

Appendix 3. Sustainability Appraisal

1. Since the Earth Summit in Rio in 1992, environmental, and subsequently, sustainability issues have been firmly set on the agenda. Sustainable development, which means ensuring that the needs of the present are met without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their needs, is an important issue for local government, as custodian of our environment.
2. Development plans lie at the heart of the planning system and planning decisions are taken in accordance with these plans unless material considerations dictate otherwise. Planning Policy Guidance (PPG) notes have emphasised the need for local authorities to encompass a wide range of environmental, social and economic issues and one way of ensuring such issues are addressed fully, is to undertake a sustainability appraisal of the development plan policies as they are being drawn up. This is in accordance with PPG 12: Development Plans, which expects all local authorities to undertake an appraisal of their development plan.
3. The main aim of a sustainability appraisal is to ensure that the policies in the development plan are compatible with each other and the general sustainability aims. Where policies fail to be compatible or sustainable, they should be reassessed to see if amendments should be made. As a result, the sustainability appraisal is an ongoing process, and should evolve with any changes to the local plan policies.
4. As part of the appraisal process, a scoping exercise was carried out of all the Planning Policy Guidance notes in the early stages of preparing the Plan to ensure that the Local Plan reflected the main aims and objectives of Government advice. Following on from this, the methodology for the appraisal was derived from the Department of the Environment Good Practice Guide: Environmental Appraisal of Development Plans, 1993. This formed the basis of the appraisal, although a broader approach was used, encompassing sustainability issues, such as social and economic criteria as well as environmental ones.
5. The 13 Local Government Management Board Key Themes to a Sustainable Community (1994) formed the basis for devising 28 more detailed tests/indicators. The 13 themes and 28 tests/indicators are as follows:

CRITERION	DESCRIPTION	TESTS / INDICATORS
1 RESOURCES	Resource consumption (energy, materials, land etc.) is reduced, resources are used efficiently, waste is minimised and reuse/recycling encouraged.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Land Use ● Resource Use ● Protection of Resources
2 POLLUTION	Pollution (of air, noise, water etc.) is limited to levels which natural systems can cope without damage.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Pollution ● Transport
3 BIODIVERSITY	The diversity of nature is valued and protected, and accessible to all.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Protection of Diversity ● Access to wildlife/nature sites
4 LOCAL NEEDS	Wherever possible, all local needs are satisfied by local service, production and supply.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Provision ● Use
5 BASIC NEEDS	Everyone has access to good food, water, shelter and fuel at affordable costs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Housing Provision ● Equality
6 SATISFYING WORK	Opportunities are available for all to undertake satisfying work in a diverse economy, recognising the value of informal unpaid work, and paying fairly.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Economy ● Employment
7 HEALTH	Safe, clean, pleasant surroundings support the work of the health services that emphasise prevention of illness as well as care.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Treatment ● Prevention
8 ACCESS	Access to facilities, services, jobs, goods and people is achieved at minimal environmental cost and is not determined by car ownership or income.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Access
9 SAFETY	People live without fear of violence from crime or persecution because of beliefs, race, gender, income, disability or sexuality.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Crime ● Fear of Crime ● Road Safety

Appendix 3. Sustainability Appraisal

CRITERION	DESCRIPTION	TESTS / INDICATORS
10 KNOWLEDGE	Everyone has access to skills, knowledge and information necessary to enable them to play a full part in society.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Self-Development ● Sustainability Awareness
11 EMPOWERMENT	All sections of the community are empowered to participate in decision-making at all levels and in all areas of society.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Involvement ● Equity
12 LEISURE	Diverse cultural, leisure and recreation opportunities are readily available to all, and can be generated by people themselves.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Provision ● Access
13 DISTINCTIVENESS	Places, spaces, settlements, buildings, landscapes and objects are designed to value and protect local diversity, uniqueness, identity and distinctiveness.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Protection of Built Environment ● Urban Design uniqueness, ● Local Identity

RDAPP3.01

6. The **Revised** Deposit Local Plan contains **454 155** proposals, each of which have been appraised against the 28 tests/indicators using a Sustainability Matrix. Each Local Plan proposal 'scored' one of the following:

- √ Positive Effect
- ?√ Possible Positive Effect
- × Negative Effect
- ?× Possible Negative Effect
- ? Uncertain Overall Effect
- ∅ Neutral - no relationship or insignificant impact

The results of this scoring process are summarised in the tables on the following pages.

