

**Winchester District Local Plan Part 1 – Joint Core
Strategy Pre-Submission January 2012**

**Strategic Environmental Assessment and
Sustainability Appraisal Non-Technical Summary,
Habitats Regulations Executive Summary
and
Winchester City Council response to
Recommendations**



Index:

| | |
|--|----|
| Non-Technical Summary from the Sustainability Appraisal (SA)/ Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)..... | 3 |
| Executive Summary from the Habitats Regulations Assessment (Appropriate Assessment)..... | 12 |
| How the Recommendations from the Sustainability Appraisal/ Sustainable Environmental Assessment and the Habitats Regulations Assessment (Appropriate Assessment) have been taken into account in the Winchester District Local Plan Part 1 – Joint Core Strategy Pre-Submission..... | 17 |



Winchester District Local Development Framework



Sustainability Appraisal/ Strategic Environmental Assessment



Winchester District Local Plan- Part 1 Joint Core Strategy: Pre-submission



December 2011



enfusion



SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL **incorporating** **STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT of** **WINCHESTER DISTRICT COUNCIL'S** **LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK:**

Winchester District
South Downs National Park
Local Plan Part 1 - Joint Core Strategy
Pre-Submission

SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT

| | | |
|---------------------------|---|-----------------|
| <i>date:</i> | <i>December 2011</i> | |
| <i>prepared for:</i> | <i>Winchester City Council</i> | |
| <i>prepared by:</i> | <i>Barbara Carroll Liz Payne Alastair Peattie Ruth Thomas</i> | <i>Enfusion</i> |
| <i>quality assurance:</i> | <i>Toney Hallahan</i> | <i>Enfusion</i> |

enfusion
environmental planning and management for sustainability



Treenwood House
Rowden Lane
Bradford on Avon
BA15 2AU
t: 01225 867112
www.enfusion.co.uk

SA OF WINCHESTER'S LOCAL PLAN PART 1- JOINT CORE STRATEGY: PRE-SUBMISSION SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL

NON-TECHNICAL SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

- 0.1 This is the summary of the Sustainability Appraisal Report for Winchester City Council's Local Development Framework (LDF) Local Plan Part 1 – Joint Core Strategy (Pre-Submission). It describes how the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) process was used to assist in planning for the development and the use of land, as required by planning legislation and Government guidance. The SA assists sustainable development through an ongoing dialogue and assessment during the preparation of LDF Development Planning Documents (DPDs), and considers the implications of social, economic and environmental demands on land use planning.

THE LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK

- 0.2 The LDF is the system introduced by the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act (2004) and it takes the form of a portfolio of documents including DPDs (Core Strategy, Development Management and Site Specific Allocations), the Statement of Community Involvement, and an Annual Monitoring Report. The Joint Core Strategy sets the LDF's long-term Vision and Strategic Objectives for development planning and it considers the options available through the planning system to the Council and communities in the Winchester area. The Pre-Submission Document sets out the Council's approach, intended to guide future change and development in the area. A larger portion of the District lies within the South Downs National Park. The Park Authority will prepare its own Core Strategy but in the meantime, the Winchester District Local Plan Part 1 – Joint Core Strategy is jointly adopted by the SDNPA and the City Council.

SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL & STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

- 0.3 Planning legislation requires that the LDF is subject to a SA, a systematic process that is designed to evaluate the predicted social, economic and environmental effects of development planning. European and UK legislation require that the LDF is also subject to a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA), a process that considers the effects of development planning on the environment. Government guidance advises that these two processes should be carried out together and outlines a number of stages of SA work that need to be carried out as the LDF is being prepared:

Stage A: Setting Context & Scope

Stage B: Developing Options & Assessing Effects
Stage C: Preparing the SA Report
Stage D: Consulting on the Plan & the SA
Stage E: Monitoring Implementation of the Plan

- 0.4 The SA/SEA of the Winchester City Council's Local Plan Joint Core Strategy Pre-Submission Document has been prepared in accordance with these requirements for SA/SEA.

