

## Initial SA of Potential Allocations in Kings Worthy

This is an initial Sustainability Appraisal for Winchester City Council's Local Plan Part 2: Development Management and Allocations – a Development Plan Document (DPD). Planning legislation requires that the DPDs are subject to an 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 DPDs are also subject to a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA), a process that considers the effects of development planning on the environment. Government Policy advises that "*a Sustainability Appraisal which meets the requirements of the European Directive on strategic environmental assessment should be an integral part of the plan preparation process, and should consider all the likely significant effects on the environment, economic and social factors*" (Paragraph 165 National Planning Policy Framework, 2012).

This initial SA seeks to identify the likely significant effects on the environment, economic and social factors of the potential allocations to be put forward in the Local Plan Part 2. SA uses a framework of objectives for sustainable development in the Winchester area as the basis for appraisal using baseline evidence and professional opinion. The SA process suggests ways of avoiding or mitigating significant negative effects and promoting enhancement of positive effects.

### Summary of SA Method

The method used for this Initial Sustainability Appraisal of the Potential Allocations in Kings Worthy comprises the following elements:

- Identifying relevant baseline information and other plans or programmes that influence the Allocations. This has been drawn from the baseline identified for Winchester Local Part 1 – Joint Core Strategy and updated as appropriate.
- Using the Sustainability Appraisal Framework developed in July 2007 (tailored to assess sites), with professional expertise and drawing upon selected information in the Review of Plans and Programmes, and the Baseline Information. Please see Appendix I for further details (pages 18 – 28).
- Commenting on the areas where the potential allocation sites may have specific effects - highlighting where possible, positive/negative effects, short/long term effects, indirect/direct effects, cumulative effects, and the reversibility, scale and likelihood of effects with recommendations for proposed mitigation or enhancement where identified.

- Using Categories of Significance to describe the level of significance attributed to each effect identified after taking into account mitigation provided in high level planning policy in Winchester Local Part 1 – Joint core Strategy. Please see below:

Key: Categories of Significance		
Symbol	Meaning	Sustainability Effect
x	Absolute constraints	Absolute sustainability constraints to development, for example, internationally protected biodiversity
--	Major Negative	Problematical and improbable because of known sustainability issues; mitigation likely to be difficult and/or expensive
-	Minor negative	Potential sustainability issues: mitigation and/or negotiation possible
+	Minor positive	No sustainability constraints and development acceptable
++	Major Positive	Development encouraged as would resolve existing sustainability problem
?	Uncertain	Uncertain or Unknown Effects
0	Neutral	Neutral effect

- In addition, thresholds to determine the significance of certain sustainability constraints, for Landscape and Transport only, were developed as these were considered to be the main sustainability differentiators for the potential allocations identified. Please see Appendix II for further details (pages 29 – 33).

Kings Worthy				
Sustainability Objective		Assessment of Effects		
		Nature of the likely sustainability effect (including positive/negative, short - medium term (5-10 years)/long term (10 - 20 years plus), permanent/temporary, secondary, cumulative and synergistic); Uncertainty		
		Site Refs: 2510, 364, 365, 2508, 381, 2509, 500, 2506 and 329		
1	<b>Building Communities</b>	<p>All development proposed on the sites are required to meet DS1 – Development Strategy and Principles and CP21 – Infrastructure and Community Benefit. Housing needs are covered in SA Objective 3 and Infrastructure is covered by SA Objective 2.</p> <p>All sites have the potential to be developed to meet the requirements of MTRA1 and MTRA 2. The sites outside of the settlement boundary to the south and east are within a settlement gap as defined by policy CP18 of the Local Plan Part 1. Development of these sites is unlikely to support MRTA2 which requires that Development should protect areas designated for their local, national, or international importance, such as Gaps and the South Downs National Park. Mitigation is provided to a certain extent by MTRA2 with the requirement that development will need to be an appropriate scale and design although it is considered that development of these sites would lead to minor negative effects.</p> <p>The Brownfield sites including 2509, 381 and 329 (part) should be prioritised according to the requirements of policy DS1 and development of these sites could lead to major positive effects if they contain poor quality structures or disused land and their removal as part of new development will improve the quality of the area.</p> <p>Kings Worthy is considered to have limited local facilities<sup>1</sup> and it is anticipated that any increase in development around the village could exacerbate shortfall in facilities and services. In addition,</p>	--	+
	To create and sustain communities that meet the needs of the population and promote social inclusion			+

<sup>1</sup>MVA Consultancy (November 2008) Winchester District Local Development Framework Transport Assessment Report for Winchester City Council. Online at <http://www.winchester.gov.uk/planning-policy/evidence-base/infrastructure/> [Accessed June 2013]

<sup>2</sup>Winchester City Council (July 2011) Market Towns and Rural Area Development Strategy Background Paper, pp. 170. Online at <http://www.winchester.gov.uk/planning-policy/evidence-base/local-communities/market-towns-rural-area-development-strategy/> [Accessed May 201]

Winchester Local Plan Part 2: Development Management and Allocations  
Initial Sustainability Appraisal of Potential Allocations in Kings Worthy

Kings Worthy					
Sustainability Objective		Assessment of Effects			
		Nature of the likely sustainability effect (including positive/negative, short - medium term (5-10 years)/long term (10 - 20 years plus), permanent/temporary, secondary, cumulative and synergistic); Uncertainty			
		Site Refs: 2510, 364, 365, 2508, 381, 2509, 500, 2506 and 329			
		<p>secondary school provision and day centre capacity have been identified as being potential issues<sup>2</sup>. Most sites could provide space for additional facilities, which could give rise to minor long-term positive effects on communities. Greater opportunities exist for the sites within and adjoining the settlement boundary, in particular, the ones closest to the village centre (sites 2508, 2509 and 381) to have access to existing and provide additional facilities which would be easily accessible (within 400m) to the existing community in Kings Worthy. Development at these sites could lead to major positive effects of this SA Objective.</p> <p>Site 2510 could be at risk of being too remote (over 1600 m), lacking proper access to existing community facilities and assets, with the resulting new residents feeling isolated from the existing Kings Worthy Community. Development here is likely to result in major negative effects and it is considered that mitigation would be difficult to implement.</p> <p>Distances to services are discussed under SA Objective 5.</p>			
2	<p><b>Infrastructure</b></p> <p>To provide for the timely delivery of infrastructure suitable to meet community needs</p>	<p>All sites proposed are required to meet the requirements of policies: DS1 – Development Strategy and Principles; CP6 – Local Services and Facilities; CP7 Open Space, Recreation and Built facilities; CP15 – Green Infrastructure; and CP21 – Infrastructure and Community Benefit. Compliance with these policies will support this SA objective.</p> <p>Shortfalls have been identified for most types of open space including: Allotments, Equipped Children’s &amp; Young People’s Space; Informal Green Space; and Natural Green Space<sup>3</sup>. No shortfall has been identified for sports grounds. Any increase in development could put additional</p>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>-</td> <td>+</td> </tr> </table>	-	+
-	+				

<sup>3</sup>Winchester City Council (2013) LDF Core Strategy – Policy CP7 Open Space Standards. Public Open Space Assessment: Kings Worthy.

