



Winchester District Local Development Framework



Sustainability Appraisal/ Strategic Environmental Assessment



of the



Winchester District Local Plan- Part 1 Joint Core Strategy: Submission



June 2012



enfusion



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

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

SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT

| | | |
|---------------------------|---|-----------------|
| <i>date:</i> | <i>June 2012</i> | |
| <i>prepared for:</i> | <i>Winchester City Council</i> | |
| <i>prepared by:</i> | <i>Barbara Carroll Liz Payne Alastair Peattie Ruth Thomas</i> | <i>Enfusion</i> |
| <i>quality assurance:</i> | <i>Toney Hallahan</i> | <i>Enfusion</i> |

enfusion
environmental planning and management for sustainability



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

SA of Winchester's Local Plan Part 1 – Joint Core Strategy: Submission Sustainability Appraisal (SA)

CONTENTS

NON-TECHNICAL SUMMARY

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Purpose of The SA and the SA Report
Core Strategy: DPD Contents and Objectives
Summary Of Compliance with the SEA Directive/Regulations
Habitats Regulations Assessment

2.0 APPRAISAL METHODS

Scoping the Key Sustainability Issues
Appraising the Core Strategy Issues and Options
Appraising the Core Strategy Preferred Option
Summary of SA Method
Consultation on the SA

3.0 SUSTAINABILITY CONTEXT AND OBJECTIVES

Review of Relevant Plans and Programmes
Description of the Baseline Conditions
The Sustainability Characteristics of Winchester
Key Sustainability Issues, Problems and Opportunities
The SA Framework

4.0 SA OF CORE STRATEGY ISSUES & OPTIONS 2008

SA of Core Strategy Policy and Options Appraisal
Summary of Alternatives Assessment and Selection

5.0 SA OF CORE STRATEGY PREFERRED POLICIES 2009

SA of Core Strategy Vision and Objectives
SA of Preferred Option

6.0 SUMMARY AND CUMULATIVE EFFECTS ANALYSIS 2009

Cumulative Effect of Plan Policies (Intra-plan Effects)
Positive Cumulative Effects of Plan Policies
Negative Cumulative Effects of Plan Policies
Interactions with Other Relevant Plans & Projects (Inter-plan Effects)

7.0 SA OF CORE STRATEGY PREFERRED OPTION 2009 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR MITIGATION & ENHANCEMENT

8.0 SA OF JOINT CORE STRATEGY PRE-SUBMISSION 2011

SA of Joint Core Strategy Vision, Spatial Objectives & Development Strategy
SA of Strategic Allocations
SA of Core Policies

9.0 SUMMARY AND CUMULATIVE EFFECTS ANALYSIS 2011

Cumulative Effect of Plan Policies (Intra-plan Effects)
Positive Cumulative Effects of Plan Policies
Negative Cumulative Effects of Plan Policies

Interactions with Other Relevant Plans & Projects (Inter-plan Effects)

10.0 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR MITIGATION AND ENHANCEMENT: PROGRESSION 2009-2011

11.00 SA OF LOCAL PLAN PART 1 JOINT CORE STRATEGY SUBMISSION 2012

Progression from Pre-Submission to Submission Local Plan Part 1-

January to June 2012

SA of Submission Local Plan Part 1 (LPP1) May 2012

Responses to Consultation on the SA Report accompanying the Pre-Submission LPP1 (2011)

SA of Housing Technical Paper May 2012

12.0 IMPLEMENTATION AND MONITORING

Introduction

SA Monitoring Proposals for Joint Core Strategy

13.0 CONCLUSIONS AND NEXT STEPS

LIST OF TABLES

Table 3.1: Key sustainability Issues/ opportunities identified for Winchester City Council

Table 3.2: The SA Framework

Table 4.1: Summary of Alternatives Assessment and Selection

Table 6.1: Cumulative summary of policies

Table 6.2: Significant positive effects of the emerging Core Strategy 2009

Table 6.3: Significant negative effects of the emerging Core Strategy 2009

Table 6.4: Significant Inter-Plan Cumulative Effects 2009

Table 9.1: Cumulative summary of proposals and policies 2011

Table 9.2: Significant positive effects of the Joint Core Strategy 2011

Table 9.3: Significant negative effects of the Joint Core Strategy 2011

Table 9.4: Significant Inter-Plan Cumulative Effects 2011

Table 10.1: SA Recommendations Progressed from 2009-2011

Table 10.2: SA Suggestions for Enhancement & Recommendations for Mitigation for Policies 2011

Table 11.1: Key Modifications to LPP1 for Submission 2012 and Implications for SA

Table 11.2: Summary Reasons for Selection/Rejection of Alternative Overall Housing Scenarios

Table 12.1: Potential Indicators

APPENDICES

(Available separately)