THE CHARACTER OF WINCHESTER DISTRICT

- 0.5 Winchester is situated in the South of England and comprises 66,107 hectares with over 50 rural settlements and the major settlement of Winchester City. The District is the least populated in Hampshire and its rural nature make it an attractive location to live in and to visit. A significant proportion of the Eastern area of the District is covered by the new South Downs National Park designation.
- 0.6 Winchester is a generally prosperous area and key employment sectors include public administration and health; banking and finance; hotels, distribution and the leisure sector. A strong, knowledge-based economy is driven by over 30% of the working population holding professional skilled roles. Winchester's relative prosperity is reflected in reasonably low deprivation, excellent health conditions among the District's population (although some pockets of poorer health in the more urban areas are evident), and low crime rates.
- 0.7 Housing demand is focused on Winchester City and to the south of the District in the area bordering the Partnership for Urban South Hampshire (PUSH) area. There is an identified need for affordable housing which is currently not being met. Areas for development are limited by physical constraints, including areas at risk of flooding, areas protected for their landscape value, and areas protected for their ecological value. A number of these areas are of local, regional, national and international ecological importance, including those protected by the EU Habitats Directive.

SA SCOPING & ISSUES FOR SUSTAINABILITY

- 0.8 During late 2007 a scoping process for Winchester was carried out by Enfusion Ltd to help ensure that the SA covered key sustainability issues relevant to Winchester. Plans and programmes were reviewed and information was collated relating to the current and predicted social, environmental and economic characteristics of the areas. This information was updated in 2008.

0.9 From these studies, the key sustainability issues and opportunities for the LDF and the SA were identified, as set out in the following table:

| Table: 3.1: Key sustainability issues/ opportunities identified for Winchester City Council | |
|--|--|
| ■ | Maintaining and developing Winchester City as a centre for commerce and learning, and stimulating the rural economy in the context of growing development pressures from the urban centres to the south of the District. |
| ■ | Reducing unsustainable traffic and transport trends (commuting patterns), including associated carbon emissions by reducing the need to travel by car and creating opportunities for renewable energy development. |
| ■ | Improving the supply and availability of affordable housing. |
| ■ | Protecting valued landscape and habitats; including seeking opportunities for new Green Infrastructure networks. |
| ■ | Catering for the need of an ageing population. |
| ■ | Ensuring that infrastructure requirements meet the needs of new development and take account of constraints (water, biodiversity etc). |

SA Framework

0.10 An SA Framework was compiled and included SA Objectives that aim to resolve the issues and problems identified; these are used to test the draft DPDs as they are being prepared. This was included in the SA Scoping Report that was sent to statutory consultees. Comments were invited and received from a number of these organisations, which helped to improve the SA Framework. The following is a list of the SA Objective headings.

| SA Objective Headings | |
|------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 1. Building Communities | 9. Climate Change |
| 2. Infrastructure | 10. Sustainable Construction |
| 3. Housing | 11. Biodiversity |
| 4. Economy and Employment | 12. Heritage |
| 5. Transport | 13. Landscape and Soils |
| 6. Health | 14. Built Environment |
| 7. Water | 15. Pollution |
| 8. Waste | |

SA OF THE JOINT CORE STRATEGY

0.11 Each stage of the preparation of the Joint Core Strategy was appraised systematically using the SA Objectives. Where significant adverse effects, including environmental effects, have been predicted, the SA sought where possible to identify means of offsetting these effects. Where it was considered that there were opportunities to enhance the sustainability of the proposals, recommendations were

made. The appraisal recognised 7 categories of predicted effects, as illustrated in the following key.

| SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL KEY | |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| ++ | Development actively encouraged as it would resolve an existing sustainability problem |
| + | No Sustainability constraints and development acceptable |
| 0 | Neutral |
| ? | Unknown/uncertain effect |
| - | Potential sustainability issues; mitigation and /or negotiation possible |
| -- | Problematical and improbable because of known sustainability issues ; mitigation or negotiation difficult and /or expensive |
| x | Absolute sustainability constraints to development |

Appraisal of the LDF Core Strategy Issues and Options 2008

- 0.12 Issues and options were developed initially during early 2008 and were subject to SA in April 2008. A summary of the key SA findings are provided in this SA report, including a summary of how alternatives were rejected or progressed.

Appraisal of the LDF Core Strategy Preferred Option 2009

- 0.13 The development of Issues and Options, and the subsequent appraisals undertaken, informed the development of Preferred Option, which were subject to detailed SA in April 2009. The key findings and recommendations of the appraisal are reported in this SA report.