<sup>4</sup>Kings Worth Residents (February 2007) Kings Worthy and Abbots Worthy Village Design Statement. Online at <http://www.winchester.gov.uk/planning-policy/village-design-statements/kings-worthy-abbots-worthy-village-design-statement/>

<sup>5</sup>District level assets are described in: Enfusion and Winchester City Council (May 2010) Winchester City Council Local Development Framework – Green Infrastructure Study. Online at <http://www.winchester.gov.uk/planning-policy/evidence-base/environment/green-infrastructure-study-2010/> [Accessed June 2013]

Winchester Local Plan Part 2: Development Management and Allocations  
Initial Sustainability Appraisal of Potential Allocations in Kings Worthy

Kings Worthy			
Sustainability Objective		Assessment of Effects	
		Nature of the likely sustainability effect (including positive/negative, short - medium term (5-10 years)/long term (10 - 20 years plus), permanent/temporary, secondary, cumulative and synergistic); Uncertainty	
		Site Refs: 2510, 364, 365, 2508, 381, 2509, 500, 2506 and 329	
		<p>pressure on these areas and increase the shortfall and therefore is considered to have major negative effects. However, CP7 requires that new housing development should make provision for public open space and built facilities in accordance with the most up to date standards, preferably through on-site provision of new facilities where feasible or by financial contributions towards offsite improvements. This should reduce the negative effects to minor. The nature of the effect could be changed to positive if a firmer requirement to provide open space on the sites is included in the allocation policy wording.</p> <p>Furthermore, site 2508 has also been identified as being used for many years for dog walking and other informal recreation; and has a well-used footpath which crosses the land although it has no official status<sup>4</sup>. If this site is developed as proposed it could lead to a loss of this informal open space leading to minor negative effects.</p> <p>Kings Worthy has a number of District level strategic Green Infrastructure (GI) Assets<sup>5</sup> including: a good public right of way network; open space for example sports and recreation ground, allotments and parks (as specified in CP7); a SSSI; a SAC; and it is a gateway to the South Downs National Park. Development of any of the sites would not result in the loss of any GI assets. There are opportunities to link and create greater access to BAP habitats/ GI assets adjacent to sites 2506, 364, 365 and 500 through creation of new habitat on these sites which could lead to major positive effect. In addition, development of both site 2506 and site 500 could provide opportunities to enhance and provide additional rights of way through the sites to provide greater access to the GI assets. It would be recommended that for all the sites, specific requirements in their allocation wording to enhance and improve access to specific GI on and around them should be included. This will increase the certainty of positive effects.</p>	
3	Housing	All sites are likely to provide housing if developed and through compliance with the following policies, where applicable, this is likely to lead to major long-term positive effects on this SA	++

Winchester Local Plan Part 2: Development Management and Allocations  
Initial Sustainability Appraisal of Potential Allocations in Kings Worthy

Kings Worthy			
Sustainability Objective		Assessment of Effects	
		Nature of the likely sustainability effect (including positive/negative, short - medium term (5-10 years)/long term (10 - 20 years plus), permanent/temporary, secondary, cumulative and synergistic); Uncertainty	
		Site Refs: 2510, 364, 365, 2508, 381, 2509, 500, 2506 and 329	
	To provide good quality housing for all	Objective provided adequate types, tenures and sizes of housing are provided: (Policy CP 1 – Housing Provision; Policy CP 2 – Housing Provision and Mix; Policy CP3 – Affordable Housing Provision on Market Led Housing Sites; Policy CP4 – Affordable Housing on Exception Sites to Meet Local Needs; Policy CP5 - Sites for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople; Policy CP6 – Local Services and Facilities); Policy CP13 – High Quality Design; DS1 – Development Strategy and Principles.	
4	<p><b>Economy and Employment</b></p> <p>To maintain the buoyant economy and develop greater diversity that meets local needs</p>	<p>It is uncertain at this stage whether the sites will be mixed use or only provide for housing and as a result the majority of the effects on this Objective are considered to be uncertain at this stage. Minor short-term positive effects may be realised through an increase in employment during construction. None of the sites proposed, if developed, would result in the loss of existing employment land. Some of the larger sites could provide mixed used development such as 500 to provide additional services and business opportunities.</p> <p>Kings Worthy and Abbots Worthy have a high proportion of working families, the majority finding employment in Winchester, the Solent conurbation, Basingstoke and London. The villages provide a limited number of job opportunities, although many self-employed people work from a home base<sup>6</sup>. Kings Worthy is also considered to have limited local facilities<sup>7</sup>. Consideration should be given to creating a policy which would encourage business related development, in addition to housing.</p> <p>Kings Worthy could be considered to not have a defined village centre other than a few services located on London Road within the Conservation Area. Greater opportunities exist for sites near London Road (2509, 2508 and 381) to provide additional employment and services to help</p>	?

<sup>6</sup>Kings Worth Residents (February 2007) Kings Worthy and Abbots Worthy Village Design Statement. Online at <http://www.winchester.gov.uk/planning-policy/village-design-statements/kings-worthy-abbots-worthy-village-design-statement/>

<sup>7</sup>MVA Consultancy (November 2008) Winchester District Local Development Framework Transport Assessment Report for Winchester City Council. Online at <http://www.winchester.gov.uk/planning-policy/evidence-base/infrastructure/> [Accessed June 2013]

Winchester Local Plan Part 2: Development Management and Allocations  
Initial Sustainability Appraisal of Potential Allocations in Kings Worthy

Kings Worthy							
Sustainability Objective		Assessment of Effects					
		Nature of the likely sustainability effect (including positive/negative, short - medium term (5-10 years)/long term (10 - 20 years plus), permanent/temporary, secondary, cumulative and synergistic); Uncertainty					
		Site Refs: 2510, 364, 365, 2508, 381, 2509, 500, 2506 and 329					
		create/reinforce the village centre, improving it's' vitality and viability and therefore the local economy.  Distances to employment areas are discussed under SA Objective 5.					
5	<b>Transport</b>  To increase accessibility; reduce car usage and the need to travel	<p>All sites are within 400 m of bus stops within Kings Worthy and as a result are likely to lead to major positive effects on this Objective. The Spring Stagecoach runs 7 days/week with reduced service on Sundays and in the evenings and during the day buses run every 20 minutes through the village<sup>8</sup>. The buses provide transport to Winchester, New Alresford and to towns and villages further afield.</p> <p>In terms of access to other services and facilities including local employment, shops, healthcare and education facilities, the sites to the South-west and South-east are within 0 – 800m of these facilities and development at these sites would support this SA objective. Development of sites 2508, 2509 and 381 are likely to lead to major positive effects given their proximity (within 400 m) of most of the existing facilities. Site 2510 is likely to lead to major negative effects on this Objective given that it is over 1600 m from the majority of the existing facilities and services provided within Kings Worthy and it would be considered to be difficult provide mitigation for this site.</p> <p>It is likely that development at any of the site locations, will increase traffic on these roads, in particularly during construction, leading to short and long-term minor negative effects. If all the sites were taken forward, the cumulative effects could be increased to major negative. Appropriate phasing of sites and the requirement for an Environmental Management Plan to be</p>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>+</td> <td>--</td> </tr> <tr> <td>+</td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	+	--	+	
+	--						
+							

<sup>8</sup>The Kings Worthy Parish Plan Steering Group (December 2011) The Kings Worthy Parish Plan. Online at [http://www.theworthys.org.uk/OtherDocs/Parish\\_Plan\\_Report\\_Feb\\_2012.pdf](http://www.theworthys.org.uk/OtherDocs/Parish_Plan_Report_Feb_2012.pdf) [Accessed June 2013]

<sup>9</sup>Kings Worth Residents (February 2007) Kings Worthy and Abbots Worthy Village Design Statement. Online at <http://www.winchester.gov.uk/planning-policy/village-design-statements/kings-worthy-abbots-worthy-village-design-statement/>

Winchester Local Plan Part 2: Development Management and Allocations  
Initial Sustainability Appraisal of Potential Allocations in Kings Worthy

Kings Worthy			
Sustainability Objective		Assessment of Effects	
		Nature of the likely sustainability effect (including positive/negative, short - medium term (5-10 years)/long term (10 - 20 years plus), permanent/temporary, secondary, cumulative and synergistic); Uncertainty	
		Site Refs: 2510, 364, 365, 2508, 381, 2509, 500, 2506 and 329	
		<p>produced should be considered as mitigation for short effects within policy wording. In addition, mitigation is provided policy CP10 – Transport which seeks to encourage the use of non-car modes particularly walking and cycling. Currently, there are no cycle ways in Kings Worthy but development of the sites to the south adjoining the settlement boundary could provide a greater opportunity to develop a cycleway to link up with the one in Headbourne Worthy to provide greater cycling access to Winchester. Development of sites 2506 or 500 could provide opportunities to enhance and provide additional rights of way through the sites to provide greater access to the GI assets (please see SA Objective 2 for more details).</p> <p>Off-road parking for residential use has been identified as an issue in the Village<sup>9</sup>. Any development may worsen parking problems by bringing additional people into the area leading to permanent minor negative effects. All sites have the opportunity to provide off-street parking for new dwellings and businesses and mitigation is provided to a certain extent by policy CP10.</p>	
6	Health To improve the health	As explained under SA Objective 2, shortfalls have been identified with regard to the amount of Allotments <sup>10</sup> available for the community of Kings Worthy <sup>11</sup> . Any increase in development will increase the need for allotments making the shortfall greater and therefore development at any	- +

<sup>10</sup>Winchester City Council (2013) LDF Core Strategy – Policy CP7 Open Space Standards. Public Open Space Assessment: Kings Worthy.