- I Compliance with the SEA Directive And Regulations
- II Summary of Responses to SA Consultation 2007, 2008, 2009, and 2011
- III Collated Baseline Information (updated 2011)
- IV Review of Relevant Plans and Programmes (updated 2011)
- V Compatibility Analysis Core Strategy Vision and Objectives 2009
- VI SA of Core Strategy Preferred Option 2009
- VII Recommendations for Mitigation and Enhancement: 2009
- VIII Compatibility Analysis Joint Core Strategy Vision, Spatial Objectives &

- IX Development Strategy: Pre-Submission 2011
- IX SA of Joint Core Strategy: Pre-Submission 2011
- X SA of Housing Technical Paper May 2012

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

NON-TECHNICAL SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

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

THE LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK

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

SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL & STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

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

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

- 0.4 The SA/SEA of the Winchester City Council's Local Plan Part 1 -Joint Core Strategy Submission Document has been prepared in accordance with these requirements for SA/SEA.

THE CHARACTER OF WINCHESTER DISTRICT

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

SA SCOPING & ISSUES FOR SUSTAINABILITY

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

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

| Table: 3.1: Key sustainability issues/ opportunities identified for Winchester City Council |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Maintaining and developing Winchester City as a centre for commerce and learning, and stimulating the rural economy in the context of growing development pressures from the urban centres to the south of the District. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Reducing unsustainable traffic and transport trends (commuting patterns), including associated carbon emissions by reducing the need to travel by car and creating opportunities for renewable energy development. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Improving the supply and availability of affordable housing. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Protecting valued landscape and habitats; including seeking opportunities for new Green Infrastructure networks. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Catering for the need of an ageing population. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Ensuring that infrastructure requirements meet the needs of new development and take account of constraints (water, biodiversity etc). |

SA Framework

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

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

SA OF THE LOCAL PLAN PART 1 -JOINT CORE STRATEGY

- 0.11 Each stage of the preparation of the Local Plan Part 1 - Joint Core Strategy was appraised systematically using the SA Objectives. Where significant adverse effects, including environmental effects, have been predicted, the SA sought where possible to identify means of offsetting these effects. Where it was considered that there were opportunities to enhance the sustainability of the proposals, recommendations were

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

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

Appraisal of the LDF Core Strategy Issues and Options 2008

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

Appraisal of the LDF Core Strategy Preferred Option 2009

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

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

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

Uncertainties

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

Significant effects identified

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

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

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

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

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

Mitigation and Enhancement Recommendations

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

Monitoring the Implementation of the Joint Core Strategy

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

Appraisal of the Local Plan Part 1 – Joint Core Strategy 2012

- 0.21 The Local Plan Part 1 Pre-Submission was modified to take into account the public consultation (January – March 2012), provision of further information, and changes in planning such as the implementation of the National Planning Policy Framework. These modifications have provided clarification and updating. They are not significant changes with regard to the SA, although overall they are likely to enhance the positive effects predicted by the Plan for the sustainable development of the Winchester District area.

CONCLUSIONS AND NEXT STEPS

- 0.22 The SA of the Local Plan Part 1 - Joint Core Strategy Submission has appraised the effects of individual proposals and policies, as well as the overall effect of the plan, including cumulative and incremental effects. The SA has found that the Winchester Local Plan Part 1 will make a significant contribution to sustainability in the District, with a particularly strong focus on meeting housing and community needs, addressing sustainable transport need and associated climate change goals which will also contribute to protecting the District's natural environment. The key negative effects identified relate to increased housing and employment development and the potential cumulative effects in the South of the District where there are significant development pressures from the PUSH area. The Strategic Proposals and Core Policies include strong mitigation measures that when implemented will minimise any significant residual adverse effects.
- 0.23 This SA Report is published alongside the Winchester District Local Plan Part 1 - Joint Core Strategy Submission Document and will be subject to public examination.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Purpose of the SA and the SA Report

- 1.1 The purpose of Sustainability Appraisal (SA) is to promote sustainable development through the integration of environmental, social and economic considerations in the preparation of Local Development Documents (LDDs). This requirement is set out in Section 39 (2) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act, 2004 and Planning Policy Statement 12: Local Spatial Planning. Local Development Documents must also be subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment¹² (SEA) and Government advises³ that an integrated approach is adopted so that the SA process incorporates the SEA requirements.
- 1.2 This is the SA Report that documents the Sustainability Appraisal/Strategic Environmental Assessment processes for Winchester City Council's Local Plan Part 1 – Joint Core Strategy Development Planning Document (DPD): Submission Document. The Sustainability Appraisal Framework discussed in Section 3 of this SA Report indicates the relationship between the SA and the SEA; compliance with the SEA Regulations is signposted below in this section and detailed in Appendix I. This SA Report is being published for consultation with the Local Plan Part 1 -Joint Core Strategy Submission Document in accordance with SEA Regulations and SA Guidance.