Appraisal of the Local Plan Joint Core Strategy Pre-Submission 2011

- 0.14 The Joint Core Strategy Pre-Submission has been developed to take account of responses to the Preferred Option, further consultation with 'Blueprint' and Plans for Places, the SA findings, and recent updates to the evidence base reports. The Joint Core Strategy Pre-Submission was subject to detailed SA in November 2011, and the findings of the SA are detailed in this SA Report.

Uncertainties

- 0.15 Throughout the development of the Joint Core Strategy and the Sustainability Appraisal process, data gaps and uncertainties were uncovered. It is not always possible to accurately predict sustainability effects when considering plans at such a strategic scale. Impacts on biodiversity and cultural heritage, for example, will depend on more detailed information and studies at a site-level. Whilst climate change science is becoming more accurate, it is difficult to predict impacts likely to result from climate change, including synergistic effects. These uncertainties have been acknowledged in the appraisal matrices, where applicable.

Significant effects identified

0.16 The majority of proposals and policies were found to have significant positive sustainability benefits. The following table summarises the key positive effects identified:

| Key Relevant SA Objective: | Positive Effects Identified: |
|--|--|
| Building Communities | The plan reflects the need to improve facilities for all sections of the community, by providing an inclusive approach to facilities provision, with particular benefits for older people and families. Measures are included to support rural economic development. |
| Housing | The plan will have significant positive effects through meeting the housing needs of the District, particularly affordable housing needs, and in locations where housing is most needed. |
| Transport Climate Change, | The plan responds to existing high levels of car ownership and accessibility issues, by including strong policies in support of public transport and through seeking to minimise out-commuting. |
| Biodiversity, Landscape & townscape, Water, Land and soil | The plan recognises the distinctive landscape and biodiversity areas in the District, (including the newly designated National Park) and takes an approach to development that minimises impacts on these areas through steering development toward the more developed Winchester City and PUSH areas of the District. |
| Economy & Employment, | The plan will have positive effects for the economic regeneration of existing centres and the promotion of regeneration in rural communities and market towns. |
| Sustainable construction | The plan has a strong focus on sustainable design and construction, including ensuring high level compliance with codes for sustainable construction. |

0.17 Alongside the many positive effects of the plan, negative sustainability effects were also identified, generally as a result of the increased development proposed in the plan. These are outlined below:

| Key Relevant SA Objective: | Negative Effects Identified: |
|--|---|
| Climate Change Biodiversity Landscape & townscape | The cumulative effects of increased development, including housing, employment development, and other infrastructure. These effects include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ increased air pollution (local and regional); ■ direct land-take; ■ pressures on water resources and water quality; ■ increased noise and light pollution, particularly |

| Key Relevant SA Objective: | Negative Effects Identified: |
|--|--|
| | <p>from traffic;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ increased waste production; ■ potential loss of tranquillity ; ■ implications for human health (e.g. from increased pollution); and ■ incremental adverse effects on landscape and townscapes. <p>Strong mitigation measures are provided by the Core Policies' requirements for avoiding and mitigating adverse effects. If implemented, this should minimise any residual significant adverse effects of the Plan.</p> |
| Climate Change and Energy/ | <p>An increase in the District's contribution to greenhouse gas production- this is inevitable given the amount of new development proposed, and includes factors such as increased transportation costs, embodied energy in construction materials and increased energy use from new housing and employment development.</p> |
| Cultural Heritage Landscape & Townscape Building Communities | <p>Less tangible effects of significant physical, economic and social changes for local communities, including impacts on cultural heritage, landscape, community cohesion particularly in locations where there will be significant increases in development.</p> <p>Strong mitigation measures are provided by the Core Policies' requirements for avoiding and mitigating adverse effects. If implemented, this should minimise any residual significant adverse effects of the Plan.</p> |

Mitigation and Enhancement Recommendations

- 0.18 An important role of the SA process is to provide recommendations for the mitigation of negative effects and enhancement of the positive effects identified in the appraisal process. These can then be carried forward in the remainder of the plan-making process and can include further recommendations for other Development Plan Documents (for example, the Development Management Policies) and for processes including development management and site master planning.
- 0.19 In preparing plan policies, Winchester City Council has already sought to mitigate the negative effects of development and maximise the opportunities presented, and are commended for the work undertaken to date. The SA process has made further recommendations for the plan and these often relate to the linkages between different issues that were identified as a result of the SA. For example, there are strong synergies between the preservation and enhancement of biodiversity and the development of Green Infrastructure. Recommendations and suggestions from the SA have been integrated into the plan-making in an on-going and iterative way.