<sup>11</sup>Winchester City Council (2013) LDF Core Strategy – Policy CP7 Open Space Standards. Public Open Space Assessment: Kings Worthy.

<sup>12</sup>Winchester City Council (March 2013) Winchester District Local Plan Part 1 0 Joint Core Strategy. Policy CP7 - Open Space, Sport and Recreation. Online at <http://www.winchester.gov.uk/planning-policy/local-plan-part-1/> [Accessed June 2013]



Kings Worthy	
Sustainability Objective	Assessment of Effects
	Nature of the likely sustainability effect (including positive/negative, short - medium term (5-10 years)/long term (10 - 20 years plus), permanent/temporary, secondary, cumulative and synergistic); Uncertainty
	Site Refs: 2510, 364, 365, 2508, 381, 2509, 500, 2506 and 329
and well being of all	<p>of the sites is considered to have minor negative effects on health. However, all sites could provide the opportunity to provide additional allotment land to address the current shortfall and the new demand from any additional development proposed. Greater opportunities exist for the sites within and adjoining the settlement boundary to the south-west and south-east to improve accessibility (within 480m<sup>12</sup>) to the existing households if they provide additional allotment space. The recommendation under SA Objective 2 requiring that development of any of the sites should include provision of new open space (including allotments), is applicable to this Objective.</p> <p>All the sites have the potential to provide good quality housing, additional or improved community facilities and open space and/ or employment opportunities which would result indirect minor positive effects on health and well being.</p> <p>With reference to the SA Objective Infrastructure, any improvement in access to GI which could encourage the community to exercise more will have long-term minor positive effects on health.</p> <p>It has been identified that healthcare facilities may be at capacity<sup>13</sup> and development at any of the sites could increase demand for these services and worsen the situation leading to long-term minor negative effects (without mitigation).</p> <p>Development of any of the sites will generate noise, light and dust in particular during construction and the majority of the sites are adjacent to existing residential uses. This could lead to both minor short-term to long-term negative effects on health. Mitigation for these effects has been suggested under the SA objective 15.</p>

<sup>13</sup>Winchester City Council (July 2011) Market Towns and Rural Area Development Strategy Background Paper, pp. 170. Online at <http://www.winchester.gov.uk/planning-policy/evidence-base/local-communities/market-towns-rural-area-development-strategy/> [Accessed May 201]

Winchester Local Plan Part 2: Development Management and Allocations  
Initial Sustainability Appraisal of Potential Allocations in Kings Worthy

Kings Worthy			
Sustainability Objective		Assessment of Effects	
		Nature of the likely sustainability effect (including positive/negative, short - medium term (5-10 years)/long term (10 - 20 years plus), permanent/temporary, secondary, cumulative and synergistic); Uncertainty	
		Site Refs: 2510, 364, 365, 2508, 381, 2509, 500, 2506 and 329	
7	<b>Water</b>  To protect, enhance and manage water resources in a sustainable way	A very small part of site 500 falls within an area of medium to high flood risk zone (2 and/or 3) <sup>14</sup> and it would be recommended that development would not be permitted in that part. In addition, all of the sites are located: on major aquifers which are all considered to be of high vulnerability; within an 'at risk' groundwater drinking protected area; and in groundwater source protection zones with sites 364, 365 and 2508 in zone 1, sites 2510, 329, part of 2506, 381 and 2509 in zone 2 and parts of site 500 being located in both zones 1 and 2. Short-term effects during construction (contaminated water-run off) and long-term effects on surface water through introduction of additional impermeable surfaces which could increase the risk of flooding in other areas. All the sites, if developed, are considered to lead to at major negative effects on water with development on sites 364, 365 and 2508 being of particularly high sensitivity. Mitigation is provided under CP17 – Flooding, Flood risk and the Water Environment which could reduce negative effects on these sites although this may be problematical and/ or expensive.	--
8	<b>Waste</b>  To ensure sustainable waste management	Not applicable at the site level as all sites can achieve this objective through meeting the requirements set out in the Local Plan Part 1 Policies (including Policy DS1 – Development Strategy and Principles).	+
9	<b>Climate Change</b>	Not applicable at the site level as all sites can achieve this objective through meeting the requirements set out in the Local Plan Part 1 Policies (including CP11 – Sustainable Low and Zero	+

<sup>14</sup>Environment Agency (2013) Maps. Online at ([http\](http://maps.environment-agency.gov.uk))maps.environment-agency.gov.uk [accessed May 2013]

Kings Worthy			
Sustainability Objective		Assessment of Effects	
		Nature of the likely sustainability effect (including positive/negative, short - medium term (5-10 years)/long term (10 - 20 years plus), permanent/temporary, secondary, cumulative and synergistic); Uncertainty	
		Site Refs: 2510, 364, 365, 2508, 381, 2509, 500, 2506 and 329	
	To address the causes of climate change and to mitigate and adapt in line with Winchester's Climate Change Strategy	Carbon Built Development; DS1 – Development Strategy and Principles; CP11 – Sustainable Low and Zero Carbon Built Development and CP12 – Renewable and Decentralised Energy.	
10	<b>Sustainable Construction</b>  To promote the sustainable design and construction of buildings and places	Not applicable at the site level as all sites can achieve this objective through meeting the requirements set out in the Local Plan Part 1 Policies (including CP11 – Sustainable Low and Zero Carbon Built Development and CP12 – Renewable; and Decentralised Energy; CP14 – Effective Use of Land).	
11	<b>Biodiversity</b>  To conserve and enhance biodiversity	There are no International, national or local nature conservation designations on or adjacent to any of the development sites <sup>15</sup> .  Sites 329 and 2508 contain or partly contain BAP priority habitat of deciduous woodland <sup>16</sup> . Development on these sites would have the potential to permanently destroy the habitats leading to minor long-term negative effects on biodiversity. Development of these sites could also increase habitat fragmentation. However, site 329 covers existing housing/gardens and it is recommended that a survey should be undertaken to determine the continued presence of BAP habitat. There are opportunities to link and create greater access to BAP habitats adjacent to sites 2506, 364, 365	-   0

<sup>15</sup>Defra (2013) Magic – Statutory Rural Designations. Online at <http://magic.defra.gov.uk> [accessed May 2013].

<sup>16</sup>Defra (2013) Magic – Statutory Rural Designations. Online at <http://magic.defra.gov.uk> [accessed May 2013].

Winchester Local Plan Part 2: Development Management and Allocations  
Initial Sustainability Appraisal of Potential Allocations in Kings Worthy

Kings Worthy			
Sustainability Objective		Assessment of Effects	
		Nature of the likely sustainability effect (including positive/negative, short - medium term (5-10 years)/long term (10 - 20 years plus), permanent/temporary, secondary, cumulative and synergistic); Uncertainty	
		Site Refs: 2510, 364, 365, 2508, 381, 2509, 500, 2506 and 329	
		and 500 through creation of new habitat on these sites.  The potential for protected species is unknown at this stage although the likelihood of their occurrence is greater on the BAP sites and sites with Tree Preservation Orders (see SA Objective 13 for more details). Temporary disturbance may be likely during construction. Mitigation with the requirement to undertake relevant assessment or survey prior to submission of a planning application is provided by policy CP16 - Biodiversity. It is anticipated that for sites without the BAP habitats and other habitats that the residual affect on protected species with be neutral with mitigation provided by CP16.	
12	<b>Heritage</b>  To protect and enhance built and cultural heritage	Only one site (381) is located within the Kings Worthy conservation area with sites 2508 adjacent to it and site 365 is adjacent to the Abbots Worthy Conservation Area. Sites 381 and 2508 are also located within a County designated historic park. The development of these sites could have the potential to affect the character and appearance of the conservation area if developed <sup>17</sup> . In addition, sites 2508 and 365 have the potential to affect the settings of listed buildings adjacent to their boundaries if developed <sup>18</sup> . Any new development on these sites could erode the historic character of the area leading to long-term minor negative effects. Furthermore, the potential for archaeology assets on all other sites is unknown at this stage although given the rich heritage of the area, the potential is likely to be high on all sites (in particular on sites closest to the centre and the scheduled monument). Protection/ mitigation for all heritage assets is provided by policies CP20 – Heritage and Landscape Character; and DS1 – Development Strategy and Principles. This should prevent/ reduce negative effects to neutral.  The northern part of site 500 is designated as a scheduled monument and it would be	0 x