7. Any proposals which emerged as being in conflict with the criteria were identified and re-examined in an attempt to redress the conflict. A summary of the main areas of conflict is contained in the following section of this Appendix.

Overview

8. The Proposals in the Review Local Plan have been rigorously scored against the 28 criteria, which resulted in a number of negative scores. In some instances the Proposals were amended slightly to reduce some negative aspects. In other cases the negative scores are offset by positive scores against other criteria, the requirements of other Proposals in the Plan, or result from a requirement of other agencies, such as the Government, or Hampshire County Council, as the Local Plan must be in conformity with them. As a result, there is limited scope to amend Proposals where they continue to score negatively.
9. This Appendix contains a summary matrix of all the Proposal scores. It is not intended that the whole document will be published, although it is available for public inspection at the Planning Department.

Appendix 3. Sustainability Appraisal

	RT12	RT11	RT10	RT9	RT8	RT7	RT6	RT5	RT4	RT3	RT2	RT1	SF6	SF5	SF4	SF3	SF2	SF1	E7	E6	E5	E4	E3	E2	E1	H10	H9	H8	H7	H6	H5		
	x	x	x	x	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	x	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	Land Use	
	x	x	x	x	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	Resource Use	
	x	x	x	x	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	Protection of Resources	
	x	x	x	x	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	Pollution	
	x	x	x	x	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	Transport	
	x	x	x	x	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	Protection of Diversity	
	x	x	x	x	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	Access to wildlife/nature sites	
	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	Local Needs Provision	
	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	Local Needs Use	
	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	Housing Provision	
	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	Basic Needs Equality	
	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	Economy	
	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	Employment	
	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	Health Treatment	
	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	Health Prevention	
	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	Access	
	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	Crime	
	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	Fear of Crime
	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	Road Safety	
	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	Self-development
	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	Sustainability Awareness
	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	Involvement
	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	Equity
	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	Leisure Provision
	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	Leisure Access
	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	Protection of the Built Environment
	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	Urban Design
	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	Local Identity

Appendix 3. Sustainability Appraisal

	S1	NC3	NC2	NC1	W10	W9	W8	W7	W6	W5	W4	W3	W2	W1	T12	T11	T10	T9	T8	T7	T6	T5	T4	T3	T2	T1	RT18 2x	RT17 2x	RT16 2x	RT15	RT14	RT13	
Land Use	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Land Use
Resource Use	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Resource Use
Protection of Resources	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Protection of Resources
Pollution	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Pollution
Transport	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Transport
Protection of Diversity	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Protection of Diversity
Access to wildlife/nature sites	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Access to wildlife/nature sites
Local Needs Provision	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Local Needs Provision
Local Needs Use	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Local Needs Use
Housing Provision	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Housing Provision
Basic Needs Equality	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Basic Needs Equality
Economy	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Economy
Employment	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Employment
Health Treatment	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Health Treatment
Health Prevention	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Health Prevention
Access	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Access
Crime	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Crime
Fear of Crime	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Fear of Crime
Road Safety	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Road Safety
Self-development	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Self-development
Sustainability Awareness	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Sustainability Awareness
Involvement	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Involvement
Equity	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Equity
Leisure Provision	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Leisure Provision
Leisure Access	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Leisure Access
Protection of the Built Environment	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Protection of the Built Environment
Urban Design	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Urban Design
Local Identity	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Local Identity