Local Plan Part 1 - Joint Core Strategy: Contents & Objectives

Local Development Framework

- 1.3 The Winchester Local Development Framework comprises the following Local Development Documents:
- Local Plan Part 1 – Joint Core Strategy DPD
 - Development Management and Site Allocations DPD
 - Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs) which supplement the DPDs by providing direction on specific issues: Village and Neighbourhood Design Statements
 - Neighbourhood Plans
 - Statement of Community Involvement
 - Annual Monitoring Report

Joint Core Strategy

- 1.4 The Local Plan Part 1 - Joint Core Strategy is the overarching strategic document of the Winchester City Council's Local Development Framework (LDF), and sets out the key elements of the planning

¹ EU Directive 2001/42/EC

² Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004

³ ODPM, 2005 *Sustainability Appraisal of Regional Spatial Strategies and Local Development Documents*

framework for the District; it is the spatial expression of the Sustainable Community Strategy. The Local Plan Part 1- Joint Core Strategy has been in development since 2007. Issues and Option were initially prepared in winter 2007 and were then published for consultation in Jan/Feb 2008. The SA and the consultation have helped to determine the preferred overall spatial strategy, and the Core Strategy Preferred Option was published for consultation in June 2009. The Local Plan Part 1 -Joint Core Strategy was further developed and the Pre-Submission Plan was published for consultation under the Town and Country Planning Regulations 2004 (as amended) during January to March 2012, together with the SA Report.

- 1.5 The Winchester Local Plan Part 1 - Joint Core Strategy sets out the broad strategic planning framework for the future of the Winchester District up to 2031, it is the lead LDF document and all other documents prepared under the LDF will have to conform to it. The Strategy sets out :

- Set out a spatial vision for the District, in accordance with the vision of the Winchester District Sustainable Community Strategy, showing how it will change in the future in physical, economic, social and environmental terms.
- Sets the strategic objectives and key policies for realising the vision.
- Identifies broad locations for change, growth and protection, including allocating strategic sites.
- Sets out an implementation and monitoring framework, together with a delivery plan to demonstrate how the infrastructure requirements necessary for the development strategy will be achieved.

- 1.6 The Local Plan Part 1 - Joint Core Strategy's Spatial Vision and Spatial Planning Objectives are set out below:

Spatial Planning Vision:

"Winchester District is a special place characterised by a rich cultural heritage and attractive countryside and is home to a diverse population and a variety of business sectors. The District should retain the distinctive characteristics of the three key areas so as to maximise opportunities to address change in a positive way that ensures it remains an attractive place to live, visit, work and do business:-

The County Town of Winchester needs to meet its housing and community requirements and to diversify its economy through the promotion of the knowledge, tourism, creative and education sectors, whilst respecting the highly valued features and setting of the Town.

Areas at Waterloooville and Whiteley on the southern fringes of the District need to provide homes, jobs, physical and social infrastructure whilst creating a strong sense of community identity and protecting nearby

environmentally sensitive sites, to create extended communities in this part of South Hampshire.

The market towns and many villages that fall within the rural area are to remain viable settlements offering where possible a range of local services and facilities, and be allowed to grow to respond to local needs, whilst retaining their individual identity and rural character. Development in those settlements that lie in the South Downs National Park should respect its purposes".

Spatial Planning Objectives:

Active Communities

- maximise new and existing opportunities for walking, cycling, sport and recreation/play to promote healthy lifestyles for all members of the community.
- provision of 11,000 new homes across the District by 2031.
- provision of a range of housing types and tenures to address the varied housing needs of the District's resident and working population and ensure inclusion for all.
- retention of existing and provision of new services and support facilities in the right places at the right time, including health, education, cultural, leisure and shopping, etc, to ensure existing and new communities are attractive and safe places to live and work and to allow our ageing population to participate.
- encourage sustainable transport alternatives that reduce the use of the private car and enable people to live close to where they work or participate in activities.

Prosperous Economy

- promote the varied talents of the District, building on the creative and knowledge based industries that exist, whilst developing the agricultural, tourism and cultural assets of our historic towns and villages and valued landscapes.
- ensure that there are a range of sites and premises available for businesses and commercial enterprises to set up and expand to meet their full potential and adequate infrastructure is available, including the provision of communications technology.
- maximise the economic opportunities offered by the designation of the South Downs National Park, utilising its tourism, recreation and cultural opportunities whilst supporting its purposes.
- encourage the development and adoption of energy efficiency and renewable energy technologies and enable their take-up by new and existing businesses, through the creation and promotion of a low carbon economy.

High Quality Environment

- maintain, protect and enhance Winchester District's valuable environments and wildlife assets, whether these are urban or rural areas or involve the built or natural environments. To ensure that

change restores, maintains or enhances the biodiversity, landscape character and historic environment of the District as a special place, whilst respecting its setting within the South Downs National Park.