<sup>17</sup> Winchester City Council (July 2011) Market Towns and Rural Area Development Strategy Background Paper, pp. 170. Online at <http://www.winchester.gov.uk/planning-policy/evidence-base/local-communities/market-towns-rural-area-development-strategy/> [Accessed May 201]

<sup>18</sup>English Heritage (2013) National Heritage List for England. Online at <http://list.english-heritage.org.uk/mapsearch.aspx> [accessed May 2013]

Winchester Local Plan Part 2: Development Management and Allocations  
Initial Sustainability Appraisal of Potential Allocations in Kings Worthy

Kings Worthy							
Sustainability Objective		Assessment of Effects					
		Nature of the likely sustainability effect (including positive/negative, short - medium term (5-10 years)/long term (10 - 20 years plus), permanent/temporary, secondary, cumulative and synergistic); Uncertainty					
		Site Refs: 2510, 364, 365, 2508, 381, 2509, 500, 2506 and 329					
		recommended that this part of the site is removed from the development otherwise this would present an absolute constraint. Given the presence of the scheduled monument on this site it is likely that there will be archaeology present on other parts of the site and potentially on sites 2506 and the undeveloped part of 329. It would be recommended that it should be a requirement of the site allocation policy for sites 500, 2506 and 329 to include the need to carry out an archaeological investigation prior to development.					
13	<p><b>Landscape &amp; Soils</b></p> <p>To protect and enhance the character and quality of the landscape of Winchester District</p>	<p>A few of the sites would result in the loss (in part or completely) of agricultural land grade 3a and above including 365, 364, 500 and 2508<sup>19</sup>. This could lead to major long-term negative effects on soils. Furthermore, all of the sites are situated within a Groundwater and Eutrophic Nitrate Vulnerable Zone (NVZ). There are no known mineral reserves under any of the sites proposed<sup>20</sup>.</p> <p>The majority of the sites are located on Greenfield land outside of the settlement boundary except for sites 381, 2509 and part of 329. Development on greenfield land could be detrimental to Kings Worthy's' landscape character areas of North Itchen Downs (for areas to the east and north-east), Wonston Downs (areas to the west and north) and Upper Itchen Valley (areas to south)<sup>21</sup>. In addition, the sites outside of the settlement boundary to the south and east are considered to be highly sensitive to development<sup>22</sup> and are within a settlement gap as defined by policy CP18 of</p>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>--</td> <td>+</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>+</td> </tr> </table>	--	+		+
--	+						
	+						

<sup>19</sup>Defra (2013) Magic – Statutory Rural Designations. Online at <http://magic.defra.gov.uk> [accessed June 2013].

<sup>20</sup>Winchester City Council (2012) Local Plan Part 1 – Proposals Map – Minerals and Waste Sites. Online at <http://www.winchester.gov.uk/planning-policy> [Accessed June 2013]

<sup>21</sup>Winchester City Council and Hampshire County Council (March 2004) Landscape Character Assessment for Winchester District. Online at <http://www.winchester.gov.uk/planning/landscape---countryside/landscape-character-assessment/> [Accessed June 2013]

<sup>22</sup>Winchester City Council (2013) Landscape Appraisal: Kings Worthy DRAFT

<sup>23</sup>Kings Worth Residents (February 2007) Kings Worthy and Abbots Worthy Village Design Statement. Online at <http://www.winchester.gov.uk/planning-policy/village-design-statements/kings-worthy-abbots-worthy-village-design-statement/>

Winchester Local Plan Part 2: Development Management and Allocations  
Initial Sustainability Appraisal of Potential Allocations in Kings Worthy

Kings Worthy					
Sustainability Objective		Assessment of Effects			
		Nature of the likely sustainability effect (including positive/negative, short - medium term (5-10 years)/long term (10 - 20 years plus), permanent/temporary, secondary, cumulative and synergistic); Uncertainty			
		Site Refs: 2510, 364, 365, 2508, 381, 2509, 500, 2506 and 329			
		<p>the Local Plan Part 1 and that they may damage important views in and across Kings Worthy<sup>23</sup>. Development of these sites could have major long-term negative effects through increasing the risk of coalescence and harming the settlement character and local distinctiveness of the Kings Worthy and Abbots Worthy.</p> <p>Sites 2508, 500 and 329 contain trees with tree preservation orders and if developed there is a chance that these could be removed and as a result amenity value could be lost. This could lead to minor negative effects on landscape in the long-term. Although mitigation to a certain extent is offered under CP 20, it would be recommended that if these sites were developed, that there should be a requirement under policy to retain trees covered by TPOs.</p> <p>Sites 2509, 381 and part of 329 are located on Brownfield land within the settlement boundary and have fewer landscape constraints than the other areas and therefore they are considered to be less sensitive than other location in terms of impact on the setting of Kings Worthy. Development of these sites could lead to major positive effects as they are likely to contain poor quality structures or disused land and their removal as part of new development will improve the quality of the area.</p>			
14	<p><b>Built Environment</b></p> <p>To secure high standards of design</p>	<p>The following sets out the sites which if developed as proposed would not meet the guidelines set out in the Kings Worthy and Abbots Worthy Village Design Statement (VDS) and lead to minor negative effects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Development of sites 2510, 364 and 365 could potential affect important views in and across Kings Worthy<sup>24</sup> and therefore not meet the requirements of D2.</li> <li>■ Site 2508 and the edges of site 365 have been identified as housing important vegetation. Development at these sites could remove vegetation unless mitigation is put in place to</li> </ul>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>-</td> <td>+</td> </tr> </table>	-	+
-	+				

<sup>24</sup>Kings Worth Residents (February 2007) Kings Worthy and Abbots Worthy Village Design Statement. Online at <http://www.winchester.gov.uk/planning-policy/village-design-statements/kings-worthy-abbots-worthy-village-design-statement/>

Winchester Local Plan Part 2: Development Management and Allocations  
Initial Sustainability Appraisal of Potential Allocations in Kings Worthy

Kings Worthy			
Sustainability Objective		Assessment of Effects	
		Nature of the likely sustainability effect (including positive/negative, short - medium term (5-10 years)/long term (10 - 20 years plus), permanent/temporary, secondary, cumulative and synergistic); Uncertainty	
		Site Refs: 2510, 364, 365, 2508, 381, 2509, 500, 2506 and 329	
		<p>protect it and therefore not meet the requirements of D7.</p> <p>With the exception of the above, it is expected that all the guidelines set out in the VDS can be met by development at the majority of sites.</p> <p>All sites can partly achieve this SA objective through meeting the requirements set out in the Local Plan Part 1 Policies (including DS1 – Development Strategy and Principles; and CP13 – High quality design) and vision.</p>	
15	<p><b>Pollution</b></p> <p>Minimise local and global sources of pollution</p>	<p>None of the sites are in or adjacent to an AQMA or overhead power cables. All the sites are located in water sensitive areas, in particular, sites 364, 365 and 2508 (see SA Objective No. 7) and therefore these sites are considered to be more vulnerable to pollution resulting from development. In addition, the potential for contamination is unknown for all of the sites although the Brownfield sites are more likely to contain contaminants than the Greenfield sites. However, sites 500 and 2506 are adjacent to a historic landfill site and therefore there could be a higher chance of encountering contaminants.</p> <p>Sites 500 and 2506 are adjacent to the main railway line and the A34 therefore there could be potential noise issues negatively affecting new residential development. It would be recommended that part of the sites to the west next to the railway line is set aside for GI which will benefit infrastructure and biodiversity as well as providing mitigation for noise.</p> <p>Development of any of the sites will generate noise, light and dust in particular during construction and the majority of the sites are adjacent to existing residential uses. This could lead to both minor short-term to long-term negative effects on pollution. Appropriate phasing of sites, time restrictions on development during the day and night, and the requirement for an Environmental Management Plan to be produced should be considered as mitigation within policy wording.</p>	-