Monitoring the Implementation of the Joint Core Strategy

- 0.20 Local planning authorities are required to produce Annual Monitoring Reports including indicators and targets against which the progress of the Local Development Framework can be measured. There is also a requirement to monitor the predictions made in the SA and Government advises Councils to prepare a Monitoring Strategy that incorporates the needs of the LDF and the SA. Winchester City Council is preparing a monitoring strategy that will incorporate the recommendations from this SA.

CONCLUSIONS AND NEXT STEPS

- 0.21 The SA of the Joint Core Strategy Pre-Submission has appraised the effects of individual proposals and policies, as well as the overall effect of the plan, including cumulative and incremental effects. The SA has found that the emerging Winchester LDF will make a significant contribution to sustainability in the District, with a particularly strong focus on meeting housing and community needs, addressing sustainable transport need and associated climate change goals which will also contribute to protecting the District's natural environment. The key negative effects identified relate to increased housing and employment development and the potential cumulative effects in the South of the District where there are significant development pressures from the PUSH area. The Strategic Proposals and Core Policies include strong mitigation measures that when implemented will minimise any significant residual adverse effects.
- 0.22 This SA Report, alongside consultation responses received, will be used to inform the preparation of the Joint Core Strategy Submission Document. Any significant changes made to the document will be subject to further SA, and a Revised SA Report will be published alongside the Joint Core Strategy Submission Document.



Winchester Local Development Framework Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA) Report

HRA (AA) of Pre-Submission Core Strategy

December 2011

prepared by

enfusion




HABITATS REGULATIONS ASSESSMENT (APPROPRIATE ASSESSMENT) REPORT

Winchester City Council Core Strategy - Pre-Submission

Prepared for: Winchester City Council

| | | |
|---------------------------|-------------------------|----------|
| <i>date:</i> | December 2011 | |
| <i>prepared for:</i> | Winchester City Council | |
| <i>prepared by:</i> | Alastair Peattie | Enfusion |
| <i>quality assurance:</i> | Barbara Carroll | Enfusion |

enfusion 
environmental planning and management for sustainability

Treenwood House
Rowden Lane
Bradford on Avon
BA15 2AU
t: 01225 867112
www.enfusion.co.uk

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 0.1 Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) of spatial development plans is a requirement of the Habitats Directive (92/43/EEC) as set out in the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (as amended 2011). This report details the Habitats Regulations Assessment for the Winchester Core Strategy (Pre-Submission). It sets out the method, findings and conclusions of the Screening and Appropriate Assessment (AA) stages of the HRA process.
- 0.2 The first stage of the HRA process (screening) considered the likely significant effects at the following European sites within the influence the plan:
- Butser Hill SAC
 - Chichester and Langstone Harbours SPA/ Ramsar
 - East Hampshire Hangers SAC
 - Emer Bog SAC
 - Mottisfont Bats SAC
 - New Forest SAC/ SPA/ Ramsar
 - Portsmouth Harbour SPA/ Ramsar
 - River Itchen SAC
 - Solent Maritime SAC
 - Solent and Isle of Wight Lagoons SAC
 - Solent and Southampton Water SPA/ Ramsar
- 0.3 Three of the European sites (Butser Hill SAC, East Hampshire Hangers SAC and Emer Bog SAC) were screened out of the assessment, given the location and sensitivities of the sites in relation to the location of development proposed in the Core Strategy. The screening concluded that the effects of the Plan were uncertain with regard to seven of the remaining European sites as a result of changes to air quality, water levels, water quality and levels of disturbance. It also concluded that the effects of the Core Strategy on four of the European sites were uncertain as a result of the loss and fragmentation of important supporting habitats. Based on the precautionary approach these issues were progressed through to the AA stage to be examined in more detail.
- 0.4 The AA considered the potential for the Core Strategy alone to have adverse effects on the integrity of the River Itchen SAC, Solent Maritime SAC and Solent and Southampton Water SPA/ Ramsar through reduced air quality, water levels and water quality, increased disturbance and the loss and fragmentation of supporting habitats. The potential for adverse effects alone predominantly arises as a result of the proposed location of development, which is in close proximity to the three European sites. The assessment noted that the impacts of individual developments are carefully regulated through development controls/ site management measures, including the requirement for project level HRA. The AA concluded that these measures along with

mitigation provided by Pre-Submission Policies and further recommendations provided by the AA would ensure that the Core Strategy alone will not have adverse effects on the integrity of the European sites.

