It also requires that the primary vehicle route will be a central corridor around which development will be focussed. All of these measures will have a positive impact.</p> <p>Objective 4: The policy allocates land for employment. All housing developments will also benefit the economy from construction jobs to increased spending in the local economy by new homeowners which will be a positive impact.</p> <p>Objective 5: The site will have to provide mitigation land to the policy standard as part of the development and therefore this will have a significant positive impact.</p> <p>Objective 6: The site will have to provide public open space and children’s play to the policy standard and therefore will have a positive impact.</p> <p>Objective 7a: The policy states that development will need to respect the landscape sensitivities of the adjoining New Forest. It also requires a transition in character from suburban to rural edge. This will have a positive impact.</p> <p>Objective 8: Uncertain / will depend on detailed implementation of the allocations / individual schemes</p> <p>Objective 10a: The site is located in a sustainable and accessible location and this helps to minimise the need to travel, and reduce greenhouse gas emissions.</p> <p>Objective 10b: Significant areas of Flood Zones 2&3 (shallow in nature. With appropriate measures the flood issues can be mitigated. Policy requires FRA and improved flood and drainage management in the locality, to ensure that there is no increased flood risk on or off the site. Full impacts and mitigation uncertain until development stage.</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Strategic site 15: Land at Snails Lane, Ringwood

| 1 Meeting Housing Needs | 2 Accessible opportunities, facilities and services | 3 Safe and Healthy environments | 4 A thriving Economy | 5 Protecting Biodiversity and wildlife | 6 Accessible Greenspace, coast and water bodies | 7a Protecting landscape and townscape | 7b Protecting landscape and townscape | 8 Heritage | 9 Sustainable Natural Resources | 10a Managing Climate Change | 10b Managing Climate Change | Conclusion |
|--|--|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|--|--|--|---------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|
| ++ | + | + | + | ++ | + | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | ?i | + |
| <p>Commentary</p> <p>Objective 1: The policy will deliver about 100 homes 50% of which will be affordable, which is a significant provision of affordable housing, when taking viability into account.</p> <p>Objective 2: The site is located close to some of the existing facilities in Ringwood. This will be a positive impact.</p> <p>Objective 3: The policy states that access will be from Snails Lane and that footpaths should connect to the existing public rights of way, which will have a positive impact.</p> <p>Objective 4: All housing developments will benefit the economy from construction jobs to increased spending in the local economy by new homeowners which will be a positive impact.</p> <p>Objective 5: The site will have to provide mitigation land to the policy standard as part of the development and therefore this will have a significant positive impact.</p> <p>Objective 6: The site will have to provide public open space and children’s play to the policy standard and therefore will have a positive impact.</p> <p>Objective 7a: The policy states that development will need to protect the rural character of the gravel lanes and to retain and enhance the hedgerow frontage to Snails Lane. This will be a positive impact.</p> <p>Objective 10a: The site is located in a sustainable and accessible location and this helps to minimise the need to travel, and reduce greenhouse gas emissions.</p> <p>Objective 10b: Development will be directed to Flood Zone 1 and FRA required but full impacts and mitigation are uncertain until development stage.</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Strategic site 16: Land to the north of Station Road, Ashford

| 1 Meeting Housing Needs | 2 Accessible opportunities, facilities and services | 3 Safe and Healthy environments | 4 A thriving Economy | 5 Protecting Biodiversity and wildlife | 6 Accessible Greenspace, coast and water bodies | 7a Protecting landscape and townscape | 7b Protecting landscape and townscape | 8 Heritage | 9 Sustainable Natural Resources | 10a Managing Climate Change | 10b Managing Climate Change | Conclusion |
|---|---|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|---|--|--|---------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|
| ++ | + | + | + | ++ | + | + | 0 | 0 | ?i | + | ?i | + |
| <p>Commentary</p> <p>Objective 1: The policy will deliver at least 140 homes 50% of which will be affordable, which is a significant provision of affordable housing, when taking viability into account.</p> <p>Objective 2: The site is located adjacent to the existing settlement and will have access to the range of facilities within Fordingbridge. This will be a positive impact.</p> <p>Objective 3: The policy states that access will be from the main Allenbrook Nursing Home junction, with a secondary access off Ashford Close. Pedestrian connections will also be provided, which will be a positive impact.</p> <p>Objective 4: All housing developments will benefit the economy from construction jobs to increased spending in the local economy by new homeowners which will be a positive impact.</p> <p>Objective 5: The site will have to provide mitigation land to the policy standard as part of the development and therefore this will have a significant positive impact.</p> <p>Objective 6: The site will have to provide public open space and children’s play to the policy standard and therefore will have a positive impact.</p> <p>Objective 7a: The policy states that development will need to create a well-designed new neighbourhood, using the higher ground for residential development with development on the western side of Marl Lane to create an attractive edge to the greenspace. This will have a positive impact.</p> <p>Objective 9: Uncertain / will depend on detailed implementation of the allocation and whether the landowner wishes to extract any deposits from the site prior to construction.</p> <p>Objective 10a: The site is located in a sustainable and accessible location and this helps to minimise the need to travel, and reduce greenhouse gas emissions.</p> <p>Objective 10b: Fluvial Flood Zones 2&3 follow the existing watercourse through the site. Development will be directed to Flood Zone 1 and FRA required but full impacts and mitigation are uncertain until development stage.</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Strategic site 17: Land at Whitsbury Road, Fordingbridge

| 1 Meeting Housing Needs | 2 Accessible opportunities, facilities and services | 3 Safe and Healthy environments | 4 A thriving Economy | 5 Protecting Biodiversity and wildlife | 6 Accessible Greenspace, coast and water bodies | 7a Protecting landscape and townscape | 7b Protecting landscape and townscape | 8 Heritage | 9 Sustainable Natural Resources | 10a Managing Climate Change | 10b Managing Climate Change | Conclusion |
|--|---|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|---|--|--|---------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|
| ++ | + | + | + | ++ | + | + | 0 | 0 | ?i | + | ?i | + |
| Commentary Objective 1: The policy will deliver at least 330 homes 05% of which will be affordable, which is a significant provision of affordable housing, when taking viability into account. Objective 2: The site is located adjacent to the existing settlement and will have access to the range of facilities within Fordingbridge. This will be a positive impact. Objective 3: The policy states that access will be from Whitsbury Road and that access to the west will be via a bridge across Sweatford Water. This will be a positive impact. Objective 4: All housing developments will benefit the economy from construction jobs to increased spending in the local economy by new homeowners which will be a positive impact. Objective 5: The site will have to provide mitigation land to the policy standard as part of the development and therefore this will have a significant positive impact. Objective 6: The site will have to provide public open space and children's play to the policy standard and therefore will have a positive impact. Objective 7a: The policy states that development will need to protect and enhance the landscape and ecological of the area, as well as providing three distinctive neighbourhoods. This will be a positive impact. Objective 9: Uncertain / will depend on detailed implementation of the allocation and whether the landowner wishes to extract any deposits from the site prior to construction. Objective 10a: The site is located in a sustainable and accessible location and this helps to minimise the need to travel, and reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Objective 10b: Fluvial Flood Zones 2&3 follows the existing watercourse through the site along Sweatfords Water. Development will be directed to Flood Zone 1 and FRA required but full impacts and mitigation are uncertain until development stage. | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Strategic site 18: Land at Burgate, Fordingbridge

| 1 Meeting Housing Needs | 2 Accessible opportunities, facilities and services | 3 Safe and Healthy environments | 4 A thriving Economy | 5 Protecting Biodiversity and wildlife | 6 Accessible Greenspace, coast and water bodies | 7a Protecting landscape and townscape | 7b Protecting landscape and townscape | 8 Heritage | 9 Sustainable Natural Resources | 10a Managing Climate Change | 10b Managing Climate Change | Conclusion |
|--|---|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|---|--|--|---------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|
| ++ | + | + | + | ++ | + | + | 0 | + | ?i | + | +/- | + |
| <p>Commentary</p> <p>Objective 1: The policy will deliver at least 400 homes 50% of which will be affordable, which is a significant provision of affordable housing, when taking viability into account.</p> <p>Objective 2: The policy sets out a requirement for a community and commercial focal point including land for additional employment provision. The site is located adjacent to the existing settlement and will have access to the range of facilities within Fordingbridge. This will be a positive impact.</p> <p>Objective 3: The policy states that access will be from the A338 with internal connections for residents. This will be a positive impact.</p> <p>Objective 4: The policy allocates land for employment and community uses. All housing developments will also benefit the economy from construction jobs to increased spending in the local economy by new homeowners which will be a positive impact.</p> <p>Objective 5: The site will have to provide mitigation land to the policy standard as part of the development and therefore this will have a significant positive impact.</p> <p>Objective 6: The site will have to provide public open space and children’s play to the policy standard and therefore will have a positive impact.</p> <p>Objective 7a: The policy states that development will provide a well-designed extension to Fordingbridge whilst maintaining the distinctive rural and historic character of Upper Burgate and Fryern Court Road. This will be a positive impact.</p> <p>Objective 9: Uncertain / will depend on detailed implementation of the allocation and whether the landowner wishes to extract any deposits from the site prior to construction.</p> <p>Objective 8: policy retains Grade II listed Farmhouse within the development area to provide an appropriate setting so that its significance can be appreciated</p> <p>Objective 10a: The site is located in a sustainable and accessible location and this helps to minimise the need to travel, and reduce greenhouse gas emissions.</p> <p>Objective 10b: The site is within Flood Zone 1, but local flood risks remain present (groundwater and surface water flood risk)</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Omission sites

The omission sites submitted to the council by promoters are set out in detail in the NFDC **Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (2018)**.

This appendix should be read in conjunction with that report, which provides location maps and further information for each submission.