- *ensure that the status of the water environment (both ground and surface water systems) in the District is maintained and improved through the development strategy promoted.*
- *provide, protect and enhance green infrastructure to include open spaces, green links and wildlife corridors.*
- *mitigate against the impacts of, and adapt to the effects of, climate change through promoting lifestyles and businesses which are sustainable for the environment and maximising the use of technologies that are available to reduce waste and carbon emissions.*
- *maximise the use of sustainable construction methods and drainage systems and encourage the use of locally sourced materials, to protect the integrity of the natural systems and resources that exist in the District.*
- *ensure high quality design takes account of character, local distinctiveness and sustainable design principles.*
- *maximise the use of the District's land resource through the promotion of higher densities and creative design where these are appropriate and make a positive contribution to the public realm.*

Summary of Compliance with the SEA Directive & Regulations

- 1.7 The SEA Regulations set out certain requirements for reporting the SEA process, and specify that if an integrated appraisal is undertaken (i.e. SEA is subsumed within the SA process, as for the SA of Winchester City Council's LDF), then the sections of the SA Report that meet the requirements set out for reporting the SEA process must be clearly signposted. The requirements for reporting the SEA process are set out in Appendix I and within each relevant section of this SA Report.

Habitats Regulations Assessment

- 1.8 In October 2005 a European Court of Justice ruling directed that land use plans are subject to the provisions of Article 6 (3) and (4) of the Directive 92/43/EEC on the Conservation of Natural Habitats and of Wild Fauna and Flora (Habitats Directive).⁴ Land Use Plans may therefore require the undertaking of an Appropriate Assessment (AA) of their implications for European Sites. The purpose of AA is to assess the impacts of a land-use plan against the conservation objectives of a European site and to ascertain whether it would adversely affect the integrity of that site, whether alone or in combination with other plans and projects. Where significant negative effects are identified, alternative options should be examined to avoid any potential damaging effects. It is the responsibility of the Local Planning Authority

⁴ Case C-06-/04 (Commission v United Kingdom) European Court of Justice (ECJ) 20 October 2005.

to assess whether or not an AA is required and to carry out the AA in the preparation of a DPD or Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) where it is required.

- 1.9 There are four European Sites (Natura 2000 sites) within Winchester City Council's plan area and twelve within a 15km search area of Winchester boundary including nine water dependant sites that lie downstream and therefore within the potential influence of the plan ⁵.
- 1.10 The potential for the spatial developments proposed through the Local Plan Part 1 -Joint Core Strategy to have an [adverse] impact on the conservation objectives of the European sites within its area's influence has, in line with the requirement of the Habitats Regulations, been considered through Habitats Regulations Assessment. The Habitats Regulations Assessment Report which accompanies the Local Plan Part 1 - Joint Core Strategy Submission has informed the preparation of the SA and is available separately.

⁵ A 15 km buffer zone is commonly used in HRA to determine effects on European sites within the influence of land use plans, but also in areas outside of plan boundaries to account for transboundary effects, e.g. through hydrological connectivity.

2.0 APPRAISAL METHODS

Scoping the Key Sustainability Issues

- 2.1 Enfusion Ltd was commissioned in December 2006 by Winchester City Council to progress the SA work. A SA scoping process was undertaken during 2007 to help ensure that the SA covers the key sustainability issues that are relevant to the spatial and development planning system in the Winchester area. This included the development of an SA Framework of objectives (presented at the end of Section 3 of this SA Report) to comprise the basis for appraisal. An SA Scoping Report was prepared to summarise the findings of the Scoping process. This was published in July 2007 for consultation with statutory consultees. Responses to this scoping consultation, and how they were taken into account, are reported in this SA Report.

Appraising the Core Strategy Issues and Options

- 2.2 Issues and options were developed initially during late 2007 and were subject to SA/SEA by Enfusion. The Strategic Options were assessed against the full SA Framework of objectives with regard to the short, medium and long term effects of the options on the SA objectives. This SA work was undertaken alongside the Issues and Options development process and the findings used to inform the consultation document (Jan/Feb 2008), a summary of the findings is provided in Section 4 of this report.

Appraising the Core Strategy Preferred Option

- 2.3 The emerging Preferred Option for the Core Strategy was developed during early 2009 and subject to SA in April 2009. A compatibility analysis of the updated vision and objectives has also been carried out. Each Preferred Option was assessed against the full SA Framework objectives. Where there were any potential adverse effects predicted for sustainability or opportunities identified to improve the sustainability of the Core Strategy, recommendations were made.
- 2.4 The full detail of the appraisal is detailed at Appendix VI accompanying this report, and a summary of the assessment findings and recommendations is provided at Section 5. The appraisal has been undertaken in accordance with the statutory requirements set out in formal guidance for the sustainability appraisal of local development documents which incorporates Strategic Environmental Assessment.⁶

Appraising the Joint Core Strategy Pre-Submission

⁶ Sustainability of Regional Spatial Strategies and Local Development Documents (ODPM, Nov 2005).