- 0.5 The AA also considered the potential for the Core Strategy to have adverse in combination effects - with development proposed in surrounding areas - on seven of the identified European sites through reduced air quality, water levels and quality and increased disturbance. Given a lack of available evidence and ongoing studies, the AA was unable to conclude with certainty that the Core Strategy would not have adverse effects on the integrity of the identified European sites as a result of these issues. To strengthen the mitigation already proposed in the Plan the AA recommended a number of policy safeguards to help provide effective plan level mitigation that will contribute to minimising the impacts of proposed development on air quality, water levels and water quality. Recommendations included:
- the monitoring of air quality at key locations within or close to the proposed strategic sites;
 - additional policy wording that supports the findings of the Solent Bird Disturbance and Mitigation Project and ensure any proposed strategic avoidance and/or mitigation measures are adopted;
 - the requirement for any proposal on land at North Whiteley to incorporate suitable areas for dog walking;
 - the requirement for sustainable water strategies to accompany all proposals for strategic developments; and
 - seeking the incorporation of higher water efficiency measures in developments where suitable, in particular for strategic sites.
- 0.6 The assessment also considered the potential for the Core Strategy to have adverse in combination effects on the eight of the European sites through the loss and fragmentation of supporting habitats. The AA concluded that the potential impacts of proposed development on supporting habitats would most appropriately be addressed at the project level. Project level HRA would provide a detailed site level analysis of the importance of the site to the designated features, and provide suitable mitigation measures to reduce the adverse effects of the proposed development. The AA recommended additional policy wording to strengthen the protection of important supporting habitats within the Core Strategy.
- 0.7 Provided that the recommendations of the AA are incorporated, it is considered that the Core Strategy will contain effective strategic plan level mitigation to address the issues identified through the HRA process, as far as is possible within the remit of a planning document. The plan should, however be seen in conjunction with the need for wider measures (e.g. effective European site management and coordinated regional approaches to air quality). The findings of this plan level HRA do not obviate the need to undertake HRA for lower level, project scale/ implementation plans where there is potential for

a significant effect on one or more European Sites. Accordingly, this AA should be used to inform any future assessment work. It should also be revisited in the light of any significant changes to the Core Strategy and/ or if any further information becomes available.

- 0.8 These findings are subject to consultation comments and advice from NE and wider stakeholders.
- 0.9 In addition to the ongoing, statutory consultation undertaken with Natural England this HRA (AA) Report is available for wider public view and comment. Consultation on this HRA Report will take place in parallel with consultation on the Pre-Submission Core Strategy. The consultation period is from 25 January 2012 to 12 March 2012. All responses should be sent to:

**Head of Strategic Planning
Winchester City Council
City Offices
Colebrook Street
Winchester
Hampshire
SO23 9LJ**

Tel : 01962 840 222

Email : LDF@winchester.gov.uk

How the Recommendations from the Sustainability Appraisal/ Sustainable Environmental Assessment and the Habitats Regulations Assessment (Appropriate Assessment) have been taken into account in the Winchester District Local Plan Part 1 – Joint Core Strategy Pre-Submission

1.0 Sustainability Appraisal/ Sustainable Environmental Assessment

| Policy | Draft HRA/SA recommendation, or changes made since Preferred Option HRA/SA | Amended draft Pre Submission Text |
|--------|--|---|
| WT1 | The Policy recognises extra care, disabilities and student needs; it could be further enhanced by including older people since Winchester has an aging population. | <p>This is now addressed in the supporting text to policy CP2 on Housing Priorities and Housing Mix which covers all spatial areas.</p> <p>These issues apply to all spatial areas, and therefore have now been covered by policy CP2.</p> |
| WT1 | The policy could be enhanced by design guidance to further explain the inter-relationships between design and sustainability requirements for development proposals. | <p>The Council has now prepared Sustainable Development Guidance Document for Planning Applications which brings together various elements in the Core Strategy on sustainable construction.</p> <p>The design guidance will be published as part of the evidence base which will be available for the Pre-submission Local Plan-Part 1 Core Strategy consultation</p> |
| WT1 | The policy should include explicit consideration of the particular historic heritage and settings. | Final policy bullet amended to read: ensuring that all new development is of the highest design quality in terms of architecture and landscape, fully considers and respects the context of its <u>setting and surroundings</u> to reflect local distinctiveness, <u>and the historical and cultural heritage of the Town</u> and makes a positive contribution to the quality of the area. |
| WT2 | The SA in 2009 recommended that the network of tracks on the site should be maintained and link with the GI land allocated to the east of the railway. This is explicit in the policy now. | No amendment required |