Kings Worthy	
Sustainability Objective	Assessment of Effects
	Nature of the likely sustainability effect (including positive/negative, short - medium term (5-10 years)/long term (10 - 20 years plus), permanent/temporary, secondary, cumulative and synergistic); Uncertainty
	Site Refs: 2510, 364, 365, 2508, 381, 2509, 500, 2506 and 329
<p><b>Summary of Key Negative and Positive Effects for Sustainable Development:</b></p> <p>The assessment has found that the sites located in the southern half of Kings Worthy and sites within the settlement boundary are likely to positively progress the majority of the SA Objectives compared to other sites. The majority of sites are likely to lead to minor positive effects on the SA Objectives of: Waste; Climate Change; Sustainable Construction; Built Environment (high quality design); and Health (opportunity to provide good quality housing). Minor negative effects have generally been found for each site with regard to the SA Objectives of: Transport (traffic); Pollution; and Health (lack of allotment provision, healthcare facilities and short-term construction effects). Neutral effects were identified for the majority of sites (except for 500) for the SA Objective of Heritage as it was considered that the protection/ mitigation for all heritage assets provided by policies CP20 – Heritage and Landscape Character; and DS1 – Development Strategy and Principles was sufficient to reduce identified potential negative effects. Furthermore, uncertain effects were identified for all of the sites in relation to Economy and Employment as it is not known at this stage whether employment land will be provided on any of the sites.</p> <p><b>Key Negative Effects:</b></p> <p>The northern part of site 500 is designated as a scheduled monument and this would present an absolute constraint.</p> <p>Major negative effects have been identified for the following SA Objectives: Building Communities – Site 2510 given its remoteness from the existing community facilities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Water - All the sites as they are located in one or more of the flowing: in medium to high flood risk zones; on major aquifers with high or intermediate vulnerability; groundwater drinking water protected area at risk; and in a groundwater source protection zone.</li> <li>■ Landscape and Soils – Major effects have been identified because they are located within a settlement Gap and/ or loss of high grade agricultural land. Sites: outside of the settlement boundary to the south and east including 365, 364, 500 and 2508.</li> <li>■ Transport – cumulative effects if all sites are taken forward.</li> </ul> <p><b>Key Positive Effects:</b></p> <p>Major positive effects have been identified for the following SA Objectives:</p>	



Kings Worthy	
Sustainability Objective	Assessment of Effects
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Building Communities – Sites 381, 2508, 2509 and part of 329.</li> <li>■ Housing – all sites are expected to provide a certain level of housing to help address local needs within the settlement and District level needs.</li> <li>■ Transport – All sites in terms of access to public transport and sites 381, 2508 and 2509 due to proximity to existing service and facilities.</li> <li>■ Landscape and Soils – The Brownfield sites: 2509, 381 and part of 329</li> </ul> <p><b>Mitigation, Recommendations and Residual Effects for Plan-making</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ A very small part of site 500 falls within an area of medium to high flood risk zone and it would be recommended that development would not be permitted in that part if the site is taken forward.</li> <li>■ If sites 500 and 2506 are taken forward, it would be recommended that part of the sites to the west next to the railway line is set aside for GI which will benefit infrastructure and biodiversity as well as providing mitigation for noise.</li> <li>■ It would be recommended that development of any of the sites should include provision of new open space including allotments. This would lead to positive effects on Health and also Infrastructure.</li> <li>■ It would be recommended that for all the sites, specific requirements in any allocation wording to enhance and improve access to GI on and around them should be included. This would increase the certainty of positive effects on Infrastructure.</li> <li>■ Appropriate phasing of sites, time restrictions on development during the day and night, and the requirement for an Environmental Management Plan to be produced should be considered as mitigation within policy wording. This will help reduce negative effects identified for the SA Objectives Pollution, Health and Transport.</li> <li>■ If sites 2508, 500 and 329 are taken forward, it would be recommended that there should be a requirement under policy to retain trees covered by TPOs and this would prevent the negative effects on landscape identified.</li> <li>■ The northern part of site 500 is designated as a scheduled monument and it would be recommended that this part of the site is removed from the development if taken forward; otherwise this would present an absolute constraint.</li> <li>■ It would be recommended that it should be a requirement of the site allocation policy for sites 500, 2506 and 329 to include the need to carry out an archaeological investigation prior to development. This would prevent any negative effects.</li> </ul>	

## **Appendix I: Sustainability Appraisal Framework for Local Plan Part 1 and Sustainability Appraisal Framework Tailored for Site Allocations in the Local Plan Part 2**

The 'decision aiding questions' for the sites have been formulated by:

- Identifying appropriate policies in the Local Plan Part 1 which set out requirements for sites to adhere to and removing the questions which refer to those requirements;
- Where 'decision aiding questions' from the Local Plan Part 1 address effects in addition to those covered by higher level policies (Local Plan Part 1 and other national requirements), they have been amended to make them more relevant to the site level (shown in Blue);
- Inserting relevant assessment criteria from the Local Plan Part 2 Site Selection Checklist, where appropriate (shown in Red);
- Including additional questions (shown in green).

	SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL (SA) OBJECTIVE	DECISION-AIDING QUESTIONS - LOCAL PLAN PART 1 (ALSO TO BE USED FOR POLICIES IN LOCAL PLAN PART 2 OR A NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN)	DECISION-AIDING QUESTIONS – FOR SITE ALLOCATIONS IN LOCAL PAN PART 2 or a NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
<b>1</b>	<b>Building Communities</b> <i>SEA topics: Population</i>		
	<b>To create and sustain communities that meet the needs of the population and promote social inclusion</b>	<p>Does the option/policy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Help provide facilities for social interaction</li> <li>▪ Promote diverse communities and meet a range of housing needs</li> <li>▪ Ensure inclusion of all sections of the community</li> <li>▪ Ensure equality of access to services</li> <li>▪ Integrate new and existing communities</li> <li>▪ Encourage community cohesion and a sense of community ownership</li> <li>▪ Reduce social exclusion of disadvantaged groups</li> <li>▪ Meet the needs of an ageing population</li> </ul>	<p>All development proposed on the sites are required to meet DS1 – Development Strategy and Principles and CP21 – Infrastructure and Community Benefit. Housing needs are covered in SA Objective 3.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ How does the site deliver the vision as set out in Policies WT1/SH1 or MTRA1 of LPP1?</li> <li>▪ How does the site deliver the locally derived vision and objectives identified by the community?</li> <li>▪ Could the site provide space for facilities for social interaction?</li> <li>▪ Does the site allow for equality of access to services? Please refer to objective 5 – transport for distances to services.</li> </ul>
<b>2</b>	<b>Infrastructure</b> <i>SEA topics: Material Assets</i>		

	<p><b>To provide for the timely delivery of infrastructure suitable to meet community needs</b></p>	<p>Does the option/policy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Support the provision of community facilities, for example cultural, health, recreational and social facilities.</li> <li>▪ Encourage the enhancement of green infrastructure (strategic network of protected sites, nature reserves, greenspaces, and greenway linkages)</li> <li>▪ Ensure the delivery of infrastructure that meets the needs of new and existing development</li> <li>▪ Ensure appropriate timing and phasing</li> </ul>	<p>All sites proposed are required to meet the requirements of policies: DS1 – Development Strategy and Principles; CP6 – Local Services and Facilities; CP7 Open Space, Recreation and Built facilities; CP15 – Green Infrastructure; and CP21 – Infrastructure and Community Benefit.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Could the site provide space to deliver enhancement of green infrastructure and open space and provide linkages to existing local network of protected sites, nature reserves, greenspaces, and greenway linkages (e.g. footpaths)?</li> <li>▪ Will the development of the site result in the loss of green infrastructure identified in: the Green Infrastructure Study 2010; PUSH GI Strategy; PUSH Implementation Framework 2012; or land identified in the 2012/13 Open Space Strategy?</li> <li>▪ Will the development of the site result in the loss of a local facility or service or registered community assets?</li> <li>▪ Is the site within the specified distances of other facilities as identified in Policy CP7 - Open Space, Sport and Recreation?</li> </ul>
<p><b>3</b></p>	<p><b>Housing</b> <i>SEA topics: Population</i></p>		
	<p><b>To provide good quality housing for all</b></p>	<p>Does the option/policy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Deliver affordable and sustainable housing both in urban and rural areas, in keeping with local character</li> <li>▪ Support the sympathetic accommodation of housing growth in sustainable locations</li> </ul>	<p>Sites which provide for residential development can achieve the requirements set out in the decision aiding questions through the following Local Plan Part 1 Policies, where applicable, ( Policy CP 1 – Housing Provision; Policy CP 2 – Housing Provision and Mix;</p>