- 2.5 The emerging Pre-Submission Joint Core Strategy was developed during early 2010-2011 and subject to SA in November 2011. A compatibility analysis of the updated vision, objectives and development strategy was also been carried out. Each Proposal and Policy was assessed against the full SA Framework objectives. Where there were any potential adverse effects predicted for sustainability or opportunities identified to improve the sustainability of the Joint Core Strategy, recommendations were made. The cumulative effects of implementing the proposals and policies within the plan itself and in combination with other key plans were also assessed.
- 2.6 The full details of the appraisal are detailed in Appendix VIII and IX accompanying this report, and a summary of the assessment findings and recommendations is provided at Sections 8, 9 and 10. The appraisal has been undertaken in accordance with the statutory requirements set out in formal guidance for the sustainability appraisal of local development documents which incorporates Strategic Environmental Assessment.⁷

Summary of SA Method

- 2.7 The method used for this Sustainability Appraisal of the Joint Core Strategy comprises the following elements:
- Identifying relevant baseline information and other plans or programmes that influence the Core Strategy policies.
 - Using the Sustainability Appraisal Framework with professional expertise and drawing upon selected information in the Review of Plans and Programmes, and the Baseline Information.
 - Commenting on the areas where each element or policy of the Joint Core Strategy has specific potential impacts - 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.

Consultation on the SA

- 2.8 The key sustainability issues were identified through the SA scoping process that was placed on consultation by Winchester City Council with statutory consultees in July 2007.
- 2.9 Issues and Options were initially prepared in winter 2007 and were then published for consultation in Jan/Feb 2008. The Council received several thousand responses on the Issues and Options Document providing comments on the options and suggesting alternatives. These responses informed the development of the Preferred Option Document.

⁷ Sustainability of Regional Spatial Strategies and Local Development Documents (ODPM, Nov 2005).

- 2.10 The Preferred Option Core Strategy was published for consultation in 2009. Comments received were considered, together with the findings from 'Blueprint' and the 'Plans for Places' consultation, and informed the preparation of the Joint core Strategy Pre-Submission which is published for consultation in January/February 2012.
- 2.11 This Sustainability Appraisal Report is being published alongside the Joint Core Strategy Pre-Submission document, in accordance with SEA Regulations and SA Guidance. It will be published on the Council's website www.winchester.gov.uk and sent to statutory consultees and other relevant stakeholders.

3.0 SUSTAINABILITY CONTEXT AND OBJECTIVES

Review of Relevant Plans and Programmes

- 3.1 In order to establish a clear scope for the SA of the LDF it is necessary (and a requirement of SEA) to review and develop an understanding of the wider range of “*policies, plans, programmes and sustainability objectives*”⁸ that are relevant to the LDF. This includes International, European, National, Regional and local level policies, plans and strategies. Summarising the aspirations of other relevant policies, plans, programmes and sustainability objectives (hereafter referred to as ‘relevant plans’) promotes systematic identification of the ways in which the LDF could help fulfil them.
- 3.2 A thorough review of relevant plans and programmes was undertaken during the SA/SEA scoping stage in accordance with the requirements of the SEA Directive, this included considering the wider plans reviewed as part of the development of the evidence base for the LDF. This Plans and Programmes review was reported in the SA Scoping Report published in July 2007 and is available on the Council's website.
- 3.3 In 2008, it was noted that the release of various new plans and programs, warranted an update of the PP review. At this point the PP Review update also included additional work to ensure that Human Health and Social/ Equality issues were appropriately addressed and informing the ongoing SA/SEA process by providing a credible evidence base. Further updating was carried out during 2011 to inform the appraisal for this Pre-Submission Joint Core Strategy. The PP Review including the updates is presented as Appendix IV to this report.

Description of the Baseline Conditions

- 3.4 Collection of baseline information is required under SEA legislation, and is fundamental to the SA process to provide a background to, and evidence base for, identifying sustainability problems and opportunities in Winchester and providing the basis for predicting and monitoring effects of the LDF. To make judgements about how the emerging content of the LDF will progress or hinder sustainable development, it is essential to understand the economic, environmental and social circumstances in Winchester today and their likely evolution in the future. The aim is to collect only relevant and sufficient data on the present and future state of the District to allow the potential effects of the LDF to be adequately predicted.
- 3.5 The SA Guidance provided by Government proposes a practical approach to data collection, recognising that information may not yet be available, and that information gaps for future improvements should be reported as well as the need to consider uncertainties in

⁸ *Sustainability Appraisal of Regional Spatial Strategies and Local Development Documents*
ODPM, November 2005

data. Collection of baseline information should be continuous as the SA process guides plan making and as new information becomes available.