Appendix 3. Sustainability Appraisal



S.23	S.22	S.21	S.20	S.19	S.18	S.17	S.16	S.15	S.14	S.13	S.12	S.11	S.10	S.9	S.8	S.7	S.6	S.5	S.4	S.3	S.2		
✓	×	×	×	×	×	✓	✓	✓	✓	×	×	×	∅	×	×	✓	∅	?	✓	✓	✓	Land Use	
✓	×	×	×	×	×	✓	✓	✓	✓	×	×	×	∅	×	×	✓	∅	∅	✓	∅	∅	Resource Use	
∅	×	×	×	×	×	✓	✓	∅	✓	×	×	×	∅	×	×	✓	∅	∅	×	∅	∅	Protection of Resources	
✓	×	×	×	×	×	✓	✓	∅	✓	×	×	×	✓	×	×	✓	∅	∅	✓	∅	∅	Pollution	
∅	×	×	×	×	×	✓	✓	✓	✓	×	×	×	✓	×	×	✓	∅	∅	✓	∅	∅	Transport	
✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	∅	∅	∅	∅	✓	✓	✓	∅	✓	✓	∅	∅	?	∅	∅	∅	Protection of Diversity	
∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	✓	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	Access to wildlife/nature sites	
∅	✓	✓	✓	∅	∅	✓	✓	✓	✓	∅	∅	∅	∅	✓	✓	✓	∅	∅	✓	✓	✓	Local Needs Provision	
∅	✓	✓	✓	∅	∅	✓	✓	✓	✓	∅	∅	∅	✓	✓	✓	✓	∅	∅	✓	✓	✓	Local Needs Use	
∅	∅	∅	∅	✓	✓	✓	✓	∅	✓	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	✓	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	Housing Provision	
∅	∅	∅	∅	✓	✓	✓	✓	∅	✓	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	✓	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	Basic Needs Equality	
?	✓	✓	✓	∅	∅	✓	✓	∅	✓	∅	∅	∅	∅	✓	✓	✓	∅	∅	✓	✓	✓	Economy	
∅	✓	✓	✓	∅	∅	✓	✓	∅	✓	∅	∅	∅	∅	✓	✓	✓	∅	∅	✓	✓	✓	Employment	
∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	Health Treatment	
∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	Health Prevention	
∅	?	?	?	?	?	✓	✓	?	?	?	?	?	✓	?	?	?	✓	∅	?	∅	∅	Access	
∅	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Crime
∅	∅	∅	∅	✓	✓	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	Fear of Crime	
∅	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	∅	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	∅	∅	✓	✓	Road Safety	
∅	✓	✓	✓	∅	∅	✓	✓	∅	✓	✓	✓	✓	∅	∅	∅	✓	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	Self-development	
∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	Sustainability Awareness	
∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	Involvement	
∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	Equity	
∅	∅	∅	∅	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	∅	✓	✓	∅	∅	∅	✓	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	Leisure Provision	
∅	∅	∅	∅	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	∅	✓	✓	∅	∅	∅	✓	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	Leisure Access	
∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	✓	✓	∅	✓	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Protection of the Built Environment	
∅	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	∅	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Urban Design	
✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	∅	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Local Identity	