Lift of Omission sites:

| Site name | Notes |
|--|--------------------------|
| Omission site 1: Land to the north of Heatherstone Grange | Submission from promoter |
| Omission Site 2: Land to the south of Ringwood (site P) | Submission from promoter |
| Omission Site 3: Land to the east and north of Ringwood Sewage Treatment Works | Submission from promoter |
| Omission Site 4: Land to the south east of Fordingbridge | Submission from promoter |
| Omission Site 5: Land to the south west of Fordingbridge | Submission from promoter |
| | |
| Omission Site 6: Land at Tinkers Cross, Fordingbridge | Submission from promoter |
| Omission Site 7: Site D – North Lymington (Initial Proposals 2016) | Deleted from Local Plan |
| Omission site 8: Northern extension to eastern part of Site F– Milford on Sea (Initial Proposals 2016) | Submission from promoter |
| Omission Site 9: Site G – Everton (Initial Proposals 2016) | Deleted from Local Plan |
| Omission Site 10: Extension to North of Hordle | Submission from promoter |
| Omission Site 11: Site J - North east of Hordle (Initial Proposals 2016) | Deleted from Local Plan |
| Omission Site 12: Site K – West of New Milton (Initial Proposals 2016) | Deleted from Local Plan |
| Omission Site 13: Site M – South east of New Milton (Initial Proposals 2016) | Deleted from Local Plan |
| Omission Site 14: North west of Milford on Sea (Western Part of Site F) | Submission from promoter |
| Omission Site 15: South of Site K – New Milton | Submission from promoter |
| Omission Site 16: East of Milford on Sea | Submission from promoter |
| Omission Site 17: North of Totton | Submission from promoter |
| Omission Site 18: South of Totton | Submission from promoter |
| Omission Site 19: North of Hythe | Submission from promoter |

SA of Omission sites - Summary table

| Omission Site | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | Conclusion |
|--|-----------------------|----------------------------|---------|-------------------------|-------------------|----------------------------------|----------|-------------------|-------------------------|------------|
| | Accessible facilities | Safe & Healthy environment | Economy | Biodiversity & Wildlife | Accessible spaces | Protecting Townscape / landscape | Heritage | Natural resources | Managing Climate change | |
| 1. Land north of Heatherstone Grange, Bransgore | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | -- | 0 | 0 | - | -- |
| 2. Omission Site 2: Land to the south of Ringwood (lower site P) | - | + | 0 | - | -- | -- | 0 | - | - | -- |
| 3: Land to the east and north of Ringwood Sewage Treatment Works | 0 | -- | 0 | -- | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | -- |
| 4: Land to the south east of Fordingbridge | + | + | 0 | - | 0 | -- | 0 | 0 | 0 | -- |
| 5: Land to the south west of Fordingbridge | ++ | ++ | 0 | -- | 0 | -- | 0 | 0 | 0 | -- |
| 6 Land at Tinkers Cross, Fordingbridge | 0 | + | 0 | - | 0 | -- | - | 0 | 0 | -- |
| 7: Site D – North Lymington | + | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | -- | - | 0 | - | -- |
| 8: Northern extension to eastern part of Site F - Milford on Sea | - | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | -- | 0 | 0 | - | -- |
| 9: Site G and Knighton Caravan Park – Everton | - | + | 0 | - | + | -- | 0 | - | 0 | -- |
| 10: Extension to SS9 North Hordle | - | + | 0 | - | 0 | -- | 0 | - | 0 | -- |
| 11: Site J North east of Hordle | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | -- | 0 | 0 | 0 | -- |
| 12: Site K – West of New Milton | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | -- | 0 | - | 0 | -- |
| 13: Site M – South east of New Milton | ++ | + | + | 0 | 0 | -- | 0 | 0 | + | -- |
| 14: North west of Milford on Sea | - | - | 0 | - | 0 | -- | 0 | 0 | - | -- |
| 15: South of site K / site X – New Milton | + | + | 0 | - | + | -- | 0 | 0 | + | -- |
| 16: East of Milford on Sea | + | + | 0 | - | 0 | -- | 0 | 0 | - | -- |
| 17: North of Totton | - | - | 0 | - | 0 | -- | - | - | - | -- |
| 18: South of Totton | - | - | 0 | - | 0 | -- | - | 0 | - | -- |
| 19: North of Hythe | + | + | 0 | - | 0 | -- | 0 | 0 | 0 | - |

Omission Site 1: Land to the north of Heatherstone Grange

| SA Site reference number | 2 Accessible opportunities, facilities and services | 3 Safe and Healthy environments | 4 A thriving Economy | 5 Protecting Biodiversity and wildlife | 6 Accessible Greenspace, coast and water bodies | 7 Protecting landscape and townscape | 8 Heritage | 9 Sustainable Natural Resources | 10 Managing Climate Change | Conclusion | Commentary |
|--------------------------|--|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|--|---|---------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------|--|
| BS028 | | | | | | | | | | | Critical Failure – Site is in Flood Zone 3 |
| BS030 | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | -- | 0 | 0 | - | -- | Unsustainable Location - development would be unacceptably harmful (and mitigation not deemed possible) |
| Combined | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | -- | 0 | 0 | - | -- | OVERALL CONCLUSION Unsustainable Location - development would be unacceptably harmful (and mitigation not deemed possible) |

Omission Site 2: Land to the south of Ringwood (lower site P)

| SA Site reference number | 2 Accessible opportunities, facilities and services | 3 Safe and Healthy environments | 4 A thriving Economy | 5 Protecting Biodiversity and wildlife | 6 Accessible Greenspace, coast and water bodies | 7 Protecting landscape and townscape | 8 Heritage | 9 Sustainable Natural Resources | 10 Managing Climate Change | Conclusion | Commentary |
|--------------------------|--|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|--|---|---------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------|---|
| R018a | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | Unsustainable Location - development would be unacceptably harmful (and mitigation not deemed possible) |
| R018b | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | - | - | Unsustainable Location - development would be unacceptably harmful (and mitigation not deemed possible) |
| Combined | - | + | 0 | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | OVERALL CONCLUSION Unsustainable Location - development would be unacceptably harmful (and mitigation not deemed possible) |

Omission Site 3: Land to the east and north of Ringwood Sewage Treatment Works

| SA Site reference number | 2 Accessible opportunities, facilities and services | 3 Safe and Healthy environments | 4 A thriving Economy | 5 Protecting Biodiversity and wildlife | 6 Accessible Greenspace, coast and water bodies | 7 Protecting landscape and townscape | 8 Heritage | 9 Sustainable Natural Resources | 10 Managing Climate Change | Conclusion | Commentary |
|--------------------------|---|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|---|---|---------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------|--|
| R014 | 0 | -- | 0 | -- | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | -- | Unsustainable Location - development would be unacceptably harmful (and mitigation not deemed possible) |
| R015 | 0 | -- | 0 | -- | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | -- | Unsustainable Location - development would be unacceptably harmful (and mitigation not deemed possible) |
| Combined | 0 | -- | 0 | -- | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | -- | OVERALL CONCLUSION Unsustainable Location - development would be unacceptably harmful (and mitigation not deemed possible) |

Omission Site 4: Land to the south east of Fordingbridge

| SA Site reference number | 2 Accessible opportunities, facilities and services | 3 Safe and Healthy environments | 4 A thriving Economy | 5 Protecting Biodiversity and wildlife | 6 Accessible Greenspace, coast and water bodies | 7 Protecting landscape and townscape | 8 Heritage | 9 Sustainable Natural Resources | 10 Managing Climate Change | Conclusion | Commentary |
|--------------------------|---|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|---|---|---------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------|---|
| F023 | + | + | 0 | - | 0 | -- | 0 | 0 | - | -- | Unsustainable Location - development would be unacceptably harmful (and mitigation not deemed possible) |
| F024 | | | | | | | | | | -- | Critical Failure – Majority of site is affected by Flood Zones 2&3 and significant areas of Surface Water Flood Risk. |
| F025 | | | | | | | | | | -- | Critical Failure – Significant parts of the site are affected by Surface Water Flood Risk and small areas within Flood Zone 2. |
| F026 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | -- | 0 | 0 | 0 | -- | Unsustainable Location - development would be unacceptably harmful (and mitigation not deemed possible) |
| F029 | + | + | 0 | - | 0 | -- | 0 | 0 | + | -- | Unsustainable Location - development would be unacceptably harmful (and mitigation not deemed possible) |
| F030 | + | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | -- | 0 | 0 | 0 | -- | Unsustainable Location - development would be unacceptably harmful (and mitigation not deemed possible) |
| F031 | + | + | 0 | - | 0 | -- | 0 | 0 | 0 | -- | Unsustainable Location - development would be unacceptably harmful (and mitigation not deemed possible) |
| Combined | + | + | 0 | - | 0 | -- | 0 | 0 | 0 | -- | OVERALL CONCLUSION Unsustainable Location - development would be unacceptably harmful (and mitigation not deemed possible) |

Omission Site 5: Land to the south west of Fordingbridge

| SA Site reference number | 2 Accessible opportunities, facilities and services | 3 Safe and Healthy environments | 4 A thriving Economy | 5 Protecting Biodiversity and wildlife | 6 Accessible Greenspace, coast and water bodies | 7 Protecting landscape and townscape | 8 Heritage | 9 Sustainable Natural Resources | 10 Managing Climate Change | Conclusion | Commentary |
|--------------------------|---|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|---|---|---------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------|---|
| F016 | | | | | | | | | | -- | Critical Failure – Site is within Flood Zones 2&3 |
| F017 | | | | | | | | | | -- | Critical Failure – Site is within Flood Zones 2&3 |
| F063 | + | + | 0 | -- | 0 | -- | 0 | 0 | 0 | -- | Unsustainable Location - development would be unacceptably harmful (and mitigation not deemed possible) |
| Combined | + | + | 0 | -- | 0 | -- | 0 | 0 | 0 | -- | OVERALL CONCLUSION Unsustainable Location - development would be unacceptably harmful (and mitigation not deemed possible) |

Omission Site 6 Land at Tinkers Cross, Fordingbridge

| SA Site reference number | 2 Accessible opportunities, facilities and services | 3 Safe and Healthy environments | 4 A thriving Economy | 5 Protecting Biodiversity and wildlife | 6 Accessible Greenspace, coast and water bodies | 7 Protecting landscape and townscape | 8 Heritage | 9 Sustainable Natural Resources | 10 Managing Climate Change | Conclusion | Commentary |
|--------------------------|---|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|---|---|---------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------|--|
| F050 | 0 | + | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | - | Unsustainable Location - development would be unacceptably harmful (and mitigation not deemed possible) |

Omission Site 7: Site D – North Lymington

| SA Site reference number | 2 Accessible opportunities, facilities and services | 3 Safe and Healthy environments | 4 A thriving Economy | 5 Protecting Biodiversity and wildlife | 6 Accessible Greenspace, coast and water bodies | 7 Protecting landscape and townscape | 8 Heritage | 9 Sustainable Natural Resources | 10 Managing Climate Change | Conclusion | Commentary |
|--------------------------|---|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|---|---|---------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------|--|
| L002 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | -- | 0 | 0 | 0 | -- | Unsustainable Location - development would be unacceptably harmful (and mitigation not deemed possible) |
| L004 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | -- | - | - | 0 | -- | Unsustainable Location - development would be unacceptably harmful (and mitigation not deemed possible) |
| L006a | + | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | -- | 0 | 0 | + | -- | Unsustainable Location - development would be unacceptably harmful (and mitigation not deemed possible) |
| L010 | + | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | -- | - | 0 | + | -- | Unsustainable Location - development would be unacceptably harmful (and mitigation not deemed possible) |
| L011 | + | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | -- | 0 | 0 | - | -- | Unsustainable Location - development would be unacceptably harmful (and mitigation not deemed possible) |
| L012 | + | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | -- | - | 0 | - | -- | Unsustainable Location - development would be unacceptably harmful (and mitigation not deemed possible) |
| L013 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | -- | 0 | 0 | - | -- | Unsustainable Location - development would be unacceptably harmful (and mitigation not deemed possible) |

| Combined | + | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | 0 | - | - | OVERALL CONCLUSION Unsustainable Location - development would be unacceptably harmful (and mitigation not deemed possible) |
|--------------------------|--|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|--|---|---------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------|---|
| SA Site reference number | 2 Accessible opportunities, facilities and services | 3 Safe and Healthy environments | 4 A thriving Economy | 5 Protecting Biodiversity and wildlife | 6 Accessible Greenspace, coast and water bodies | 7 Protecting landscape and townscape | 8 Heritage | 9 Sustainable Natural Resources | 10 Managing Climate Change | Conclusion | Commentary |