- 3.6 SA Guidance advises that, where possible, information should be collated to include:
- 'comparators' - (ie the same information for different areas) - as points of reference against which local data may be compared
 - established targets, which will highlight how far the current situation is from such thresholds
 - trends - to ascertain whether the situation is currently improving or deteriorating
- 3.7 A SA/SEA Baseline has been prepared for Winchester City Council's LDF. The report draws together national, regional and local data to enable assessment of the current situation within the District. Targets and standards at international, national and local level are reviewed to provide the necessary context and to facilitate the focussing of resources into areas of non-compliance or significant failure. The Baseline, including comparators, established targets and trends; it was updated in 2011 and is presented in Appendix III to this report. The key issues that arose from the baseline profile are:
- **Population:** Winchester's population is increasing more rapidly than in surrounding areas. The majority of the population reside in rural areas. Population health is typically better than both national and regional averages.
 - **Economy:** The District has higher than average full time employment with a high percentage (30%) of the workforce educated and skilled, working in professional roles.
 - **Housing:** House prices in Winchester are significantly higher when compared with the South East, and there identified shortages of affordable housing within the City and in rural areas, particularly for workers in lower paid professions who are required to commute.
 - **Transport:** Winchester City experiences significant problems with traffic congestion, exacerbated by high commuting trends of workers leaving the City to work in the South East and lower paid workers commuting into the City. The District has a proportionately higher level of car ownership when compared with neighbouring authorities.
 - **Landscape & Townscape:** Winchester's built heritage is distinctive and plays a major role in tourism interest for the area. Approx 40% of the District lies within the East Hampshire AONB and importantly the newly designated South Downs National Park.
 - **Cultural Heritage:** The District has a rich archaeological resource including remains from prehistory to the military history of the last century, and has an extensive number of listed buildings which provide the area with a rich character and historical identity.
 - **Biodiversity:** The District has a variety of high quality habitats including sites designated as Special Areas for Conservation, Special

Protection Areas and Ramsars. There are two nationally designated nature reserves and nine local nature reserves.

- **Water:** Water supply in the area is dependant on groundwater. Whilst there has been an overall improvement in river quality in the area since 1990 the River Itchen (which is designated as an SAC) is experiencing pollution pressures from agriculture and sewage discharges arising from population growth.
- **Air Quality:** Monitoring indicates that air quality in the area is good, however traffic emission and the predicted growth in road traffic is noted as a major source of nitrogen dioxides.
- **Climate Change:** Winchester falls within an area of the South East that has seen carbon dioxide emissions rising progressively. Renewable energy sources in the area are currently limited.
- **Waste:** Projected population increases will require increased waste management capacity in the Winchester area and substantial improvements in recycling rates are required to meet statutory targets.

The Sustainability Characteristics of Winchester

- 3.8 It is important to distil the key sustainability issues, problems and objectives relevant to the District from the collated information and consideration of the particular character of the area. These issues are considered to be priorities for consideration through the Sustainability Appraisal, and the SA Framework of sustainability objectives (detailed in Section 3) seeks to attend to them.

Characterisation

- 3.9 Winchester is situated in the South of England and comprises 66,107 hectares with over 50 rural settlements and the major settlement of Winchester City. The District is the least populated in Hampshire and its rural nature make it an attractive location to live in and to visit. A significant proportion of the Eastern area of the District is covered by the new South Downs National Park designation.
- 3.10 In 2001 the Census recorded the District as having a population of 107,222. The Office for National Statistics (ONS) estimated that the population of the District in 2006 is 110,000, and projections are that this will rise by 25,057 people in the period up to 2026. The District is home to an ageing population with figures indicating that by 2026 approximately 22.7% of the resident population will be 65 years and over.
- 3.11 The average price of a detached dwelling in Winchester (2007) is £330,451, which compares with the South East average of £248,003. The availability of affordable housing is set to becoming a growing issue for the authority. The Regional Spatial Strategy requires that 12,740 houses be built in Winchester District over the plan period. These allocations are split between Winchester Town, the market towns and

rural areas, and the southern part of the district that lies within the area covered by the Partnership for Urban South Hampshire (PUSH).

- 3.12 Winchester is a generally prosperous area and key employment sectors include public admin and health; banking and finance; hotels, distribution and the leisure sector. A strong, knowledge based economy is driven by over 30% of the working population holding professional skilled roles. Winchester's relative prosperity is reflected in reasonably low deprivation, excellent health conditions among the District's population (although some pockets of poorer health in the more urban areas are evident), and low crime rates.
- 3.13 Winchester is well connected to London and the South East through a number of major road links including the M3/M27 and A303. This relative ease of access supports a high level of commuting activity with 18,000 commuting into the City and 8,600 commuting out on a daily basis. Winchester has direct rail connections to London and Southampton, however, public transport usage in the District (7.32%) is lower than the South East average (10.118%).
- 3.14 The landscape character of the District is one of rolling downland, typical of the Hampshire area. Approximately 40% of the District lies within the East Hampshire AONB and importantly the newly designated South Downs National Park. Much of the District is rural in nature and development sensitivities reflect the requirement to protect environmental and heritage distinctiveness whilst provide housing and facilities for an expanding population. Areas for development are therefore limited by physical constraints, including areas at risk of flooding, areas protected for their landscape value, and areas protected for their ecological value. Some such areas are of local, regional, national and international importance, including those protected by the EU Habitats Directive.