Proposals where conflict arises

Design and Development Principles

- RDAPP3.03** ~~10. Proposal DP.7 seeks the provision of adequate garden space with residential developments. In doing so, the Proposal could lead to development of a low density or may affect the types of residential development provided. This in turn could have a negative impact upon land use and people's basic needs, such as choice and equality issues. As a result, this proposal was modified to require amenity space instead of private gardens. Although an improvement on the original Proposal, it could still have a slight negative impact on land use. The Proposal is, however, needed to protect the amenities of local residents. Other Proposals in the Plan, including DP.1 and DP.3, ensure optimal use of land is made in conjunction with a design led approach to development.~~
11. Proposal DP.8 seeks more energy efficient development, which may have a slightly negative impact upon housing provision. Energy efficient technology can cost more to install and these costs could be transferred to house buyers, thus reducing the 'affordability' of houses. However, many energy efficiency measures can be implemented without significant extra cost and should result in lower fuel bills. The Proposal is in accordance with Government guidance and the aims of the Proposal outweigh any possible disbenefits.
 12. Proposals DP.10 and DP.11 seek to reduce the amount of run-off from development and avoid development on floodplains. Such an approach could lead to a slightly lower density of development, thus requiring more land. However, the approach taken is in accordance with Government guidance and seeks to reduce flooding problems. It may be possible to overcome many of the issues with adequate flood protection and mitigation measures.
 13. Proposals DP.13 and DP.14 seek to reduce the impact of pollution generating developments and unneighbourly uses, by locating them away from residential uses. As a result, such development could occur on greenfield land and on sites which are not as easily accessible as those in more central locations. There are also possible negative impacts upon the local economy as sites are not as attractive for businesses, and urban design issues where such uses require unusual building shapes/sizes which may be out of character, or contain uses which are incompatible, with the surrounding area. However, it is important to protect the amenities of local residents and these uses will only be permitted in exceptional circumstances rather than as the norm.
 14. Proposal DP.16 seeks to redevelop contaminated land and ensure suitable remedial measures are implemented to prevent risk to future uses. Such requirements to clean up sites means that the Proposal scores negatively on basic needs issues such as housing and equality as the costs of the clean-up will be passed on to the cost of the housing development, therefore reducing the choice and 'affordability' of housing. It may also have an impact upon land use, as these areas may become less attractive to developers with the additional burdens imposed on them, thus they will look for alternative sites. However, cleaning up these sites is positive and will minimise the need for greenfield land.

Countryside

15. Proposals C.1 – C.4 and C.17 do not permit residential development within the countryside, or more specifically, within the defined Strategic and Local Gaps. This could have a negative effect on provision of a mix of housing types, sizes and costs for people in rural areas. However, the protection of settlement and landscape character and local amenities, as well as the prevention of urban sprawl, are consistent with Government advice and, with the aims of developing on brownfield sites within the settlements.
16. Proposals C.12 and C.13 allow development in rural areas for agricultural or forestry uses in certain circumstances. This may have a slightly negative impact upon the character, appearance and local identity of these areas as such developments can require larger and more unsightly buildings. However, with changes in agriculture and the rural economy, it is necessary to be flexible and, with careful planning, it should be possible to minimise the impact.
17. Proposals C.14 - C.16 allow rural enterprises and farm diversification in certain circumstances. In addition, Proposal C.27 permits the development of recreation and tourist facilities in the countryside. However, due to the rural locations, these may not be situated in easily accessible locations, which can have a negative impact upon traffic generation and access. However, a balance needs to be struck between keeping the rural economy healthy and transport issues; both of which will be fully considered

Appendix 3. Sustainability Appraisal

when assessing each case. The Transport Proposals in the Plan seek to minimise car use and encourage alternative modes. As a result, the City Council will seek locations which are as accessible as possible, and may also require companies to produce Green Travel Plans to show how they aim to reduce the need to travel by car.

Historic Environment

18. Proposals HE.4 – HE.16 all score slightly negatively on safety grounds, particularly on reducing the opportunities for crime to occur, with improved design and landscaping. This is largely down to the protection of the features within historic environments, including walls, trees and other landscape features, which may prevent good surveillance and visibility. Many of these Proposals also score slightly negatively on reducing the fear of crime for similar reasons. However, it is important to retain those landscape features of historic environments which form an important part of the District's character. There may be some scope in new development to design landscaping to take safety into account.
19. Proposals HE.4 – HE.6 and HE.13 – HE.16 may also score negatively on equality and equity because they impose additional controls on development within Conservation Areas, especially upon Listed Buildings, which may restrict the development of a range of house types and sizes. This is in accordance with Government advice, which stresses the importance of encouraging good design and protecting the character of these areas. However, other proposals in the Plan, such as Proposal H.7, encourage a mix of housing types and sizes on all sites of two or more dwellings.
20. Proposal HE.17 relates to the re-use of rural buildings of historical or architectural interest for employment or storage uses. This scores negatively on access issues due to the rural locations involved. However, keeping such buildings in some sort of use may be preferable to them falling into disrepair, although access issues will be considered when determining the application.