Winchester Local Plan Part 2: Development Management and Allocations  
Initial Sustainability Appraisal of Potential Allocations in Kings Worthy

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Balance housing and employment land delivery with community facilities and environmental capacity</li> <li>Provide for an appropriate mix of dwelling size, type, density and phasing to meet local needs</li> <li>Provide for a range of housing to meet the needs of specific groups, (e.g. the elderly, disabled, young, Gypsies and Travellers) and adaptable housing that meets the needs of people in different life stages</li> </ul>	<p>Policy CP3 – Affordable Housing Provision on Market Led Housing Sites; Policy CP4 – Affordable Housing on Exception Sites to Meet Local Needs; Policy CP5 - Sites for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople; Policy CP6 – Local Services and Facilities); Policy CP13 – High Quality Design; DS1 – Development Strategy and Principles.</p>
<b>4</b>	<b>Economy and Employment</b>		
	<i>SEA topics: Population</i>		
	<p><b>To maintain the buoyant economy and develop greater diversity that meets local needs</b></p>	<p>Does the option/policy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide a diverse range of jobs that meet the needs of local people</li> <li>Ensure jobs are located in sustainable locations</li> <li>Support the rural economy</li> <li>Reduce both out commuting and in commuting</li> <li>Help maintain WinchesterCity as a major focus of learning and education</li> <li>Assist in the retention of young people and graduates</li> <li>Recognise the role of tourism in the local economy</li> <li>Support retail diversity across the district</li> <li>Support live work units &amp; working from home</li> <li>Balance suitable employment with housing growth</li> <li>Encourage environmentally and socially responsible employment and help to create local markets for local goods/services</li> <li>Aim towards establishing a low carbon</li> </ul>	<p>Sites which propose mixed use or employment related development sites are required to meet the requirements of Policies: CP8 – Economic Growth; CP9 – Retention of Employment Land and Premises; and DS1 – Development Strategy and Principles.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How well is the site located in relation to places of employment? Please refer to objective 5 – transport for distances to employment.</li> <li>Would the use of the site lead to a loss of employment land/ jobs?</li> <li>Could the site provide a balance between housing and local employment opportunities and local community facilities and retail?</li> </ul>

		economy for Winchester District	
<b>5</b>	<b>Transport</b> <i>SEA topics: Air, Climatic Factors, Population, Material Assets</i>		
	<b>To increase accessibility; reduce car usage and the need to travel</b>	<p>Does the option/policy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Support delivery of quality public transport that is accessible to all sections of the community</li> <li>▪ Enable the enhancement of a District-wide network of footpaths and cycle links between settlements, homes and work and community facilities</li> <li>▪ Support the need to reduce travel, especially during peak times</li> <li>▪ Locate new development to reduce the need to travel</li> <li>▪ Help create an integrated sustainable transport system, for example through providing for safe storage for cycles, respect for users of shared road space, green lane linkages</li> <li>▪ Adopt maximum parking standards</li> </ul>	<p>All sites proposed are required to meet the requirements of Policies CP10 – Transport and DS1 – Development Strategy and Principles.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Is the site served well by public transport (i.e. frequency of service every hour on days when a bus service operates<sup>25</sup>)?</li> <li>▪ Is the site within walking distance (ideally between 400 to 800 m<sup>26</sup>) of a number of services and facilities including<sup>27</sup>: opportunities for local employment; Bus stop; and Local facilities which could include (shop, health and education facilities)?</li> <li>▪ Is there safe access to and from the site (pedestrian, cycle and vehicle) to the facilities mentioned above, onto an adopted road with pavements to key facilities?</li> <li>▪ Are there any existing transport infrastructure issues in the local area such as congestion, single track roads, and accident hotspots which development of the site could exacerbate?</li> <li>▪ Is access to and from the site (pedestrian, cycle and vehicle) to the facilities mentioned above, constrained by topography?</li> <li>▪ Could the site enable the enhancement of a local network of footpaths and cycle links between settlements, homes and work and community facilities?</li> </ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Could the site help create an integrated sustainable transport system, for example through providing for shared road space, green lane linkages?</li> </ul>
<b>6</b>	<b>Health</b> <i>SEA topics: Human Health</i>		
	<b>To improve the health and well being of all</b>	<p>Does the option/policy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Protect and increase the provision of and accessibility to community, cultural and recreational facilities</li> <li>Require design that ensures safe, attractive places and engenders a sense of place</li> <li>Require design that promotes healthy lifestyles and increased physical activity</li> <li>Increase accessibility to health facilities and encourage multi-functional use of facilities</li> <li>Ensure residents have access to healthy and affordable food through, for example, the provision of allotments</li> </ul>	<p>All sites proposed are required to meet Policy DS1 – Development Strategy and Principles.</p> <p>Design is dealt with under Objective 14.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will the site improve access to healthy and affordable food through, for example, the provision of allotments? Through meeting the specified standards in CP7.</li> <li>Is there access to community, cultural facilities by walking/ cycling and access open space, sport and recreational facilities? Please refer to Objective 5 – transport for distances to community and cultural facilities and Objective 2 – Infrastructure for open space, sport and recreational facilities.</li> </ul>
<b>7</b>	<b>Water</b> <i>SEA topics: Water, Climatic Factors, Biodiversity, Health</i>		
	<b>To protect, enhance and manage water resources in a sustainable way</b>	<p>Does the option/policy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Require the use of water efficiency measures</li> <li>Manage and minimise risk of flooding including regard to future climate change (promotion of adaptation measures)</li> <li>Promote the adoption and use of sustainable drainage systems</li> <li>Protect ground and surface water sources: quality &amp; quantity</li> <li>Progress compatibility with the objectives of</li> </ul>	<p>All sites proposed are required to meet Policies: CP11 – Sustainable Low and Zero Carbon Built Development; DS1 – Development Strategy and Principles; and CP17 – Flooding, Flood risk and the Water Environment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is the site Flood Zone 2 or 3?</li> <li>Are there any known problems with flooding on the site?</li> <li>Is the site in a ground water protection zone, safeguarded zone, water protection zone and/ or</li> </ul>

Winchester Local Plan Part 2: Development Management and Allocations  
Initial Sustainability Appraisal of Potential Allocations in Kings Worthy