Key Sustainability Issues, Problems and Opportunities

- 3.15 The following key sustainability issues are considered to be priorities for sustainability, arising from the particular characteristics, pressures and opportunities currently affecting Winchester:

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

Table 3.1: Key sustainability issues/ opportunities identified for the Winchester District area

Ensuring that infrastructure requirements meet the needs of new development and take account of constraints (water, biodiversity etc).

- 3.16 The SA Framework presented in the next Section sets out objectives to address these issues.

The SA Framework

- 3.17 The proposed SA Framework provides the basis by which the sustainability effects of emerging Local Development Documents will be described, analysed and compared. It includes a number of sustainability objectives, elaborated by 'decision-aiding questions'. These have been distilled from the information collated during the review of relevant Plans and Programmes and the review of Baseline Information (as detailed in Sections 2 and 3 of this report, respectively), the key sustainability issues identified (as detailed in previously in this Section), as well as from discussions with planning professionals with extensive experience working in Winchester.
- 3.18 The sustainability objectives seek to address and progress the main sustainability issues and opportunities identified as important in Winchester. The decision-aiding questions assist by clarifying the detail of the issues, improving objectivity, ensuring that the appraisal is relevant to land use planning, and making the SA Framework more locally specific.
- 3.19 The framework has been reviewed as the LDF has progressed to accommodate recommendations resulting from the consultation exercises.

Table 3.2: The SA Framework

| SA Objective | Decision-Aiding Question Will it (the Policy)...? |
|---|---|
| 1. Building Communities <i>SEA topics: Population, Human Health, Material Assets</i> | |
| To create and sustain communities that meet the needs of the population and promote social inclusion | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Help provide facilities for social interaction Promote diverse communities and meet a range of housing needs Ensure inclusion of all sections of the community Ensure equality of access to services Integrate new and existing communities Encourage community cohesion and a sense of community ownership Reduce social exclusion of disadvantaged groups Meet the needs of an ageing population |
| 2. Infrastructure <i>SEA topics: Material Assets</i> | |
| To provide for the | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support the provision of community facilities, for example cultural, health, recreational and social facilities. |

| SA Objective | Decision-Aiding Question Will it (the Policy)...? |
|---|--|
| timely delivery of infrastructure suitable to meet community needs | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Encourage the enhancement of green infrastructure (strategic network of protected sites, nature reserves, greenspaces, and greenway linkages) Ensure the delivery of infrastructure that meets the needs of new and existing development Ensure appropriate timing and phasing |
| 3. Housing (SEA topic: Population & Human Health) | |
| To provide good quality housing for all | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Deliver affordable and sustainable housing both in urban and rural areas, in keeping with local character Support the sympathetic accommodation of housing growth in sustainable locations Balance housing and employment land delivery with community facilities and environmental capacity Provide for an appropriate mix of dwelling size, type, density and phasing to meet local needs 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 |
| 4. Economy & Employment (SEA topic: Population & Human Health, Material Assets) | |
| To maintain the buoyant economy and develop greater diversity that meets local needs | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide a diverse range of jobs that meet the needs of local people Ensure jobs are located in sustainable locations Support the rural economy Reduce both out commuting and in commuting Help maintain Winchester City as a major focus of learning and education Assist in the retention of young people and graduates Recognise the role of tourism in the local economy Support retail diversity across the district Support live work units & working from home Balance suitable employment with housing growth Encourage environmentally and socially responsible employment and help to create local markets for local goods/services Aim towards establishing a low carbon economy for Winchester |
| 5. Transport SEA topics: Air, Climatic Factors, Population, Material Assets | |
| To increase accessibility; reduce car usage and the need to travel | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support delivery of quality public transport that is accessible to all sections of the community Enable the enhancement of a District-wide network of footpaths and cycle links between settlements, homes and work and community facilities Support the need to reduce travel, especially during peak times Locate new development to reduce the need to travel 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 |