Housing

21. Proposal H.1 sets out the general housing requirements for the plan period in accordance with the Hampshire County Structure Plan Review. It incorporates the Major Development Area (MDA) allocations which are designated on greenfield sites. As a result, this proposal scores negatively on all of the resource and pollution criteria. However, the remainder of the housing is to be incorporated into the settlements on brownfield sites, which will address these issues. There were also a number of 'uncertain' scores, which it should be possible to overcome with other proposals in the Plan, particularly relating to the protection of nature and local identity issues, which should be addressed with good design (Proposal DP.3).
22. Proposals H.2 – H.4 score slightly negatively on pollution by virtue of the fact that more housing could add to the amount of air, noise and light pollution, simply because there is more development within an area. This is likely to be the case wherever housing is located, although the impacts can be minimised by locating development in built-up areas in comparison to rural areas, where the overall impact would be much greater. Restricting development to the existing built-up areas should minimise any impacts upon ground, surface and drinking water, as the infrastructure is already in place, whilst there is also potential to reduce the amount of contaminated and derelict land.
23. Proposal H.6 permits small-scale housing schemes as an exception to other Proposals of the Plan where they will meet the needs of local people who are unable to afford to rent or buy property on the open market. As a result, housing may be permitted on greenfield sites outside the settlement boundary, resulting in negative scores for land and resource use, as well as pollution and transport. This could be as a result of the sites being on the edge of settlements and not close to existing facilities and services. However, there is a lack of affordable housing within the district, and not permitting such development could seriously compromise people's access to their basic needs.
24. Proposals H.9 and H.10 allow mobile homes to be located within the settlements where they can be accommodated without detriment to the area, and restricting their change of use. Due to the nature of mobile homes, they can often be out of character with the locality and therefore, score negatively on urban design and local identity. There is little scope to improve such developments, as can be achieved with buildings, except with the aid of suitable landscaping and by restricting them to settlements outside of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. These types of development also score negatively on prevention of health problems, as they do not reduce the factors contributing to ill-health, and could

exacerbate them. However, they provide an important source of affordable housing to some sectors of society, which is under-provided in the District.

Employment

25. Proposals E.1 – E.4 score uncertainly on transport and health prevention as it is not known what impact employment development may have, being dependent upon the type of development allowed. However, there are a number of Proposals in the Plan which should minimise any likely impacts on nearby residents and also seek development in locations which are accessible by a choice of mode of transport. These should overcome any possible negative aspects of employment development.

26. Proposals E.5 and E.6 relate to development on Ministry of Defence (MoD) sites, which are situated in countryside locations. Due to their locations, they score slightly negatively on transport and access grounds. However, should they be vacated, they will represent significant brownfield sites and should be redeveloped prior to the use of greenfield sites, in accordance with Government advice, thus having a positive score for resource and pollution issues.

RDAPP3.04 ~~27. Proposal E.7 safeguards additional land for MoD activity at HMS Dryad. As the safeguarded land is currently countryside, the Proposal scores negatively on land use, and also slightly negatively on transport and access. However, the MoD has drawn up a comprehensive Establishment Development Brief for HMS Dryad, which involves substantial redevelopment of the existing site before expansion is considered. Given the limited control the local planning authority has on MoD activities, Proposal E.7 seeks to minimise any negative impacts as much as possible.~~

Town Centres, Shopping and Facilities and Services

28. Proposal SF.2 permits A3 uses within town centres where they will not harm nearby residential properties or the character of the area. There is a slight possibility that allowing uses such as pubs, which are open until late at night, may score slightly negatively on crime and fear of crime. This is due to rowdy and antisocial behaviour which may result from people leaving these premises. However, such uses may also help to create a more vibrant place, whereby there are more people on the streets throughout the day and night, offering greater natural surveillance and thus reducing opportunities for crime to occur and the fear of crime. The Proposal accords with Government advice which seeks to create a mix of uses in town centres, and the benefits of encouraging such mixed uses should outweigh any disbenefits.