| | | |
|-----|---|---|
| WT2 | The policy could be enhanced by clarifying the waste/recycling requirements to be addressed in the masterplan. | No amendment required. This is now covered by DS1: '...development proposals will be expected to demonstrate conformity with the following principles:-...testing existing infrastructure and service capacity to serve new development, and making arrangements in a timely manner for appropriate increases in capacity;' |
| WT3 | Green Travel/Transport Plans that encourage or require employees to use sustainable transport modes could be provided by the occupiers and contribute further to exemplar | No amendment required. This is covered in part by the fourth and fifth bullet points in WT3 which promotes non-vehicular access to and within the site and the use of the site's proximity to the Park and Ride site to access the site without reliance on the private car. This is also supported by policy CP 10 on transport which supports the use of travel plans as one way to encourage non-car modes particularly walking and cycling. |
| SH1 | The policy could be enhanced by including the specific needs of the elderly in the policy text as well. | This is now addressed in the supporting text to policy CP2 on Housing Priorities and Housing Mix which cover all spatial areas. These issues apply to all spatial areas, and therefore have now been covered by policy CP2. |
| SH1 | Work outwith the new development areas will have more positive effects if supported by sustainable transport systems. | This is covered in DS1: Making the use of public transport, walking and cycling easy, to reduce non-essential car use; and Policy CP 10 – Transport which requires development to be located and designed to reduce the need to travel. |
| SH1 | Policies could be enhanced if DS1 Development Strategy and Principles included historical & cultural heritage. | This has been strengthened for Winchester Town in WT1. Under DS1, development proposals are now expected to demonstrate how they achieve high standards of design and sensitivity to character and setting which will apply across the district. |
| SH2 | Light and noise pollution on the western urban/countryside edges should be given consideration in the site master plan. | This development is permitted, so unable to amend policy on this point. |
| SH3 | New commitments for maximising open space opportunities and requirement for | No amendment required |

| | | |
|-------|---|---|
| | green infrastructure strategy will ensure more certainty for mitigation of potential adverse effects. | |
| SH3 | The additional requirement for a full Transport Assessment will reduce uncertainty about the effectiveness of mitigation proposals. | No amendment required |
| SH3 | The HRA recommends that this policy should require the consideration of effects of recreation on water e.g. dog-walking; | The following text has been added to the supporting text: -In addition, the green infrastructure will provide for recreational open space provision including children's play, allotments <u>and separate areas for dog walking, in recognition of the sites proximity to protected European sites.</u> The detail will be discussed with the developer through the planning of the site. |
| SH3 | New specific requirement to avoid adverse effects including addressing light and noise pollution in the green infrastructure strategy. | The specific reference to noise and light pollution has been removed from the section of the policy on green infrastructure, to the first bullet which seeks to protect and enhance the various environmentally sensitive areas within and around the site, avoiding harmful effects or providing mitigation as necessary. |
| MTRA1 | Policy enhanced since 2009 to include specific reference to social needs and improve inclusivity. Policy enhanced through commitment to identify and provide for the need of each settlement, relative to its role and function. | No amendment required |
| MTRA1 | Policy now includes reference to expansion of facilities (as recommended by the SA); requirement for green infrastructure covered by CP15; appropriate timing by DS1. | No amendment required |
| MTRA1 | Policy now includes specific reference to a range of housing types, sizes and tenures. | No amendment required |
| MTRA1 | Policy has been improved to include retention or redevelopment of existing employment land and improve local employment opportunities; Development should be of an appropriate scale so as not to exceed | No amendment required |