Omission Site 8: Northern extension to the eastern part of Site F– Milford on Sea (Initial Proposals 2016)

| SA Site reference number | 2 Accessible opportunities, facilities and services | 3 Safe and Healthy environments | 4 A thriving Economy | 5 Protecting Biodiversity and wildlife | 6 Accessible Greenspace, coast and water bodies | 7 Protecting landscape and townscape | 8 Heritage | 9 Sustainable Natural Resources | 10 Managing Climate Change | Conclusion | Commentary |
|--------------------------|---|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|---|---|---------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------|--|
| MS024 | - | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | - | - | OVERALL CONCLUSION Unsustainable Location - development would be unacceptably harmful (and mitigation not deemed possible). But incorporated in site SS7 as land for natural recreational greenspace and public open space |

Omission Site 9: Site G and Knighton Caravan Park – Everton

| SA Site reference number | 2 Accessible opportunities, facilities and services | 3 Safe and Healthy environments | 4 A thriving Economy | 5 Protecting Biodiversity and wildlife | 6 Accessible Greenspace, coast and water bodies | 7 Protecting landscape and townscape | 8 Heritage | 9 Sustainable Natural Resources | 10 Managing Climate Change | Conclusion | Commentary |
|--------------------------|---|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|---|---|---------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------|---|
| HE001b | - | + | 0 | - | + | -- | 0 | 0 | 0 | -- | Unsustainable Location - development would be unacceptably harmful (and mitigation not deemed possible) |
| HE002 | + | + | 0 | - | 0 | -- | 0 | - | 0 | -- | Unsustainable Location - development would be unacceptably harmful (and mitigation not deemed possible) |
| Combined | - | + | 0 | - | + | -- | 0 | - | 0 | -- | OVERALL CONCLUSION Unsustainable Location - development would be unacceptably harmful (and mitigation not deemed possible) |

Omission Site 10: Extension to North of Hordle

| SA Site reference number | 2 Accessible opportunities, facilities and services | 3 Safe and Healthy environments | 4 A thriving Economy | 5 Protecting Biodiversity and wildlife | 6 Accessible Greenspace, coast and water bodies | 7 Protecting landscape and townscape | 8 Heritage | 9 Sustainable Natural Resources | 10 Managing Climate Change | Conclusion | Commentary |
|--------------------------|---|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|---|---|---------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------|---|
| HE048 | 0 | + | 0 | - | 0 | -- | 0 | 0 | 0 | -- | Unsustainable Location - development would be unacceptably harmful (and mitigation not deemed possible) |
| HE049 | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | -- | 0 | - | 0 | -- | Unsustainable Location - development would be unacceptably harmful (and mitigation not deemed possible) |
| HE050 | + | + | - | 0 | 0 | -- | 0 | - | 0 | -- | Unsustainable Location - development would be unacceptably harmful (and mitigation not deemed possible) |
| Combined | - | + | 0 | - | 0 | -- | 0 | - | 0 | -- | OVERALL CONCLUSION Unsustainable Location - development would be unacceptably harmful (and mitigation not deemed possible) |

Omission Site 11 Site J North east of Hordle

| SA Site reference number | 2 Accessible opportunities, facilities and services | 3 Safe and Healthy environments | 4 A thriving Economy | 5 Protecting Biodiversity and wildlife | 6 Accessible Greenspace, coast and water bodies | 7 Protecting landscape and townscape | 8 Heritage | 9 Sustainable Natural Resources | 10 Managing Climate Change | Conclusion | Commentary |
|--------------------------|--|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|--|---|---------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------|---|
| HE031 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | -- | 0 | 0 | - | -- | Unsustainable Location - development would be unacceptably harmful (and mitigation not deemed possible) |
| HE044 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | -- | 0 | 0 | 0 | -- | Unsustainable Location - development would be unacceptably harmful (and mitigation not deemed possible) |
| Combined | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | -- | 0 | 0 | 0 | -- | OVERALL CONCLUSION Unsustainable Location - development would be unacceptably harmful (and mitigation not deemed possible) |

Omission Site 12: Site K – West of New Milton

| SA Site reference number | 2 Accessible opportunities, facilities and services | 3 Safe and Healthy environments | 4 A thriving Economy | 5 Protecting Biodiversity and wildlife | 6 Accessible Greenspace, coast and water bodies | 7 Protecting landscape and townscape | 8 Heritage | 9 Sustainable Natural Resources | 10 Managing Climate Change | Conclusion | Commentary |
|--------------------------|---|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|---|---|---------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------|---|
| NM039 | + | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | -- | 0 | - | 0 | - | Significant sustainability issues - in combination these appear to make the site unsuitable for housing |
| NM040 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | -- | 0 | - | 0 | -- | Unsustainable Location - development would be unacceptably harmful (and mitigation not deemed possible) |
| Combined | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | -- | 0 | - | 0 | -- | OVERALL CONCLUSION Unsustainable Location - development would be unacceptably harmful (and mitigation not deemed possible) |

Omission Site 13: Site M – South east of New Milton

| SA Site reference number | 2 Accessible opportunities, facilities and services | 3 Safe and Healthy environments | 4 A thriving Economy | 5 Protecting Biodiversity and wildlife | 6 Accessible Greenspace, coast and water bodies | 7 Protecting landscape and townscape | 8 Heritage | 9 Sustainable Natural Resources | 10 Managing Climate Change | Conclusion | Commentary |
|--------------------------|---|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|---|---|---------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------|---|
| NM013 | ++ | + | + | 0 | 0 | -- | 0 | 0 | + | - | Significant sustainability issues - in combination these appear to make the site unsuitable for housing |
| NM014 | ++ | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | -- | 0 | 0 | + | -- | Unsustainable Location - development would be unacceptably harmful (and mitigation not deemed possible) |
| Combined | ++ | + | + | 0 | 0 | -- | 0 | 0 | + | -- | OVERALL CONCLUSION Unsustainable Location - development would be unacceptably harmful (and mitigation not deemed possible) |

Omission Site 14: North west of Milford on Sea (Western part of Site F – Milford on Sea (Initial Proposals 2016) and promoted northern extension

| SA Site reference number | 2 Accessible opportunities, facilities and services | 3 Safe and Healthy environments | 4 A thriving Economy | 5 Protecting Biodiversity and wildlife | 6 Accessible Greenspace, coast and water bodies | 7 Protecting landscape and townscape | 8 Heritage | 9 Sustainable Natural Resources | 10 Managing Climate Change | Conclusion | Commentary |
|--------------------------|--|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|--|---|---------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------|---|
| MS025 | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | -- | 0 | 0 | - | -- | Unsustainable Location - development would be unacceptably harmful (and mitigation not deemed possible) |
| MS026 | - | - | 0 | - | 0 | -- | 0 | 0 | - | -- | Unsustainable Location - development would be unacceptably harmful (and mitigation not deemed possible) |
| MS027 | - | - | 0 | - | 0 | -- | 0 | 0 | - | -- | Unsustainable Location - development would be unacceptably harmful (and mitigation not deemed possible) |
| MS028 | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | -- | 0 | 0 | - | -- | Unsustainable Location - development would be unacceptably harmful (and mitigation not deemed possible) |
| Combined | - | - | 0 | - | 0 | -- | 0 | 0 | - | -- | OVERALL CONCLUSION Unsustainable Location - development would be unacceptably harmful (and mitigation not deemed possible) |

Omission Site 15: South of site K – New Milton

| SA Site reference number | 2 Accessible opportunities, facilities and services | 3 Safe and Healthy environments | 4 A thriving Economy | 5 Protecting Biodiversity and wildlife | 6 Accessible Greenspace, coast and water bodies | 7 Protecting landscape and townscape | 8 Heritage | 9 Sustainable Natural Resources | 10 Managing Climate Change | Conclusion | Commentary |
|--------------------------|---|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|---|---|---------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------|---|
| NM037 | + | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | -- | 0 | 0 | + | -- | Unsustainable Location - development would be unacceptably harmful (and mitigation not deemed possible) |
| NM038 | + | + | 0 | - | 0 | -- | 0 | 0 | 0 | -- | Unsustainable Location - development would be unacceptably harmful (and mitigation not deemed possible) |
| Combined | + | + | 0 | - | + | -- | 0 | 0 | + | -- | OVERALL CONCLUSION Unsustainable Location - development would be unacceptably harmful (and mitigation not deemed possible) |

Omission Site 16: East of Milford on Sea

| SA Site reference number | 2 Accessible opportunities, facilities and services | 3 Safe and Healthy environments | 4 A thriving Economy | 5 Protecting Biodiversity and wildlife | 6 Accessible Greenspace, coast and water bodies | 7 Protecting landscape and townscape | 8 Heritage | 9 Sustainable Natural Resources | 10 Managing Climate Change | Conclusion | Commentary |
|--------------------------|---|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|---|---|---------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------|---|
| MS008 | 0 | + | 0 | - | 0 | -- | 0 | 0 | - | -- | Unsustainable Location - development would be unacceptably harmful (and mitigation not deemed possible) |
| MS010 | + | + | 0 | - | 0 | -- | 0 | 0 | - | -- | Unsustainable Location - development would be unacceptably harmful (and mitigation not deemed possible) |
| MS011 | ++ | + | 0 | - | 0 | -- | 0 | 0 | + | -- | Unsustainable Location - development would be unacceptably harmful (and mitigation not deemed possible) |
| MS015 | + | + | 0 | - | 0 | -- | 0 | 0 | 0 | -- | Unsustainable Location - development would be unacceptably harmful (and mitigation not deemed possible) |
| MS049 | + | + | 0 | + | ++ | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | ++ | Highly Sustainable Location. Allocated site in Part 2 of the local plan. |
| Combined | + | + | 0 | - | 0 | -- | 0 | 0 | - | -- | OVERALL CONCLUSION Unsustainable Location - development would be unacceptably harmful (and mitigation not deemed possible) |