29. Proposal SF.4 restricts uses within the defined Primary Shopping Area to retail uses at ground floor level. This results in a slightly negative score for leisure provision as it will not be permitted within these areas. However, the Proposal is in accordance with Government guidance, seeking to retain a mix of uses within town centres. Retaining retail uses in the core area whilst permitting other mixes of uses on upper floors and within the rest of the town centre should ensure its vitality and viability are maintained.

RDAPP3.05 **New Proposal (RD08.19) provides for development that is essential for the operation of existing further and higher education establishments in the countryside. As these sites are in rural locations they score negatively on transport and protection of resources issues. However these may be alleviated in part by the requirements for an impact assessment to be carried out to assess the consequences of any increase in student numbers in terms of sustainability. Indeed, the opportunity for students to live closer to the establishments at which they study may actually reduce the need to travel.**

Recreation and Tourism

30. Nearly all the Proposals in this Chapter score slightly negatively on land use and many on the protection of resources. This is due to the protection of land for recreational use within the settlements, or allowing recreational uses in the countryside. Both could have implications for the availability of land for development within the settlements and using greenfield land in the countryside. However, it is important to provide adequate recreational and amenity facilities for local residents to improve their quality of life. In addition, some recreational facilities are of a type which need to be located in a rural area, either because of the noise generated, or the amount of land needed, for example golf courses. As a result, recreational and tourism development is permitted in certain locations, although there are tight controls on them, afforded by other Proposals of the Plan.

31. Proposals RT.10 – RT.12 all score quite negatively on pollution and biodiversity issues, due to the rural

locations involved. There are also uncertain impacts on access and road safety. However, these proposals relate to equestrian uses, golf and noisy sports, all of which require rural locations. The proposals have a number of criteria which seek to control their development, for example, equestrian development must be located where there are bridleways nearby to avoid exacerbating conflicts on rural roads. As a result, any negative impacts should be minimised by these criteria and other Proposals in the Plan.

32. Proposals RT.15 – RT.18 relate to tourist and leisure facilities in the countryside, which also score slightly negatively on transport and access. Once again, this is due to the rural locations involved and their relative lack of accessibility. However, there are controls over such development, which will not be permitted in certain locations, whilst other Proposals in the Plan seek to minimise any possible negative aspects.

Transport

33. Proposals T.6 – T.10 have an uncertain score for land use. This is because they allow for development which will improve integrated and more sustainable modes of transport. These may require additional land to develop such facilities, which could result in a negative impact on land use. However, such facilities are likely to occur within built-up areas, where most people will be able to use them, and thus, should be able to recycle existing developed land. Any such development will still need to be in accordance with other Proposals in the Plan which seek to protect the character of the District.
34. Proposals T.11 and T.12 permit new road construction in two locations, as well as permitting others where it is needed to ameliorate serious environmental and/or safety problems. Thus they score negatively on land use. They also score slightly negatively on protection of resources, transport and protection of biodiversity. In addition, it is uncertain what the impacts will be on resource use, pollution and access. New roads will have a negative impact on the local environment, in terms of the use of land, and may generate additional traffic with its associated pollution. It may also encourage more traffic onto the road, or it could shorten existing journeys. Other Proposals in the Plan encourage more sustainable modes of travel and new roads are not generally permitted, although the two proposed are necessary to deal with local traffic issues. As a result, new roads are the exception to the rule, and other Proposals in the Plan should ensure that they are only considered as a last resort where a particular need arises.