		<p>the Water Framework directive</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Promote access to water for recreation, enjoyment and understanding (including valued biodiversity/ habitats)</li> </ul>	<p>situated on major aquifer with high/ intermediate vulnerability?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is there potential for adverse effects on the quality of ground and surface water sources?</li> </ul>
<b>8</b>	<b>Waste</b> <i>SEA topics: Material Assets</i>		
	<b>To ensure sustainable waste management</b>	<p>Does the option/policy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Help reduce waste and facilitate recycling in construction and operation</li> <li>Encourage composting</li> <li>Encourage development that is self-sufficient in waste management</li> <li>Support the recovery of energy from waste</li> </ul>	<p>Not applicable at the site level as all sites can achieve this objective through meeting the requirements set out in the Local Plan Part 1 Policies (including Policy DS1 – Development Strategy and Principles).</p>
<b>9</b>	<b>Climate Change</b> <i>SEA topics: Climatic Factors, Air, Water</i>		
	<b>To address the causes of climate change and to mitigate and adapt in line with Winchester's Climate Change Strategy</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Promote renewable energy generation</li> <li>Help reduce carbon and other greenhouse gas emissions</li> <li>Ensure adaptation planning that maximises opportunities and minimises the costs of climate change.</li> <li>Promote community involvement, understanding and action on climate change</li> </ul>	<p>Not applicable at the site level as all sites can achieve this objective through meeting the requirements set out in the Local Plan Part 1 Policies (including DS1 – Development Strategy and Principles; CP11 – Sustainable Low and Zero Carbon Built Development and CP12 – Renewable and Decentralised Energy).</p>
<b>10</b>	<b>Sustainable Construction</b> <i>SEA topics: Air, Water, Climatic Factors, Material assets</i>		
	<b>To promote the sustainable design and construction of buildings and places</b>	<p>Does the option/policy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ensure the incorporation of energy and water efficiency measures and renewables in new development aiming for zero carbon dwellings and workplaces</li> </ul>	<p>Not applicable at the site level as all sites can achieve this objective through meeting the requirements set out in the Local Plan Part 1 Policies (including CP11 – Sustainable Low and Zero Carbon Built Development and CP12 – Renewable;; and Decentralised Energy;</p>



Winchester Local Plan Part 2: Development Management and Allocations  
Initial Sustainability Appraisal of Potential Allocations in Kings Worthy

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Seek higher density in new development in appropriate locations</li> <li>Require the use of sustainable building standards (Code for Sustainable Homes, BREEAM)</li> <li>Promote locally and sustainably sourced (e.g. recycled) materials in construction and renovation</li> </ul>	CP14 – Effective Use of Land).
<b>11</b>	<b>Biodiversity</b> <i>SEA topics: Biodiversity, Fauna and Flora</i>		
	<b>To conserve and enhance biodiversity</b>	<p>Does the option/policy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Protect and enhance designated and locally valued habitats and species</li> <li>Prevent and reverse habitat fragmentation, where possible promote understanding of and access to biodiversity</li> <li>Provide opportunities for provision and enhancement of a network of greenspaces.</li> </ul>	<p>All sites proposed are required to meet Policies: CP16 – Biodiversity; DS1 – Development Strategy and Principles; and CP15 – Green Infrastructure, when developed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does the whole or part of the site or is the site near to a designated site (international, European, national or local)?</li> <li>Does the site contain any protected species?</li> <li>Are there any locally valued habitats and or species (non-recorded biodiversity interests) present or adjacent, for example: Mature hedgerows, traditional orchards, veteran trees etc.?</li> </ul> <p>Could the site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Have any adverse impact on any designated sites or protected species (International, European, National or Local) and/ or on any locally valued habitats and species (non-recorded biodiversity interests)?</li> <li>Have potential to enhance designated and locally valued habitats and species?</li> <li>Provide space to reverse habitat fragmentation?</li> </ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Provide opportunities for provision and enhancement of a network of greenspaces using an ecosystems approach?</li> <li>▪ Are there streams, rivers, lakes or other watercourses/ aquatic habitat on or within 200m of the site<sup>28</sup>?</li> <li>▪ Is the site within 500m of a large<sup>29</sup> pond?</li> <li>▪ Will development of this site affect any structure or features that could be habitats for protected species?</li> </ul>
<b>12</b>	<b>Heritage</b> <i>SEA topics: Cultural Heritage</i>		
	<b>To protect and enhance built and cultural heritage</b>	<p>Does the option/policy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Protect and where appropriate, enhance the historical and archaeological environment (landscapes, sites, buildings and settings), including resources of local value</li> <li>▪ Support, develop and where appropriate, enhance and increase access to cultural &amp; heritage resources and activities</li> <li>▪ Help accommodate new development without detriment to the existing built and cultural heritage</li> </ul>	<p>All proposed development on all the sites are required to meet Policies: CP20 – Heritage and Landscape Character; and DS1 – Development Strategy and Principles.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Does the site contain or is it close to heritage assets including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Scheduled Monuments</li> <li>○ Conservation Areas</li> <li>○ Listed Buildings</li> <li>○ Archaeological sites (recorded and non-recorded)</li> <li>○ Historic Parks and Gardens</li> <li>○ Existing landscape and townscape character?</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ Would the use of the site increase access to local cultural and heritage resources and activities?</li> <li>▪ Could the site accommodate new development without detriment to the existing local built and cultural heritage?</li> <li>▪ Could the site have an adverse impact on the historical and archaeological environment (landscapes, sites, buildings and settings), including</li> </ul>

			<p>resources of local value?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Could the site enhance the historical and archaeological environment (landscapes, sites, buildings and settings), including resources of local value?</li> </ul>
<b>13</b>	<b>Landscape &amp; Soils</b> <i>SEA topics: Landscape, Soils</i>		
	<p><b>To protect and enhance the character and quality of the landscape of Winchester District</b></p>	<p>Does the option/policy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Minimise adverse impact on the landscape setting of the city, towns and rural settlements</li> <li>Prioritise the use of previously developed land to minimise greenfield development</li> <li>Conserve and enhance the natural beauty of the South Downs National Park, and locally designated landscapes</li> <li>To protect soil resources and manage in a sustainable way</li> </ul>	<p>All development on proposed sites is required to meet Policies: CP20 – Heritage and Landscape Character.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Could the site adversely impact on the landscape setting of the city, towns and rural settlements?</li> <li>Is the site classified as previously developed land or Greenfield? Prioritise the reusing of land that has been previously developed (brownfield land), provided that it is not of high environmental value.</li> <li>Could the site contribute towards conserving and enhancing: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>recognised built form and designed or natural landscapes that include features and elements of natural beauty, cultural or historic importance;</li> <li>local distinctiveness, especially in terms of characteristic materials, trees, built form and layout, tranquillity, sense of place and setting.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Could the use of the site protect soil resources or would it result in the loss of high grade (1 – 3a) agricultural land?</li> <li>Is the site within a defined settlement gap (LPP1 Policy CP18)?</li> <li>Is the site or part of the site underlain by mineral reserves? Is extraction possible within the timeframe of the plan or could it be extracted prior to development?</li> </ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is the site or part of the site in a Nitrate Vulnerable Zone?</li> </ul>
<b>14</b>	<b>Built Environment</b> <i>SEA topics: Cultural heritage, Population, Material Assets</i>		
	<b>To secure high standards of design</b>	<p>Does the option/policy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Promote recognition of local distinctiveness and a sense of place in style, materials and scale within the public realm</li> <li>Make best use of existing buildings through reuse and conversion</li> <li>Promote innovation in sustainable design for new and heritage development</li> <li>Promote integration of new development with existing context/design</li> <li>Recognise the role of the community in securing good design e.g. Village design statements, community planning</li> </ul>	<p>All sites can achieve the requirements set out in the Local Plan Part 1 Policies (including DS1 – Development Strategy and Principles; and CP13 –High quality design.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Would the development of the site be in keeping with the character and sense of place of the local area and where applicable, aid with the delivery of locally derived design principles as set through a Village Design Statement/ Neighbourhood Design Statement?</li> </ul>
<b>15</b>	<b>Pollution</b> <i>SEA topics: Air, Climatic Factors, Human Health, Soils, Water</i>		
	<b>Minimise local and global sources of pollution</b>	<p>Does the option/policy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improve air quality, e.g. through transport management and reduction of employment related emissions</li> <li>Reduce and manage noise pollution</li> <li>Reduce and manage the impact of light pollution</li> <li>Ensure there is no pollution of water sources</li> <li>Ensure there is no pollution of the soil</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will the use of the site result in an increase in air, noise, light, water, odour and soil pollution in the area?</li> <li>Is there a risk of contamination on the site?</li> <li>Are there overhead power cables on the site?</li> <li>Is the site a known landfill site?</li> <li>Are there any adjacent uses to the site which may cause noise, light, odour or air pollution conflicts?</li> <li>Is the site in or adjacent to an AQMA?</li> </ul>

## Appendix II: Thresholds for landscape and Transport for Potential Allocation Sites

Five thresholds of development potential have been produced, ranging from absolute sustainability constraints (red), through issues for sustainability that may be mitigated or negotiated (orange and yellow) (although some effects may be more difficult or expensive to address than others), to sites that have no constraints (light green) or where development may be encouraged as it would help to resolve particular sustainability issues (dark green). The thresholds for landscape and transport have been set out below as these are considered to be the main sustainability differentiators for potential allocation sites covered by Winchester Local Plan: Part 2 (LPP2).