Omission Site 17: North of Totton

| SA Site reference number | 2 Accessible opportunities, facilities and services | 3 Safe and Healthy environments | 4 A thriving Economy | 5 Protecting Biodiversity and wildlife | 6 Accessible Greenspace, coast and water bodies | 7 Protecting landscape and townscape | 8 Heritage | 9 Sustainable Natural Resources | 10 Managing Climate Change | Conclusion | Commentary |
|--------------------------|---|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|---|---|---------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------|--|
| T007 | - | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | -- | Unsustainable Location - development would be unacceptably harmful (and mitigation not deemed possible) |
| T008 | | | | | | | | | | | Critical Failure – Site in Flood Zone 3. |
| T009 | - | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | - | -- | Unsustainable Location - development would be unacceptably harmful (and mitigation not deemed possible) |
| T010 | - | 0 | 0 | - | + | -- | - | 0 | - | -- | Unsustainable Location - development would be unacceptably harmful (and mitigation not deemed possible) |
| T012 | 0 | -- | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | -- | Unsustainable Location - development would be unacceptably harmful (and mitigation not deemed possible) |
| T013 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | - | Significant sustainability issues - in combination these appear to make the site unsuitable for housing |
| Combined | - | - | 0 | - | 0 | -- | - | - | - | -- | OVERALL CONCLUSION Unsustainable Location - development would be unacceptably harmful (and mitigation not deemed possible) |

Omission Site 18: South of Totton

| SA Site reference number | 2 Accessible opportunities, facilities and services | 3 Safe and Healthy environments | 4 A thriving Economy | 5 Protecting Biodiversity and wildlife | 6 Accessible Greenspace, coast and water bodies | 7 Protecting landscape and townscape | 8 Heritage | 9 Sustainable Natural Resources | 10 Managing Climate Change | Conclusion | Commentary |
|--------------------------|---|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|---|---|---------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------|---|
| T036 | - | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | -- | 0 | 0 | + | - | Significant sustainability issues - in combination these appear to make the site unsuitable for housing |
| M001 | - | - | 0 | - | 0 | -- | 0 | 0 | + | - | Significant sustainability issues - in combination these appear to make the site unsuitable for housing |
| M002a | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | - | 0 | 0 | -- | Unsustainable Location - development would be unacceptably harmful (and mitigation not deemed possible) |
| M002b | + | - | 0 | - | 0 | -- | - | 0 | 0 | -- | Unsustainable Location - development would be unacceptably harmful (and mitigation not deemed possible) |
| Combined | - | - | 0 | - | 0 | -- | - | 0 | - | -- | OVERALL CONCLUSION Unsustainable Location - development would be unacceptably harmful (and mitigation not deemed possible) |

Omission Site 19: North of Hythe

| SA Site reference number | 2 Accessible opportunities, facilities and services | 3 Safe and Healthy environments | 4 A thriving Economy | 5 Protecting Biodiversity and wildlife | 6 Accessible Greenspace, coast and water bodies | 7 Protecting landscape and townscape | 8 Heritage | 9 Sustainable Natural Resources | 10 Managing Climate Change | Conclusion | Commentary |
|--------------------------|---|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|---|---|---------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------|---|
| H014a | + | + | 0 | - | 0 | -- | 0 | 0 | + | - | Significant sustainability issues - in combination these appear to make the site unsuitable for housing |
| H014b | 0 | + | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Acceptable location with no major issues, but site on its own is not large enough to be a strategic allocation. |
| Combined | + | + | 0 | - | 0 | -- | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | OVERALL CONCLUSION Significant sustainability issues on site H014a - make the site unsuitable for housing and H014b is not large enough on its own to be a strategic site. |

Appendix 7

Equalities Impact Assessment

Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA) is a rigorous and systematic tool for checking that policies/projects/practices and services take into account the needs of those groups identified in law as being at risk of discrimination (otherwise known as protected characteristics). This covers both our service users and our employees. It is important to note that EIAs should be done in a way that is both effective and proportionate to the size and structure of the organisation.

It is also important to note that EqIAs are not simply about removing potentially negative impacts, they are also an opportunity to identify ways to promote equality of opportunity and ensure greater access to public services. EqIAs are about considering any negative or adverse impacts that can be removed or mitigated where possible. However, any negative or adverse impacts that amount to unlawful discrimination, must be removed. In brief EqIAs provide a system of quality assurance and an opportunity to:

1. Eliminate discrimination
2. Tackle inequality
3. Improve access and remove any barriers to opportunities
4. Develop a better understanding of the community we serve by consulting our customers
5. Target resources efficiently
6. Adhere to the transparency and accountability element of the Public Sector Equality Duty
7. Consider the people who are not using our services and the possible reasons for this.
8. Provide evidence that we are advancing equality of opportunity

PROTECTED GROUPS

The protected groups as defined by the Equality Act 2010 are:

| Protected groups | Summary |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| Age | Where this is referred to, it refers to a person belonging to a particular age or range of ages (e.g. 18 - 30 year olds). |
| Disability | A person has a disability if s/he has a physical or mental impairment which has a substantial and long-term adverse effect on that person's ability to carry out normal day-to-day activities. |
| Gender Reassignment: | The process of transitioning from one gender to another. |
| Marriage and civil partnership | Marriage is defined as a 'union between a man and a woman'. Same-sex couples can have their relationships legally recognised as 'civil partnerships'. Civil partners must be treated the same as married couples on a wide range of legal matters. |
| Pregnancy and maternity | Pregnancy is the condition of being pregnant or expecting a baby. Maternity refers to the period after the birth, and is linked to maternity leave in the employment context. In the non-work context, protection against maternity discrimination is for 26 weeks after giving birth, and this includes treating a woman unfavourably because she is breastfeeding. |
| Race | This refers to a group of people defined by their race, colour, and nationality (including citizenship) ethnic or national origins. |
| Religion and belief | Religion has the meaning usually given to it but belief includes religious and philosophical beliefs including lack of belief (e.g. Atheism). Generally, a belief should affect your life choices or the way you live for it to be included in the definition. |
| Gender | A man or a woman |
| Sexual orientation | Whether a person's sexual attraction is towards their own sex, the opposite sex or to both sexes. |

1. What is the overall purpose and aim of this strategy/plan?

The New Forest Local Plan Review 2016-2036 (Part One) will:

- set out policies for the use, development or protection of land and buildings looking ahead at least fifteen years;
- identify how much new housing and commercial development is needed, where, and how it will be delivered;
- set out development management policies to update those already adopted in Part Two.

The New Forest Local Plan Review Plan Part One provides a policy framework for the delivery of sustainable development across the District which will form a transparent basis for planning decisions. It will help to support local residents, local community organisations, town and parishes, councillors and developers to understand the policies that development management officers will use to determine applications. By applying a consistent framework to all development the aim is to benefit communities and businesses on a balanced basis.

The implementation of the Local Plan will be monitored by the council on a regular basis to assess the extent to which they are being implemented as intended, and whether objectives are being achieved. Public consultation has informed the Local Plan at a number of stages in the process and communities have had opportunities to influence and shape the content of the plan.

This Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA) covers the detailed policies and additional site allocations proposed in the Local Plan Review Part One.

2. What are the main aspects of the strategy/plan where consideration of equality impacts and issues need to be incorporated?

Consider the various elements of your policy/practice/proposal or service where equality issues are likely to be apparent, i.e. which of the processes significantly impact on people; access, understanding, financial impact, etc. It may help to ask your customers, or those the policy/practice/proposal or service affects to answer this question.

3. Relevance Assessment - which group(s) of people (if any), do we think will, or potentially can be, affected by this strategy/plan?

The “Relevance Assessment” requires us to consider the 9 protected groups and decide whether our policy/practice/proposal may have an impact on these groups. Where it is concluded that the impact is none or low this should be recorded and we must give our reasons why we have made this assessment.

IMPACT LEVELS

The following key has been used to score the Local Plan policies:

| | | |
|---------------|-----------|--|
| No Impact | 0 | This indicates that the strategy/plan is likely to have little or no discernible impact on the community as a whole |
| Unknown | ?i | Unknown impact in relation to the community as a whole, or depends on implementation |
| Low Impact | + / - | Similar to no impact, but requires some thought to be given. The issues are clear and the impact is likely to be minimal. However, it may be worth seeking advice before making this judgement. The policy may be positively beneficial or negative for particular groups. |
| Medium Impact | ++ / -- | Negative or positive outcome for these specific groups in relation to the community as a whole, for example meeting their needs. The issues are clear and actions are required e.g. to gather more information or to take specific steps to ensure that some groups will not be unfairly discriminated against or disadvantaged. |
| High Impact | +++ / --- | This applies usually to significant changes in policies and processes. The issues will be clear and the actions to address them need to be specific, time limited and verifiable. |

Detailed Analysis

| Policy | | Age | Gender | Disability | Race | Religion & Belief | Sexual Orientation | Marriage/Civil Partnership | Gender reassignment | Maternity | Summary of effect |
|--------|---|-----|--------|------------|------|-------------------|--------------------|----------------------------|---------------------|-----------|--|
| STR1 | Achieving sustainable development | + | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | This policy seeks to ensure that development is adaptable for occupiers (helping those that require specific housing requirements e.g. due to impaired mobility) and that necessary services and infrastructure are provided for all stages of life. |
| STR2 | Protection of the countryside, AONB and setting of New Forest NP | 0 | 0 | ?i | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Local implementation of schemes to mitigate recreational impacts of development on internationally protected sites could lead to physical restrictions on certain routes or areas, but this will depend on the design of the scheme(s) and could be appropriately mitigated. |
| STR3 | The strategy for locating new development | + | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | The policy seeks to locate development in accessible locations which will assist those who experience reduced mobility. |
| STR4 | The settlement hierarchy | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | No effect on any protected group |
| STR5 | Meeting housing needs | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | No effect on any protected group |
| STR6 | Sustainable economic growth | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | No effect on any protected group |
| STR7 | Strategic transport proposals | + | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | This policy seeks to improve accessibility and improve road safety – these have positive impacts especially on vulnerable age groups and those with reduced mobility. |
| STR8 | Community services and infrastructure development | + | 0 | ++ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | This policy seeks to improve accessibility to facilities and community services – this will have positive impacts especially on vulnerable age groups and those with disability impairments. |
| STR9 | Development on land within a Minerals Safeguarding Area or Minerals Consultation Area | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | No effect on any protected group |
| DM2 | Nature conservation, biodiversity and geodiversity | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | No effect on any protected group |
| ENV1 | Mitigating the impact of development on International Habitats | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | No effect on any protected group |
| DM1 | Heritage and conservation | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | No effect on any protected group |
| ENV2 | The South West Hampshire Green Belt | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | No effect on any protected group |
| ENV3 | Design quality and local distinctiveness | + | 0 | ++ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | The policy requires development to create spaces that are accessible to those with disabilities or reduced mobility – which has positive impacts in particular for older groups and those with reduced mobility. |
| ENV4 | Landscape character and quality | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | No effect on any protected group |
| CS7 | Open Space, sport and recreation | + | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | This policy requires all new residential developments to make provision for appropriately designed public open space, either through on site provision of new open space or by financial contribution to enhance or create off-site provision and management of public open space. This benefits all age groups through better access to open spaces and active recreation sites, and through modern design standards also provides good access for those with reduced mobility. |
| HOU1 | Housing type, size and choice | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | This requires a diversity of housing types, and a range of types for all stages of life. |
| HOU2 | Affordable housing | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | No effect on any protected group |
| HOU3 | Residential Accommodation for older people | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Positive impacts on age, in particular the provision of residential dwellings for older people – this also scores positively for those who have developed reduced mobility / other impairments due to age. |