| | | |
|-------|---|---|
| | the capacity of existing services and infrastructure or should be accompanied by any required improvements to physical and community infrastructure provision. | |
| MTRA1 | The policy does not include specific support for rural transport initiatives and improvement of public transport; this reduces the certainty of positive effects for accessibility. | The following text has been added to the policy: <u>Development should be of an appropriate scale so as not to exceed the capacity of existing services and infrastructure or should be accompanied by any required improvements to physical and community infrastructure provision, including rural transport initiatives and communications technology.</u> |
| MTRA1 | Policy enhanced through commitment to identify and provide for the need of each settlement. | No amendment required |
| MTRA1 | Policy improved to include maintenance and enhancement of important local character; and landscape protected by CP20 | No amendment required |
| MTRA2 | Policy improved to clarify and support evolution of larger settlements that can support more sustainable communities. Specific reference to Neighbourhood Plans and Village Design Statements acknowledges the role of community planning involvement in developing sustainable communities | No amendment required |
| MTRA2 | Policy improved and now sets out requirements for infrastructure and location. | No amendment required |
| MTRA2 | Policy now includes specific reference to development being appropriate to each settlement's identity, setting, key historic characteristics and local feature; specific protection for Gaps and South Downs NP s. | No amendment required |
| MTRA3 | Policy now includes specific reference to development being appropriate to each settlement's identity, countryside setting, key historic characteristics and local features; specific protection for Gaps and South Downs NP. | No amendment required |
| MTRA4 | The policy now includes explicit requirement for no inappropriate noise/light or traffic generation. | No amendment required |
| CP5 | The policy now includes the provision of play space for younger children (as recommended by the previous SA). | No amendment required |
| CP6 | The policy has been extended to refer to provision of additional services, not just retention of existing services. | No amendment required |

| | | |
|------|--|--|
| CP7 | The policy has been updated to include details of the current open space standards, thus providing additional clarity. | No amendment required |
| CP7 | The policy could be improved by making specific reference to the effects of water-based leisure activities on the water environment. | A specific reference to water based leisure activities has been added to the supporting text of policy CP17. The policy avoids mentioning the potential effects of water recreation on the environment as this is addressed through the HRA. |
| CP8 | The policy has been updated to reflect the latest economic situation and sets out the 5 key economic sectors for the District. The policy now includes specific commitment to promote self-employment, working from home, and ensuring good access to modern communications technology. | No amendment required |
| CP10 | The policy could be strengthened by referring to the role of green infrastructure in sustainable transport (although GI is covered by CP15). | A reference to this link between Green Infrastructure and sustainable transport has been added to the supporting text of policy CP15 Green Infrastructure to read: ‘Policy CP15 supports provision of suitable and sufficient green infrastructure incorporating green spaces and features for recreation, amenity and biodiversity and provision of routes and pathways to link with the existing network, <u>thereby contributing to sustainable transport provision.</u> ’ |
| CP12 | The policy now includes explicit reference to taking account of environmentally sensitive locations, including the South Downs National Park; it also refers to proximity to the energy network and other relevant infrastructure – thus overall adding clarity and strengthening the sustainability of the policy | No amendment required |
| CP13 | It could be clarified that the reference to the public realm extends to walking and cycling routes through the development to encourage their use. | The policy text has been amended accordingly: ‘... all proposals for new development ... should be accompanied by a design and access statement which clearly sets out: ...how the public realm has been designed to ensure that it is attractive, safe, accessible and well connected to its surroundings, <u>including walking and cycling routes to and within</u> |

| | | |
|------|--|---|
| | | <u>the development, to encourage their use'</u> |
| CP15 | The policy has been updated and made more specific for GI on-site and immediate areas, and where not appropriate - with provision for financial contributions. | No amendment required |
| CP16 | The policy has been updated and made more specific including requirements to protect sites of international and European importance from inappropriate development. | No amendment required |
| CP16 | The policy has been amended as a result of the findings of the previous SA. It now states that development proposals will only be supported if the benefits of the development clearly outweigh the harm to the habitat and/or species. | No amendment required |
| CP19 | The policy has been updated to reflect the designation of the National Park and that it is now operational. | No amendment required |
| CP19 | The policy could be enhanced by reference to the ecosystems approach (www.defra.gov.uk) that recognises that the natural environment provides diverse functions and services that are inter-related. | It was considered that this would be more appropriate within the accompanying text to CP17 Flooding and the Water Environment. The following text has therefore been added: The water environment <u>is not only a key element of the wider ecosystem of the District</u> , it is also a key part of the green infrastructure network |
| CP20 | The policy has been expanded to include consideration of the wider archaeology. | No amendment required |
| CP20 | The policy has been expanded to clarify local distinctiveness. | No amendment required |
| CP20 | The policy could be enhanced by reference to the ecosystems approach (www.defra.gov.uk) that recognises that the natural environment provides diverse functions and services that are inter-related. | It was considered that this would be more appropriate within the accompanying text to CP17 Flooding and the Water Environment. The following text has therefore been added: The water environment <u>is not only a key element of the wider ecosystem of the District</u> , it is also a key part of the green infrastructure network |
| CP21 | The policy has been updated and clarified. | No amendment required |