Each category is judged according to its own standards and methods of assessment. There is no weighting or scoring, with colours being used to help consider potential effects. The aim is to make comparisons between sites and areas easier and help identify which sites are more sustainable. The development potential and environmental constraint categories may change, as may site gradings as work on the evidence base and LPP2 preparation evolves and further information on a particular site becomes available. For example, for many categories a precautionary principle has underpinned the current assessment, but when further information is available, such as through site surveys, the grading can be amended to reflect this.

\* Relevant assessment criteria from the Local Plan Part 2 Site Selection Checklist, where appropriate (shown in Red).

Threshold for Landscape and soils		
<b>X</b>	Absolute sustainability constraints	The site is underlain by mineral reserves with extraction not possible within the timeframe of the plan. Brownfield land with high environmental value <sup>30</sup> or Greenfield land with high environmental value.
<b>--</b>	Sustainability issues; mitigation considered problematic and/or expensive	Major negative effect on the landscape setting of the city, towns and rural settlements and: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ recognised built form and designed or natural landscapes that include features and elements of natural beauty, cultural or historic importance;</li> <li>○ local distinctiveness, especially in terms of characteristic materials, trees, built form and layout, tranquillity, sense of place and setting.</li> </ul> <p style="color: red;">The site within a defined settlement gap (LPP1 Policy CP18).</p>

Winchester Local Plan Part 2: Development Management and Allocations  
Initial Sustainability Appraisal of Potential Allocations in Kings Worthy

		<p>The site is underlain or partly underlain by mineral reserves with extraction either not possible or uncertain prior to development.</p> <p>The use of the site would result in the loss of high grade (1 – 3a) agricultural land.</p> <p>Brownfield land which has moderate environmental value or Greenfield land with moderate environmental value.</p>
-	Sustainability issues; mitigation considered achievable	<p>Minor negative effect on the landscape setting of the city, towns and rural settlements and:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ recognised built form and designed or natural landscapes that include features and elements of natural beauty, cultural or historic importance;</li> <li>○ local distinctiveness, especially in terms of characteristic materials, trees, built form and layout, tranquillity, sense of place and setting.</li> </ul> <p>The site is underlain or partly underlain by mineral reserves with extraction possible prior to development.</p> <p>Brownfield land which has low environmental value or Greenfield land with low environmental value.</p>
+	No sustainability constraints	<p>Minor positive effect on the landscape setting of the city, towns and rural settlements and it could contribute towards conserving:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ recognised built form and designed or natural landscapes that include features and elements of natural beauty, cultural or historic importance;</li> <li>○ local distinctiveness, especially in terms of characteristic materials, trees, built form and layout, tranquillity, sense of place and setting.</li> </ul> <p>Brownfield land which has negligible environmental value and Greenfield Land negligible environmental value.</p>
++	Development will support Sustainable Objectives	<p>Major positive on the landscape setting of the city, towns and rural settlements and could contribute towards conserving and enhancing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ recognised built form and designed or natural landscapes that include features and elements of natural beauty, cultural or historic importance;</li> <li>○ local distinctiveness, especially in terms of characteristic materials, trees, built form and layout, tranquillity, sense of place and setting.</li> </ul> <p>Brownfield land which has negligible environmental value and contaminated land remediated to restore soil resource.</p>

**Threshold for Transport**

Winchester Local Plan Part 2: Development Management and Allocations  
Initial Sustainability Appraisal of Potential Allocations in Kings Worthy

X	Absolute sustainability constraints	<p>Safe access to and from the site (pedestrian, cycle and vehicle) to the facilities mentioned above, is not achievable onto an adopted road. There are no pavements to facilities.</p> <p>There are major existing transport infrastructure issues in the local area such as congestion, single track roads, and accident hotspots.</p> <p>Access to and from the site (pedestrian, cycle and vehicle) to the facilities mentioned above, is majorly constrained by topography (for example – a steep hill).</p>
--	Sustainability issues; mitigation considered problematic	<p>The site is <b>not</b> within walking distance (over 1600 m<sup>31</sup>) of a number of services and facilities including<sup>32</sup>: opportunities for local employment; Bus stop; and Local facilities which could include (shop, health and education facilities)?</p> <p>Safe access to and from the site (pedestrian, cycle and vehicle) to the facilities mentioned above, is problematic onto an adopted road. Pavements to key facilities (food stores, health and education) are only available part of the way and cannot be connected.</p> <p>There are moderate existing transport infrastructure issues in the local area such as congestion, single track roads, and accident hotspots.</p> <p>The site is served well by public transport (frequency of service more than 2 hours on days when bus operates).</p> <p>Access to and from the site (pedestrian, cycle and vehicle) to the facilities mentioned above, is moderately to majorly constrained by topography.</p>
-	Sustainability issues; mitigation considered achievable	<p>The site <b>is</b> within walking distance (800 to 1600 m<sup>33</sup>) of a number of services and facilities including<sup>34</sup>: opportunities for local employment; Bus stop; and Local facilities which could include (shop, health and education facilities)?</p> <p>Safe access to and from the site (pedestrian, cycle and vehicle) to the facilities mentioned above, is achievable onto an adopted road. Pavements to key facilities (food stores, health and education) are available part of the way and could be connected.</p> <p>There are minor existing transport infrastructure issues in the local area such as congestion, single track roads, and accident hotspots.</p> <p>The site is served well by public transport (frequency of service every 1 – 2 hours on days when bus operates).</p> <p>Access to and from the site (pedestrian, cycle and vehicle) to the facilities mentioned above, is slightly to moderately</p>

Winchester Local Plan Part 2: Development Management and Allocations  
Initial Sustainability Appraisal of Potential Allocations in Kings Worthy

		constrained by typography.
+	No sustainability constraints	<p>The site <b>is</b> within walking distance (400 to 800 m<sup>35</sup>) of a number of services and facilities including<sup>36</sup>: opportunities for local employment; Bus stop; and Local facilities which could include (shop, health and education facilities)?</p> <p>The site is served well by public transport (frequency of service every hour on days when bus operates).</p> <p>Access to and from the site (pedestrian, cycle and vehicle) to the facilities mentioned above, is slightly constrained by typography.</p> <p>The site can enable the enhancement of a local network of footpaths and cycle links between settlements, homes and work and community facilities.</p> <p>The site can help create an integrated sustainable transport system, for example through providing for safe storage for cycles, respect for users of shared road space, green lane linkages.</p> <p>There is safe access to and from the site (pedestrian, cycle and vehicle) to the facilities mentioned above, onto an adopted road with pavements.</p> <p>There are no existing transport infrastructure issues in the local area such as congestion, single track roads, and accident hotspots.</p>
++	Development	The site <b>is</b> within walking distance (0 to 400 m <sup>37</sup> ) of a number of services and facilities including <sup>38</sup> : opportunities for



Winchester Local Plan Part 2: Development Management and Allocations  
Initial Sustainability Appraisal of Potential Allocations in Kings Worthy

	<p>will support Sustainable Objectives</p>	<p>local employment; Bus stop; and Local facilities which could include (shop, health and education facilities)?</p> <p>The site is served well by public transport (frequency of service every hour on days when bus operates).</p> <p>Access to and from the site (pedestrian, cycle and vehicle) to the facilities mentioned above, is not constrained by typography.</p> <p>The site can enable the enhancement of a local network of footpaths and cycle links between settlements, homes and work and community facilities.</p> <p>The site can help create an integrated sustainable transport system, for example through providing for safe storage for cycles, respect for users of shared road space, green lane linkages.</p> <p>There is safe access to and from the site (pedestrian, cycle and vehicle) to the facilities mentioned above, onto an adopted road with pavements.</p> <p>There are no existing transport infrastructure issues in the local area such as congestion, single track roads, and accident hotspots.</p>
--	--	--