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------|---|----|---|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| HOU4 | Gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople | + | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Policy will help families from cultures where it is important to live in close proximity to family members. |
| HOU5 | Rural housing Exception Sites and Community Led Housing Schemes | + | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | This policy includes provision for self-build homes - this is particularly helpful to those with special design needs due to disability or age |
| ECON1 | Employment land and development | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | No effect on any protected group |
| ECON2 | Retention of employment sites and consideration of alternative uses | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | No effect on any protected group |
| ECON3 | Marchwood Port | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | No effect on any protected group |
| ECON4 | Port development at Dibden Bay | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | No effect on any protected group |
| ECON5 | Retail development and other main town centre uses | + | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | The policy directs town centre uses to defined areas within the district settlements – this will protect accessibility in particular for those who have reduced mobility. |
| ECON6 | Primary, secondary and local shopping frontages | + | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | This policy seeks to ensure that services remain conveniently accessible to surrounding residential areas, which better serves the older and less mobile groups in the community. |
| CS19 | Tourism | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | No effect on any protected group |
| CS21 | Rural economy | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | No effect on any protected group |
| CCC1 | Safe and healthy communities | ++ | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | The policy safeguards public safety, and in particular those of those at higher risk from the hazards set out in the policy (e.g. the elderly and less mobile). |
| DM6 | Coastal change management areas | + | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | The policy safeguards public safety, and in particular those of those at higher risk from the erosion hazard set out in the policy (e.g. the elderly and less mobile). |
| CCC1 | Safe and sustainable travel | + | | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | The policy promotes the provision of safe access and improved mobility – and will therefore benefit the elderly, those with reduced mobile and young families. |
| DM26 | Development generating significant freight movement | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | No effect on any protected group |
| DM4 | Renewable and low carbon energy generation | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | No effect on any protected group |
| IMPL1 | Developer contributions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | No effect on any protected group |
| IMPL2 | Development standards | + | 0 | ++ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | This policy will ensure that more houses are built to a standard which provides suitable homes for those with physical disabilities and older people. |
| SS1 | North of Totton | + | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Provision of community and commercial hub will provide positive effects on those who require facilities local to them, including those with reduced mobility. |
| SS2 | West of Marchwood | + | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Provision of community and commercial hub will provide positive effects on those who require facilities local to them, including those with reduced mobility. |
| SS3 | North of Marchwood (Cork's Farm) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| SS4 | The former Fawley Power Station | + | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Village-scale community provision will service the needs of a range of ages and mobility levels. |
| SS5 | South-west of Lymington | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | No effect on any protected group |
| SS6 | South of Lymington | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | No effect on any protected group |
| SS7 | North-east of Milford-on-Sea | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | No effect on any protected group |
| SS8 | Central Hordle | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | No effect on any protected group |
| SS9 | North Hordle | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | No effect on any protected group |
| SS10 | North-east New Milton | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | No effect on any protected group |
| SS11 | South-west New Milton | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | No effect on any protected group |
| SS12 | West of Bransgore | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | No effect on any protected group |
| SS13 | South of Ringwood | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | No effect on any protected group |
| SS14 | East of Ringwood | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | No effect on any protected group |
| SS15 | North of Ringwood | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | No effect on any protected group |
| SS16 | East of Ashford | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | No effect on any protected group |
| SS17 | North-west of Fordingbridge | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | No effect on any protected group |
| SS18 | North of Fordingbridge (Burgate) | + | | + | | | | | | | village core / community hub will service a range of ages & mobility levels. |

APPENDIX 8**Comments received in relation to previous consultations on the Local Plan & Sustainability Appraisal**

The Local Plan review has been informed by a range of formal and informal consultation and engagement with the public, statutory bodies and regulatory agencies, development interests, infrastructure and service providers and other interested parties.

Table A8.1: Preliminary consultation with infrastructure providers (2016) – prior to the Initial Proposals consultation

Following preliminary site assessment as part of the SA, meetings and ongoing correspondence took place with infrastructure providers to identify possible critical infrastructure constraints around main settlements to inform preparation of the consultation proposals. This included correspondence with the following organisations and on the following issues:

| Infrastructure provider(s) | Issues | Council response |
|---|---|---|
| Water utility companies | Water supply and waste water treatment | Engagement and consultation with infrastructure providers has informed the preparation of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan which sets out the infrastructure needs of each strategic site in order to effectively mitigate the impacts of development on infrastructure and services. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan should be read in conjunction with the strategic sites policies. Further work will be undertaken by site promoters in cooperation with Wessex Water to effectively address issues of sewage treatment and capacity in Bransgore, Ringwood and Fordingbridge |
| Environment Agency / Hampshire County Council (HCC) | Capacity constraints or deficiencies in surface and/or ground water drainage | The Council has engaged with water companies to identify if and where there are issues. Developments will be required to address any issues as part of the planning application and development process. |
| Electricity utility companies | Overall electricity capacity, and new connection issues | This is a mandatory requirement of any new development. |
| Gas utility companies | Existence of mains gas connections in each area | This is a mandatory requirement of any new development. |
| Telecommunication firms | Whether potential sites were likely to have mobile coverage to the latest speeds, and access to fibre optic enabled connections | Policy 35: Development standards seeks to ensure that new development ensures provision of a high speed fibre broadband connection to the property threshold. BT Openreach has also made a commitment to provide fibre broadband for free to developments of 100+ dwellings so all proposed strategic sites will be appropriately connected. |
| HCC | Likely sufficiency of primary and secondary school places | The Council is working with Hampshire County Council to establish the building feasibility of expanding existing schools. A land reserve is provided for a new school, if demonstrated to |

| Infrastructure provider(s) | Issues | Council response |
|---|---|---|
| | | required, at Strategic Site 1 North of Totton, Strategic Site 2 West of Marchwood, and Strategic Site 13 South of Ringwood. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan should be read in conjunction with the strategic sites policies. |
| Highways England / HCC Highways | Highway capacity to meet likely demand from proposed housing, taking into account committed investment | Engagement and consultation with infrastructure providers has informed the preparation of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan which sets out the infrastructure needs of each strategic site in order to effectively mitigate the impacts of development on community infrastructure and services. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan should be read in conjunction with the strategic sites policies. |
| Public transport bodies | Capacity on existing bus routes to meet likely demand from proposed housing, taking into account committed investment | |
| NHS West Hampshire Clinical Commissioning Group | Hospital, surgery and dentist capacity to meet likely demand from proposed housing, and other healthcare needs likely to be necessary | |

Table A8.2: Public Consultation (Initial Proposals 2016)- Representations on proposed strategic sites, by site

| Proposed strategic site | Representations | Object | Support | Comments | Council response |
|--|-----------------|------------|------------|------------|---|
| Totton and the Waterside sub area | 100 | 32% | 15% | 50% | |
| A. North of Totton | 50 | 18% | 40% | 42% | Strategic site allocation policy addresses the key issues (Policy Strategic Site 1) |
| B. West of Marchwood | 20 | 25% | 10% | 65% | Strategic site allocation policy addresses the key issues (Policy Strategic Site 2) |
| C. North of Marchwood | 23 | 26% | 9% | 65% | Strategic site allocation policy addresses the key issues (Policy Strategic Site 3) |
| U. Fawley Power Station (mixed use) | 7 | 57% | 0% | 29% | Strategic site allocation policy addresses the key issues (Policy Strategic Site 4) |
| South Coastal Towns sub area | 1289 | 86% | 5% | 9% | |
| D. North of Lymington | 29 | 48% | 7% | 45% | Site deleted from Local Plan (Strong Green Belt) |
| E. South West of Lymington | 19 | 16% | 21% | 63% | Strategic site allocation policy addresses the key issues (Policy Strategic Site 5) |
| F. North of Milford on Sea | 168 | 92% | 2% | 6% | Western half of the site deleted from the Local Plan (Relatively Strong Green Belt) Eastern half of the site remains as a proposed strategic site allocation, for which Strategic site allocation policy addresses the key issues raised (Policy Strategic Site 7) |
| G. North East of Everton | 356 | 95% | 1% | 4% | Site deleted from Local Plan (Relatively Strong Green Belt) |

| | | | | | |
|--|--------------|------------|-----------|------------|--|
| H. Central Hordle | 226 | 86% | 7% | 7% | Strategic site allocation policy addresses the key issues (Policy Strategic Site 8) |
| I. North Hordle | 218 | 83% | 9% | 8% | Strategic site allocation policy addresses the key issues (Policy Strategic Site 9) |
| J. North East of Hordle | 237 | 90% | 3% | 7% | Site deleted from Local Plan (Relatively Strong Green Belt) |
| K. North West of New Milton | 10 | 40% | 10% | 50% | Site deleted from Local Plan (Relatively Strong / Strong Green Belt) |
| L. North East of New Milton | 12 | 25% | 8% | 67% | Strategic site allocation policy addresses the key issues (Policy Strategic Site 10) |
| M. South East of New Milton | 8 | 38% | 13% | 50% | Site deleted from Local Plan (Strong Green Belt) |
| N. South West of New Milton | 6 | 33% | 50% | 17% | Strategic site allocation policy addresses the key issues (Policy Strategic Site 11) |
| Avon Valley and Downlands sub area | 508 | 78% | 3% | 19% | |
| O. West of Bransgore | 149 | 89% | 1% | 9% | Strategic site allocation policy addresses the key issues (Policy Strategic Site 12) |
| P. South of Ringwood | 130 | 81% | 2% | 17% | Strategic site allocation policy addresses the key issues (Policy Strategic Site 13) |
| Q. East of Ringwood | 80 | 80% | 4% | 16% | Strategic site allocation policy addresses the key issues (Policy Strategic Site 14) |
| R. North of Ringwood | 45 | 69% | 4% | 27% | Strategic site allocation policy addresses the key issues (Policy Strategic Site 15) |
| S. North West of Fordingbridge | 39 | 41% | 10% | 49% | Strategic site allocation policy addresses the key issues (Policy Strategic Site 17) |
| T. East of Ashford | 65 | 82% | 0% | 19% | Strategic site allocation policy addresses the key issues (Policy Strategic Site 16) |
| Total representations on strategic sites: | 1,900 | 81% | 5% | 14% | |