2.0 Habitat Regulation Assessment (Appropriate Assessment)

| Policy | Draft HRA/SA recommendation, or changes made since Preferred Option HRA/SA | Amended draft Pre Submission Text |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|
| Monitoring Framework | It is recommended that the Council requires the monitoring of air quality at key locations within or close to the proposed strategic sites to determine if air quality is worsening as a result of new development (this is also a recommendation of the Sustainability Appraisal). The location of monitoring sites could be determined through lower level assessments. This information can then inform the Council and County Council's wider approach to air quality management. | Air Quality is now addressed in policy DS1 which requires development proposals to address the impact on air quality, alongside other potential environmental impacts. The Council can then consider the suitability of setting up air quality monitoring as part of the development through the planning application process. |
| Development Management Policies DPD | In preparing the Allocations and Other Development Management Policies DPD, the Council should consider opportunities for the phasing and management of construction to minimise any impacts on air quality (especially from vehicular movement). | No Change to Pre-Submission CS |
| CP16 | It is recommended that the following wording is incorporated into the supporting text for Policy CP16: 'The Council will implement the findings of the Solent Bird Disturbance and Mitigation Project commissioned by the Solent Forum and will ensure that any proposed strategic avoidance and/or mitigation measures are adopted in all planning documents and in the assessment of planning applications.' | The following text has been added to the supporting text:- <u>A specific study¹ is in progress to identify the recreational impacts of development on designated European sites around the Solent, which includes land in the south of the District. The Council will seek to implement the findings of this study where relevant to Winchester District, to ensure that any appropriate strategic avoidance and/or mitigation measures proposed are considered in the planning process.</u> The recommended text has been amended as the study in question is not yet finalised and the results of the work are unknown. The recommended text has been amended slightly to reflect the fact that the Council does not yet know what the outcomes of the study will be but recognises the requirement to ensure that any appropriate strategic |

¹ Solent Disturbance and Mitigation Project – Solent Forum 2011 (in progress)

| | | |
|------|--|---|
| | | avoidance and/or mitigation measures proposed are considered in the planning process. |
| SH3 | It is recommended that Policy SH3 (Strategic Housing Allocation - North Whiteley) should require any proposal for the site to incorporate suitable areas for dog walking. This should include a best practice 'dog friendly park', which provides a suitable area for dogs to be let off the lead and that is of sufficient size and quality to deter owners from travelling to the European sites. This should be developed in consultation with local dog owners and trainers. | <p>The following text has been added to the supporting text:</p> <p>-In addition, the green infrastructure will provide for recreational open space provision including children's play, allotments <u>and separate areas for dog walking, in recognition of the sites proximity to protected European sites.</u></p> <p>The detail will be discussed with the developer through the planning of the site.</p> |
| CP16 | It is recommended that the wording of Policy CP16 (Biodiversity) is amended as follows: 'protecting sites of European importance - including any supporting habitats that are important to maintain the integrity of these sites - from inappropriate development.' | <p>The following text has been added to the policy:</p> <p>...and has regard to the following:... <u>supporting habitats that are important to maintain the integrity of European sites.</u></p> <p>The wording has been amended to retain the clear hierarchy set out in the previous bullet and ensuring that supporting habitats are also considered as important for maintaining the integrity of the European sites.</p> |
| CP17 | It is recommended that the Core Strategy require sustainable water strategies to accompany all proposals for strategic developments, which should specifically consider the incorporation of Sustainable Drainage Systems into any proposals. | <p>The new policy states that the council will support development which:-</p> <p>Avoids flood risk to people and property by... including sustainable water management systems such as Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) which should be designed to meet the relevant standards so as to gain approval by the SuDS Approval Body.</p> |
| CP11 | It is recommended that Policy CP11 should seek the incorporation of higher water efficiency measures in developments where suitable, in particular for strategic sites. The supporting text of Policy CP11 should also include further detail in relation to the types of water efficiency measures that might be used. | <p>The policy sets out support for development which optimises water efficiency. More information on water efficiency measures is included in the Sustainable Development Guidance Document for Planning Applications which forms part of the evidence base.</p> |