Winchester

35. Proposal W.1 seeks to protect the character and landscape setting of Winchester. As a result, there are tighter controls on development, which may result in a slightly negative impact upon equality. However, it is desirable to retain the character and setting of Winchester, and with the implementation of good design (Proposal DP.3), it is possible to overcome this in certain locations.
36. Proposal W.2 relates to the allocation of an area of open land on the edge of the City for recreation and tourism uses. As a result, it scores slightly negatively on land use and negatively on transport. Any development of the site is likely to generate additional traffic movement, possibly from a wider catchment area, although the Proposal seeks good public transport and cycle facilities and footpaths to try to provide a choice of access to the site. There is a shortfall of recreation facilities in Winchester and this site provides a good opportunity to address the shortfall.
37. Proposal W.3 also scored negatively on land use and slightly negatively for resource use and protection of resources. Proposal W.3 allows for the development of additional Park and Ride facilities to serve the city, in accordance with the Local Transport Plan. These are likely to be built on greenfield sites on the edge of the city due to a lack of available land within the city, thus possibly posing a threat to resources. However, the Proposal has strict criteria to avoid any undue harm to the setting and character of the city and is necessary to conform with the Local Transport Plan.
38. Proposal W.6 has an uncertain score relating to local needs use and fear of crime. Limiting non-residential parking may reduce access to local facilities and services, especially by car. However, at the same time, it may improve conditions for access by alternative modes, such as walking or cycling. Reducing parking may require people to park further from the facility or service, which can increase the fear of crime, particularly for women on their own. However, this may also increase the numbers of people walking and thus increase passive surveillance and careful design of car parks may improve perceptions.

New Communities

39. Proposals NC.2 and NC.3 relate to the development of a Major Development Areas (MDA) at West of Waterlooville, possible 'reserve' allocations at Winchester City (north), and an additional 1000 houses at West of Waterlooville. The MDAs have been allocated on greenfield sites, which score negatively on resource, pollution and biodiversity issues, with a possible negative effect on the local environment and local distinctiveness. However, these MDAs have been allocated in the Hampshire County Structure Plan Review and the Local Plan must allocate them to be in conformity with the Structure Plan. As a result, there is no scope to amend these Proposals, although their content seeks to ensure a Master Plan for the developments are drawn up in order to plan the developments in a comprehensive way to minimise their impacts.

Settlements

40. Proposals S.4, S.7, S.14 and S.16 - S.17 all score slightly negatively on protection of resources and transport. These Proposals are employment allocations located in the settlements around the District. As a result, they represent the development of previously developed land (which could possibly have otherwise been used for housing) and could generate additional traffic. There are also uncertain implications for access in these locations, as they may reduce local commuting if employees live locally, or generate additional commuting if they live further away. However, these proposals are in accordance with Government advice, which seeks to make settlements more self-contained and reduce the need to travel. These employment sites offer some local employment and provide the opportunity to reduce the need to travel to work.
41. Proposals S.8 – S.9, S.13 and S.20 – S.22 generally relate to employment sites within the countryside around the rural settlements. They are greenfield allocations, situated adjoining the settlements or on new land included within the settlement boundary at Whiteley. As a result, they score negatively on land use, resource use, protection of resources, pollution, transport and slightly negatively on protection of diversity. There is also uncertainty over access issues. However, it is desirable to provide for employment close to where people live and create a diverse economic base in the District. These proposals are in accordance with Government advice, which seeks to make settlements more self-contained and reduce the need to travel. These employment sites offer the potential to provide some local employment and may help reduce the need to travel to work, which is in accordance with Government guidance.
42. Proposals S.11 – S.12 and S.18 – S.19 are housing allocations within the settlements. These were allocated in the adopted Local Plan and have been carried forward for completion. They score very similarly to the Proposals listed in paragraph 39, although the access issue was uncertain. There is little scope to amend these policies as development is committed, although higher densities may be sought where possible, in accordance with PPG 3: Housing.
43. Proposal S.15 proposes a new footpath along a disused railway line between Kings Worthy and Winchester. This has a slightly negative score for crime due to the rural nature of the footpath and the limited opportunities that exist to design out crime. However, the benefits of the footpath link should outweigh any disbenefits, and as more people use the footpath, passive surveillance will improve.