Table A8.3: Public Consultation (Initial Proposals 2016) - Responses by policy area

| Topic | Council response |
|---|---|
| Transport | |
| <p>1.1 The responses submitted under each policy area are summarised briefly in this section. Many of the issues commented on by members of the public were very similar for each site and therefore comments have been summarised under broad topic areas, rather than identifying issues for each individual site. For more detail of the main issues raised by specific consultation bodies and other significant consultees. For details of alternative site proposals put forward by consultation respondents.</p> | <p>The Strategic Transport Network Assessment (2016) demonstrated that the cumulative impacts of the planned housing growth set out within Policy 5: Meeting Our Housing Needs, are not severe and the transport impacts of planned development can be accommodated satisfactorily. Planned growth will place increased pressure on the road network at certain locations, but these impacts can be adequately addressed by specific local measures that are capable of being funded by development contributions or provided as part of site developments.</p> <p>The Local Plan includes a policy (Policy 31: Safe and Sustainable Travel) which sets how new development is accessed including parking and servicing arrangements, and how the development is connected to the road network, public transport services, footpaths and cycle ways.</p> <p>The Strategic Site Allocation Policies address transport and road network considerations relevant to each site, and set out site specific requirements for sustainable transport measures identified to be necessary to support the proposed development.</p> |
| <p>1.2 The issue of transport was raised in more representations than any other area of planning policy (62.2% of total responses). Comments on transport issues were concerned predominantly with the traffic impacts of new development at the proposed strategic sites, both on the Strategic Road Network (M27, M271 and A31) and on local roads in the vicinity of the proposed strategic sites. A significant proportion of responses from members of the public referred to transport issues as the basis of objections to one or more proposed sites.</p> | |
| <p>1.3 The objections covered the following areas of concern:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The existing volume of traffic using the roads around the strategic sites is already too high • Existing transport networks need to be improved in order for the sites to accommodate the number of new homes proposed • How to ensure safe vehicle access to the sites, taking into account the width/capacity of existing roads • How to ensure the safety of pedestrians and cyclists is not reduced by additional local traffic • Potential worsening of peak-time traffic congestion • Lack of public transport • Risk of increased accidents, noise and air pollution from traffic volume increases on local and surrounding roads • Increased pressure on parking in villages, with potential adverse impacts for local summer tourism at sites near the coast, e.g. Milford on Sea (this was also highlighted as being an adverse impact for the local economy). | |
| <p>1.4 A number of individuals commenting felt that developers of the proposed strategic sites should make financial contributions towards transport infrastructure to mitigate the adverse transport</p> | |

| Topic | Council response |
|---|--|
| <p>impacts of developments, but concerns were also raised that the cost of building new roads may be prohibitively expensive for smaller sites.</p> <p>1.5 Some respondents suggested that financial contributions could also help to improve the existing highway network in the areas around the proposed strategic sites, for example by providing improved access points, turning points and pedestrian crossings.</p> <p>1.6 A number of statutory consultees were also concerned about the transport impact of housing development on the proposed strategic sites. The Highways Agency commented that detailed assessments of sites B and C (North and West of Marchwood), P (South of Ringwood), Q (East of Ringwood) and R (North of Ringwood) would be required to assess the cumulative impact on the Strategic Highway Network.</p> <p>1.7 Southampton City Council noted that the proposals for Totton and the Waterside sub area presented opportunities to link the New Forest Waterside and Totton with Southampton City Centre by rail using existing rail infrastructure. Their representation added that additional housing would also need to link to and enhance existing public transport and cycle routes.</p> | |
| Community Infrastructure and facilities | |
| <p>1.8 Many of the objections from members of the public to one or more proposed strategic sites also focussed on availability of community infrastructure. In nearly half of the total representations to the consultation, lack of existing community facilities in the immediate area of a proposed site was mentioned. Pressure on existing schools and doctors' surgeries was observed, particularly where such facilities could not easily expand to accommodate a larger catchment population. Some respondents suggested that the pressure on medical and health facilities could potentially become even more acute following an increase in older age residents moving to new properties within these facilities' catchment areas.</p> <p>1.9 Hampshire County Council's representation included estimates of the number of additional Early Years Education places that would be required based on the number of homes proposed for each site, as well as areas where there was place pressure and scope for school expansion. The County Council commented that expansion of existing schools would be limited by site and building constraints and schools' financial budgets. Consolidating the provision of new housing development into larger sites could therefore provide better opportunities to create additional school places close to areas of proposed housing development.</p> <p>1.10 Some schools supported future development at the proposed strategic sites. Burgate School and Sixth Form, for example, submitted a representation in support of sites S (North West of Fordingbridge) and T (East of Ashford). This identified opportunities for the school to expand to</p> | <p>The Council has engaged extensively with infrastructure providers throughout the Local Plan review process in order to understand their needs with regards capacity of schools, surgeries and other community infrastructure and facilities. This engagement and consultation has informed the preparation of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan which sets out the infrastructure needs of each strategic site in order to effectively mitigate the impacts of development on community infrastructure and services. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan should be read in conjunction with the strategic sites policies.</p> <p>The Council is also working with Hampshire Council to establish the building feasibility of expanding existing schools. A land reserve is provided for a new school, if demonstrated to required, at Strategic Site 1 North of Totton, Strategic Site 2 West of Marchwood, and Strategic Site 13 South of Ringwood</p> |

| Topic | Council response |
|--|---|
| <p>accommodate the projected pupil increase and to build new school facilities.</p> <p>1.11 Sport England’s representation concentrated on the need to ensure good design and layout of developments to improve accessibility and amenity. It also emphasised that the Council should update its sporting evidence base, in particular its Playing Pitch Strategy, which was adopted in 2007, to ensure a robust evidence base that is in line with the NPPF.</p> <p>1.12 Sports England noted that the strategic sites section of the consultation document did not consider provision of indoor sports facilities. It recommended that consideration of additional demand for sports provision generated by new development should identify not only open space, but also both outdoor and indoor sports facilities. They also made reference to guidance and studies that they had published which would assist in updating the evidence base in these policy areas.</p> | <p>Furthermore, the Local Plan sets out a policy (Policy 8) which will support appropriate proposals for community services, infrastructure and facilities, and how the Council will continue to work with infrastructure providers</p> |
| Environment | |
| <p>1.13 This policy area covered all ecology issues including protected areas and wildlife species and habitats. The majority of representations from members of the public on the environment were in relation to a proposed strategic site and centred around the potential loss of wildlife or habitat, as well as the associated impact on protected areas (e.g. SSSIs) and on the rural landscape (which overlapped with the landscape policy area).</p> <p>1.14 A standard response form was submitted by approximately 150 local residents in objection to Site G: North East of Everton, based partly on the potential threat to wildlife. It was highlighted in other responses that development of Site G would reduce the distance between woodlands and existing housing. Also mentioned were the potential loss of trees and impact of increased recreational use of woodland and forest commons to the north west of the National Park, which one respondent (Woodgreen Parish Council) stated that SANGS would be unable to effectively mitigate.</p> <p>1.15 The Environment Agency submitted comments on each of the proposed strategic sites in relation to fauna and flora species and habitats present at watercourses close to the sites. Their representations advised that the Local Plan Review should cover water quality for the entire district, including protection of shallow groundwater sources against contamination from new development proposed nearby. It emphasised the need to ensure groundwater protection, particularly as most of the proposed strategic sites are located on a secondary aquifer; and it also highlighted the importance of being able to demonstrate evidence of adequate infrastructure capacity of sewage treatment works to be able to accommodate additional development.</p> | <p>The Local Plan includes Policies 9 and 10 which specifically explain how the natural environment will be protected, how biodiversity will be protected and enhanced, and how the effects of development on International Nature Conservation Designation sites will be mitigated appropriately and effectively.</p> <p>The Strategic Site Allocation Policies address the environmental issues relevant to each site, and set out site specific requirements for mitigation and enhancement where appropriate.</p> |

| Topic | Council response |
|--|---|
| <p>1.16 Natural England submitted comments on the principle of improving and enhancing connectivity of sites for wildlife, protecting areas from adverse air quality impacts, protecting biodiversity and safeguarding 'best and most versatile' (BMV) agricultural land. Their representation suggested that the Local Plan Review should take a strategic approach to the environment, taking advantage of opportunities to enhance and improve the connectivity of biodiversity networks. They also stated that Local Plan policies should take account of the recommendations for mitigation likely to be proposed in the updated South Hampshire Integrated Water Management Strategy.</p> <p>1.17 Hampshire and Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust also provided comments relating to potential biodiversity impacts of the proposed release of sites outside the urban area. Their representation emphasised that any land release and mitigation should be carefully considered and supported by robust ecological information. A number of parish and town councils also voiced concern over the loss of wildlife habitat or agricultural land that could potentially result from development of the proposed sites.</p> | |
| Green Belt | |
| <p>1.18 The majority of respondents who commented on the Green Belt felt that it should not be released for development. The reasons for this varied from potential impact on wildlife species, habitats and ecological networks, loss of farmland and grazing land, to the potential impact on rural landscape character and local identity caused by settlement expansion.</p> <p>1.19 Some respondents felt that the Council should actively prioritise development of brownfield sites ahead of Greenfield sites. It was put forward that many of the proposed strategic sites performed strongly or moderately as Green Belt sites and therefore should not be considered for development on that basis. Some respondents felt that amending the Green Belt boundary to accommodate new development would be contrary to the NPPF (paragraphs 79, 80 and 83) as it would go against the five purposes that the Green Belt serves and that there were no 'exceptional circumstances' to justify its release.</p> <p>1.20 A number of respondents were also concerned about any narrowing of the gap between settlements currently provided by the Green Belt and felt that releasing this land for development would set an adverse precedent for other sites within the Green Belt to be developed in future.</p> <p>1.21 Two neighbouring local authorities (Christchurch and East Dorset Borough Councils and New Forest National Park Authority) (NFNPA) commented that they felt the release of Green Belt was necessary to address the housing shortage. NFNPA pointedly supported the decision to undertake a review of the Green Belt to avoid site promoters making a case for release of</p> | <p>The Local Plan recognises the importance of the Green Belt and sets out a policy (Policy 12) which explains how the Green Belt will continue to be protected.</p> <p>However, the Local Plan also recognises that in order to provide the necessary housing, some carefully selected weaker Green Belt land in sustainable locations will need to be released. The Council commissioned an independent study of the Green Belt (undertaken by Land Use Consultants, 2016) which assessed the extent to which land in the Green Belt still serves its main purposes to preserve open countryside and prevent urban sprawl, taking into account development since the Green Belt was originally established</p> <p>The Local Plan proposes the release of some weak to moderate Green Belt for residential development but balances this by continuing to protect relatively Strong and Strong Green Belt in accordance with the policies of the National Planning Policy Framework.</p> |

| Topic | Council response |
|--|---|
| <p>smaller parcels of land on a site-by-site basis. However it stated that the Council should reconsider whether release of strongly performing Green Belt land would be justifiable and quoted examples of other Local Plans where the Government had accepted a lower housing target due to constraints identified by the NPPF.</p> <p>1.22 Other respondents were in support of developing specific sites in the Green Belt for non-residential uses where residential use was inappropriate, for example Otter Nurseries or New Milton potential employment Site X.</p> <p>1.23 Respondents in support of development of strategic sites argued that weaker-performing Green Belt land could be sustainably released and provide opportunities for well-designed SANGs as mitigation for loss of habitat. These sites could also provide extensions to public rights of way.</p> <p>1.24 Some landowners or agents commented on the size of the proposed strategic sites and suggested that smaller sites on the edge of settlements could also be developed without undermining the Green Belt's purposes. Some of these sites were extensions to the proposed strategic sites and it was suggested that footpaths, cycle links and wildlife corridors could be built in to improve accessibility between the proposed strategic sites and these extended areas.</p> | |
| Flooding, safety and climate change | |
| <p>1.25 Many responses from members of the public were objecting to the proposed sites on grounds of localised flooding and additional flood risk, which they felt that further development would exacerbate, in particular on Sites F (North of Milford on Sea), G (North East of Everton) and O (West of Bransgore). Sites I (North of Hordle) and J (North East of Hordle) were also highlighted within the representations as experiencing localised flooding.</p> <p>1.26 A large number of respondents, including Bransgore Parish Council, indicated the increased risk of homes being contaminated as a result of the limited capacity of pumping stations to deal with the likely increase in wastewater as the result of further development in these areas, particularly during periods of heavy rainfall.</p> <p>1.27 Natural England stated in its representation that green infrastructure and ecological networks should be covered by the Local Plan Review, as they provide significant opportunities for climate change adaptation, including flood risk management, as well as opportunities to enhance wildlife habitat (see comments under 'Environment')</p> <p>1.28 The Environment Agency emphasised the importance of ensuring that development does not increase the risk of flooding from all sources. They highlighted existing flood risk at Site S (North West of Fordingbridge) from the main river, which they stated is liable to increase further in</p> | <p>The Council has undertaken a comprehensive Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (JBA, 2018) which covers the whole district. Additionally, a Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (JBA, 2018) was undertaken for the proposed strategic site allocations at North of Marchwood, West of Bransgore, South of Ringwood and East of Ringwood to ensure that would be possible that these sites could be made safe for development and to satisfy the NPPF sequential and exceptions test.</p> <p>The site-specific policies address localised surface water/groundwater flooding issues, and the issues regarding capacity of the sewage network at Bransgore, Ringwood and Fordingbridge.</p> <p>The Local Plan as a whole follows the framework set out in the National Planning Policy Framework with regard to flood risk and climate change. The Local</p> |

| Topic | Council response |
|--|---|
| future as a result of climate change. | Plan will allow appropriate development proposals related to renewable energy schemes through saved policy DM4. Further policies are included to reduce risk from coastal erosion (saved policy DM6: Coastal change management areas). Policy 35 also sets development standards for the efficient use of water, the achievement of lower emission standards in commercial development, and charging points in residential properties for electric vehicles. |
| Housing – other policy matters | |
| <p>1.29 The representations covered a diverse range of matters in relation to housing – other policy matters (which were not specifically related to the housing target). These included the following opinions and concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The increase in the district’s older aged population is liable to increase pressure on local services, particularly medical and transport facilities • Existing residential properties close to the strategic sites could become devalued by the housing proposals on the proposed strategic sites – a negative impact • The new-build housing market does not cater for the needs of lower income residents, young families or retired people for lower cost accommodation to buy or rent • The housing proposals are unbalanced and the National Park should take its ‘fair share’ of housing development, rather than the bulk of it being channelled into areas of the district that fall close to, but outside the National Park’s boundary • A high proportion of affordable housing and/or starter homes should be provided as part of new developments, to address the shortfall against objectively assessed housing need (OAN) • Local residents should be entitled to first priority to buy or rent affordable homes on proposed strategic sites • Potential purchase options for first-time buyers could be reduced by new homes on allocated sites being bought as ‘buy-to-let’ properties – a negative impact of encouraging new higher value properties in desirable areas for example in the Green Belt • New homes should be concentrated around major urban conurbations, where there is a larger range of shops and community facilities (this view was put forward by a number of respondents) • Queries over the evidence for the predicted increase in retired homeowners/decline in working age population that informed the housing needs figures in the SHMA • Housing policies should be worded flexibly to ensure that the mix of homes in a scheme can be | <p>The council has undertaken a comprehensive studies to ascertain the need in relation to housing provision across all groups and housing types – as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demographic Projections (JGC 2017) • New Forest District and the New Forest National Park Authority Objectively Assessed Housing Need (Justin Gardner Consulting, JGC 2017) • New Forest Strategic Housing Market Assessment (GL Hearn 2014) • Housing Affordability (JGC 2017) • Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (2018) • The Hampshire Gypsy & Traveller Accommodation Assessment (ORS 2017) <p>Those studies and the feedback received from consultations have informed the suite of Local Plan policies to address this topic (see Chapter 6 – Providing for our housing needs).</p> |

| Topic | Council response |
|---|--|
| <p>varied to reflect local factors, i.e. the type of development most needed in a particular area</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Local Plan should take residential caravans into account as a form of low cost/affordable housing, to reflect their status under the Housing and Planning Act 2016¹ | |
| Landscape | |
| <p>1.30 Most of the objections from members of the public on landscape-related issues were commenting on a strategic site. In general, the comments cited factors such as the impact of development on rural landscape character. The views put forward generally reflected a desire to preserve a sense of openness and to not allow existing settlements to become more urban which, respondents felt, would harm the area's local distinctiveness. Loss of farmland was also mentioned as an adverse potential impact.</p> | <p>Policy 2 and Policy 14 sets out how the effects of development on landscape will be minimised and seeks to ensure that development impacts on landscape are as positive as they can be, and that important landscape character is retained. Specific strategic site policies set out the key site considerations development should have with regard to landscape</p> |
| <p>1.31 Some landowners and agents that wished to promote a particular site as an extension to an existing strategic site boundary responded that they believed development would benefit the landscape character of the area by better defining the settlement. The same argument was used for a site assessed in the sustainability appraisal, part of the Land at Middle Burgate, which was put forward under representation ID 3732 (assessed by SA as parcel FO42A).</p> | |
| <p>1.32 Fordingbridge Parish Council proposed two alternative sites which they felt would have lower landscape value than the proposed strategic sites S (North West of Fordingbridge) and T (East of Ashford) and therefore felt they would be more suitable alternatives. For maps and details of all the alternative sites that were proposed in the consultation.</p> | |
| Housing target | |
| <p>1.33 Many responses did not comment directly on the housing target insofar as suggesting that the number of homes proposed for the district was too high, but concentrated instead on issues such as transport impacts on specific parts of the district or whether sufficient community infrastructure could be provided as part of the developments. Therefore the majority of respondents were not against the principal of new housing development in New Forest district, but on where it was proposed.</p> | <p>The Council has undertaken an up-to-date assessment of objectively assessed housing need (JGC, 2017) which used the most up-to-date and robust information available. The National Planning Policy Framework states that local authorities should meet their objectively assessed needs in full where possible and sustainable to do so. The policies of the Local Plan as a whole set out how housing growth can be accommodated in an appropriate and sustainable manner.</p> |
| <p>1.34 The bulk of the objections in relation to the housing target related to increased traffic pressure on local roads, loss of open landscape characteristics, altered character of towns and villages and the fear that existing community facilities may not be able to keep pace with new developments. There were suggestions that brownfield sites should be prioritised over Greenfield sites for house-building, for similar reasons, i.e. to protect Green Belt, urban and landscape character, to protect the rural environment and to enable more affordable housing to</p> | |

¹ Section 124 of the Housing and Planning Act amends section 8 of the Housing Act 1985, to include a duty to consider the needs of people with respect to sites where caravans can be stationed.

| Topic | Council response |
|--|--|
| <p>be built (see also 'Housing – other policy matters' and 'Green Belt').</p> <p>1.35 The comments in support of the Council's proposed approach towards meeting its housing target were, unsurprisingly, mainly from planning agents on behalf of landowners who wished to promote certain strategic sites.</p> <p>1.36 Comments from specific consultation bodies on the housing target generally supported housing growth, with the range of comments reflecting the need for the Council to reduce its unmet objectively assessed housing need and contribute towards targets in the SHMA and PUSH Position Statement.</p> | |
| Utilities | |
| <p>1.37 A number of responses by members of the public referred to essential infrastructure, or facilities, with regard to the need to ensure infrastructure was either already available or could be put in place before any development started. Utilities were mentioned specifically in some responses, but in many others, infrastructure was taken to include roads and community infrastructure, as well as electricity, gas and water supply networks. The objections that specifically commented on electricity, gas and water utilities related to the capacity of strategic sites to accommodate the proposed number of dwellings, based on capacity of the existing utility supply networks.</p> <p>1.38 Southern Water made comments on proposed strategic sites A-F and I-M. For all of these sites they identified limited existing capacity in the local sewerage network, and advised that any developments would need to make connections at the nearest point of adequate capacity.</p> <p>1.39 Wessex Water also commented on the existing sewage network capacity of a number of strategic sites in Bransgore, Fordingbridge and Ringwood (sites O—T), whilst Bournemouth Water supplied comments on the water supply capacity of sites D-T, highlighting additional cost requirements for developing the areas around Ashford and Fordingbridge. The comments from Wessex Water and Bournemouth Water were initially sent as responses to the earlier infrastructure providers consultation and also formed their responses to the Initial Proposals Consultation.</p> | <p>The Council has worked with the relevant water companies covering the Plan Area to identify possible issues of capacity. Engagement and consultation with infrastructure providers has informed the preparation of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan which sets out the infrastructure needs of each strategic site in order to effectively mitigate the impacts of development on infrastructure and services. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan should be read in conjunction with the strategic sites policies.</p> <p>Utilities such as gas connections, mains connections, and adequate drainage systems are already requirements for any new development.</p> <p>Further work will be undertaken by site promoters in cooperation with Wessex Water to effectively address issues of sewage treatment and capacity in Bransgore, Ringwood and Fordingbridge</p> |
| Economy | |
| <p>1.40 Most of the responses that objected to a site for reasons related to the economy referred to a lack of employment opportunities for new residents of developments at proposed strategic sites. It was suggested by numerous respondents that urban sites would be closer to existing potential employment opportunities and therefore, more sustainable, than sites located in rural areas. A number of respondents also felt that demand for local employment and community infrastructure from the housing numbers proposed would outstrip current and future provision.</p> <p>1.41 Associated British Ports (ABP) commented that significant elements of the Port of Southampton,</p> | <p>A Commercial Property Market and Business Needs Assessment (Chilmark Consulting Ltd, April 2017) has been undertaken for the Plan Area. This has informed the proposed future employment land provision as part of Strategic Site 1: North of Totton, Strategic Site 4: The former Fawley Power Station, and Strategic Site 14: East of Ringwood.</p> |

| Topic | Council response |
|--|---|
| <p>including part of the deep water access channel; and the Marchwood and Cracknore Industrial Parks, which ABP own; are located within the district. They suggested that the prospect of planned future port expansion would therefore require specific consideration within the Plan. Both ABP and Southampton City Council also recommended proactive inclusion of a policy to set out the type of development proposals that would be permitted at Dibden Bay, which ABP holds as a strategic land reserve. Dibden Bay is partially designated as SSSI and SPA. Southampton City Council commented that “any proposal made for major expansion of the Port of Southampton at Dibden Bay is likely to be the most significant development proposal made in New Forest District over the plan period”. They also stated that they welcomed the proposal to identify Marchwood Military Port in the Local Plan as suitable for port related uses.</p> | <p>The Local Plan has responded to issues raised during the consultation by supporting new business development in appropriate location and, where possible, seeking to retain suitable and viable employment sites (Policies 21 and 22).</p> |
| <p>1.42 Although no representations were received from the Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs), Southampton City Council commented that they welcomed the proposed employment North of Totton (site A) and at Eling Wharf (site V) as it would support the objectives of the Solent LEP and Partnership for Urban South Hampshire (PUSH) to secure economic growth. A planning agent referred to the Enterprise M3 LEP’s Housing Evidence Study (which covers the Enterprise M3 area including New Forest district), which recognised the economic benefits that provision of additional housing can bring to an area.</p> | <p>The Local Plan includes policy on Dibden Bay (24) which fits with the defined role of local authorities in the NSIP process. This is to prepare a Local Impact Report, identifying the local impacts (positive and negative) of an NSIP proposal. This policy setting out the relevant considerations is the most appropriate to seek the best outcome for the district and in particular for directly affected communities.</p> |
| <p>1.43 The New Forest National Park Authority referred to the local employment needs survey mentioned at paragraph 5.106 of the consultation document. They stated that this would need to be completed prior to publication of the submission draft plan to demonstrate the relationship between housing growth and the projected working age population.</p> | |
| <p>1.44 Another respondent (Barker Mill Estates) claimed that the employment evidence base referred to in the consultation document (the PUSH Spatial Position Statement and the New Forest Business Needs Survey) was insufficient to take full account of employment need and potential for future employment provision. They stated that a much broader local assessment was needed which would enable proactive provision of land for employment need where opportunities exist. New Forest District Council plans to commission a local commercial property market assessment to provide a locally based assessment which could update the PUSH assessment for the area around Totton and the Waterside. The Council is therefore already currently seeking to address this concern.</p> | |
| <p>1.45 Pennington Residents’ Association commented that they would welcome a new employment area at the Otter Nurseries site in Efford (Site W), but that the type of employment that this site would attract is unlikely to allow those employed there to afford to buy a house in the district. They also felt that limited employment opportunities within the New Forest would mean new residents having to travel some distance to work, which would worsen peak local traffic</p> | |

| Topic | Council response |
|--|---|
| <p>congestion.</p> <p>1.46 One planning agent (Bloor Homes) objected to a lack of reference in the policy directions (section 5 of the consultation document) to the requirements of paragraph 22 of the NPPF, which states that ‘Planning policies should avoid the long-term protection of sites allocated for employment use where there is no reasonable prospect of a site being used for that purpose’ and that existing employment allocations should only be carried over where supported by evidence and where those sites would not better serve more pressing needs. Quoting paragraph 5.107 of the consultation document, which states that there are already sufficient reserves of business land and premises in the district, they suggested that the release of employment sites at the Waterside that have little potential for new employment uses would make better use of the land and create opportunities for attractive, well integrated residential developments.</p> <p>1.47 In contrast, Hampshire Chamber of Commerce stated the following in relation to employment and the local economy:</p> <p>1.48 <i>“Employment has a low profile in the emerging strategy. There is a need for additional land allocations to support greater flexibility and to allow for expansion. This is not reflected in the minimal requirements outlined by PUSH and does not reflect the opportunities that exist. It is essential that the evidence base looks beyond the PUSH spatial plan (which has not been tested) and is more proactive in providing for future employment to address the growing generational imbalance of population in the New Forest area. An example of this would be to allocate employment land and housing between Totton and the M27 Junction 2, in particular the extension of the North Totton allocation, which would be preferable to developing land further away from accessible transport connections in the New Forest”.</i></p> | |
| Built Environment and Design | |
| <p>1.49 A number of members of public felt that the development of strategic sites in the consultation document would harm the visual character of existing towns and villages. This was the main comment that arose in relation to the built environment.</p> <p>1.50 However there were other responses that supported development of the strategic sites, provided that they were planned sensitively and contributed to local vitality of existing settlements.</p> | <p>The Local Plan includes a policy (Policy 13) that deals specifically with the issue of design and the built environment. The objective of this policy is to create high quality places that enhance local character and distinctiveness, that connect well to existing development, that offer a high quality living environment for current and future residents, and also offer attractive green spaces and opportunities for wildlife.</p> <p>The strategic sites policies also seek to ensure that the new proposed strategic residential developments</p> |

| Topic | Council response |
|---|--|
| | achieve good design and create high quality places. |
| Comments on all other evidence base studies | |
| <p>1.51 There were a number of references to other evidence base studies in the representations. These were either criticised, or more generally used to support the respondent's point of view. The evidence studies included the National Planning Policy Framework and other national or sub-regional documents, and local documents including evidence base studies published by New Forest District Council. Some of the key representations which referred to the Council's evidence base documents were as follows:</p> <p>1.52 Ellingham, Harbridge & Ibsley Parish Council and Sandleheath Parish Council criticised the findings of the Draft Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Study (June 2016) in objection to strategic site R in the Avon Valley and Downlands sub area, which the parish council felt should have been assessed by the study as having a higher sensitivity rating due to its landscape and ecological value.</p> <p>1.53 Two planning agents responding on behalf of landowners commented on the Draft Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Study. One of these disagreed with references in the study to site Q (East of Ringwood) as having only low to minor capacity for development; whilst another highlighted references in the study which favour the development of Site E (South West of Lymington).</p> <p>1.54 Ringwood Town Council disagreed with the assessment of the New Forest District Green Belt Study (July 2016) that the southern side of Moortown Lane within Site P: South of Ringwood only moderately supports the purposes of the Green Belt.</p> <p>1.55 The New Forest National Park Authority referred to the New Forest Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) within its general comment on the housing target, which it believes is too high for this area. It stated that the housing target figures in the SHMA should be considered only as a starting point and not as a proxy for the final figure in the Local Plan. It also pointed out that the SHMA does not take into account land constraints.</p> <p>1.56 Ellingham Parish Council also referred to the SHMA in objection to development on all of the proposed strategic sites around Ringwood. Their response claimed that basing the need for housing growth on the SHMA report meant using out of date household forecasts, as lower population projections had been published by the Government in 2014 shortly after the SHMA had been prepared.</p> | <p>The methodology for the Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity study has been devised to formulate a transparent method of analysing existing data, and confirmed by field work, taking a cumulative approach.</p> <p>However, it must be noted that whilst scoring has been used to express the findings, professional judgment has also been applied to determine the score in the first instance, through a rigorous use of field record sheets that require a combination of observations recorded as text and notation on plan, and selection from standard criteria. Each assessment is tested through desk based study to ensure a consistent approach is taken.</p> |
| Habitat mitigation | |
| 1.57 Most respondents in general supported the principle of providing Suitable Alternative Natural | Policy 10 explains how new development should |

| Topic | Council response |
|---|---|
| <p>Greenspace (SANGS) and were in favour of the Council’s approach to habitat mitigation under the Solent Recreation Mitigation Partnership (SDMP).</p> <p>1.58 Of the objections received on this topic, one planning agent felt that a ‘one size fits all’ approach to habitat mitigation favoured the development of green field sites over brownfield sites, as they are better able to accommodate on-site mitigation measures. The Council also received a few representations of support from landowners or agents who suggested enlarging a proposed strategic site boundary to provide additional land for habitat mitigation and to enable additional housing to be developed.</p> | <p>mitigate the impacts on International Nature Conservation Designations and the requirements regarding on-site Recreational Mitigation.</p> |
| Heritage and conservation | |
| <p>1.59 Most of the comments in relation to heritage and conservation focussed on the local character of areas adjacent to a proposed strategic site. This was a particular concern for the sites around Hordle and Lymington. A number of respondents commented that it was important to retain the setting of these existing villages and not to allow them to merge with other settlements. Some respondents also opposed loss of agricultural land on these sites, on the basis that it forms part of these areas’ rural heritage.</p> <p>1.60 Historic England submitted comments on each of the strategic sites in the consultation document to highlight buildings or other features of heritage interest (heritage assets)</p> <p>1.61 Its representation stated that the consultation document contained insufficient references to conservation and enhancement of the built and historic environment, given that the NPPF describes it as an integral part of sustainable development. It also felt it was unclear as to how and when designated heritage assets were taken into account in the SA site assessment, given lack of reference to them within the site assessment criteria in tables 5.1 and 5.3.</p> <p>A local group (the Twentieth Century Society) commented that redevelopment of Site U (Fawley Power Station) should be conservation-led, as the site is of high architectural and historic value.</p> | <p>Policy DM1 Heritage and Conservation, which is up-to-date and still in accordance with the NPPF, has been saved.</p> <p>Subsequent decisions on Green Belt release and the sustainability of housing sites (post-Initial Proposals 2016) has resulted in some of the proposed housing sites being deleted. This will help to retain an element of the rural character and setting of the coastal settlements.</p> <p>Where relevant, the strategic site policies and concept plans address conserving and enhancing heritage assets.</p> |
| Comments on Sustainability Appraisal | |
| <p>1.62 There were only 14 representations on the Sustainability Appraisal (SA), five of which came from specific consultation bodies – Historic England, the Environment Agency, Test Valley Borough Council and Sandehead and Milford on Sea Parish Councils.</p> <p>1.63 Three representations from landowners and planning agents referred to the SA as justification for the release of a strategic or alternative site for development. Two of these disagreed with the conclusion in the SA that Site F: North of Milford on Sea would be suitable, whilst another objected to the inclusion of Site A: North of Totton, as part of that was rated in the SA as having sustainability issues.</p> | <p>The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) scores for individual land parcels have been updated in the light of further technical studies and information provided by site promoters through meetings held with landowners and/or agents.</p> <p>Omission sites and alternatives are assessed in this SA and are set out in Appendix 6.</p> |

| Topic | Council response |
|--|-------------------------|
| 1.64 Another planning agent argued that several of the land parcels in Hordle and Everton had been incorrectly assessed in the SA as being sustainable locations for new housing. The same agent also suggested that his client's site in Milford on Sea, to the west of Site F, which had been assessed as having 'significant sustainability issues' should have been scored as a suitable alternative site for housing. | |