| SA Objective | Decision-Aiding Question Will it (the Policy)...? |
|--|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adopt maximum parking standards |
| 6. Health <i>SEA topics: Human Health</i> | |
| To improve the health and well being of all | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protect and increase the provision of and accessibility to community, cultural and recreational facilities Require design that ensures safe, attractive places and engenders a sense of place Require design that promotes healthy lifestyles and increased physical activity Increase accessibility to health facilities and encourage multi-functional use of facilities Ensure residents have access to healthy and affordable food through, for example, the provision of allotments |
| 7. Water <i>SEA topics: Water, Climatic Factors, Biodiversity, Health</i> | |
| To protect, enhance and manage water resources in a sustainable way | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Require the use of water efficiency measures Manage and minimise risk of flooding including regard to future climate change (promotion of adaptation measures) Promote the adoption and use of sustainable drainage systems Protect ground and surface water sources: quality & quantity Progress compatibility with the objectives of the Water Framework directive Promote access to water for recreation, enjoyment and understanding (including valued biodiversity/ habitats) |
| 8. Waste <i>SEA topics: Material Assets</i> | |
| To ensure sustainable waste management | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Help reduce waste and facilitate recycling in construction and operation Encourage composting Encourage development that is self-sufficient in waste management Support the recovery of energy from waste |
| 9. Climate Change <i>SEA topics: Climatic Factors, Air, Water</i> | |
| To address the causes of climate change and to mitigate and adapt in line with Winchester's Climate Change Strategy | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Promote renewable energy generation Help reduce carbon and other greenhouse gas emissions Ensure adaptation planning that maximises opportunities and minimises the costs of climate change. Promote community involvement, understanding and action on climate change |
| 10. Sustainable Construction <i>SEA topics: Air, Water, Climatic Factors, Material assets</i> | |
| To promote the sustainable design and construction of buildings and places | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure the incorporation of energy and water efficiency measures and renewables in new development aiming for zero carbon dwellings and workplaces Seek higher density in new development in appropriate locations Require the use of sustainable building standards (Code for Sustainable Homes, BREEAM) Promote locally and sustainably sourced (e.g. recycled) |

| SA Objective | Decision-Aiding Question Will it (the Policy)...? |
|---|---|
| | materials in construction and renovation |
| 11. Biodiversity <i>SEA topics: Biodiversity, Fauna and Flora</i> | |
| To conserve and enhance biodiversity | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protect and enhance designated and locally valued habitats and species Prevent and reverse habitat fragmentation, where possible promote understanding of and access to biodiversity Provide opportunities for provision and enhancement of a network of greenspaces. |
| 12. Heritage <i>SEA topics: Cultural Heritage</i> | |
| To protect and enhance built and cultural heritage | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protect and where appropriate enhance the historical and archaeological environment (landscapes, sites, buildings and settings), including resources of local value Support, develop and where appropriate enhance and increase access to cultural & heritage resources and activities Help accommodate new development without detriment to the existing built and cultural heritage |
| 13. Landscape & Soils <i>SEA topics: Landscape, Soils</i> | |
| To protect and enhance the character and quality of the landscape of Winchester District | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minimise adverse impact on the landscape setting of the city, towns and rural settlements Prioritise the use of previously developed land to minimise greenfield development Conserve and enhance the natural beauty of the AONB, (proposed) South Downs National Park, and locally designated landscapes To protect soil resources and manage in a sustainable way |
| 14. Built Environment <i>SEA topics: Cultural heritage, Population, Material Assets</i> | |
| To secure high standards of design | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Promote recognition of local distinctiveness and a sense of place in style, materials and scale within the public realm Make best use of existing buildings through reuse and conversion Promote innovation in sustainable design for new and heritage development Promote integration of new development with existing context/design Recognise the role of the community in securing good design e.g. Village design statements, community planning |
| 15. Pollution <i>SEA topics: Air, Climatic Factors, Human Health, Soils, Water</i> | |
| Minimise local and global sources of pollution | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improve air quality, e.g. through transport management and reduction of employment related emissions Reduce and manage noise pollution Reduce and manage the impact of light pollution Ensure there is no pollution of water sources Ensure there is no pollution of the soil |

4.0 SA OF CORE STRATEGY ISSUES AND OPTIONS 2008

SA of Core Strategy Issues and Options

- 4.1 The Core Strategy Issues and Options were developed through early 2008 and subject to SA to inform the emerging options. The SA method and appraisal key set out in Section 3 of this report was used to provide a strategic overview of the performance of the various issues and options against the framework of SA objectives. The appraisal was informed by the available baseline information and emerging evidence base underpinning the development of the issues and potential spatial options for the Winchester District area. The Core Strategy Issues and Options Plan was published in 2008. The full details of the SA were published in the accompanying SA Report (April 2008).
- 4.2 The results of the SA which comprise detailed matrix based appraisal were provided to the Council to support the ongoing development of the Core Strategy. A summary of the results is provided below. Council considered the findings of the SA of the Issues and options, alongside wider comments received through the various public consultation exercises undertaken, in the development of the Preferred Option. This assisted in the development of a sustainable Preferred Option and published for consultation in 2009. At the end of section 4 in this SA Report, a summary table outlines the reasons for progressing or rejecting options.

1. Potential Broad Strategic Allocations for Winchester Town

Option 1: Planned boundaries Approach

To remain within its current planned limits – this includes existing sites with planning permission for development and sites reserved for future uses through the adopted Local Plan

Option 2: Step Change Option

To raise the profile of the town through a step change in growth – to include large scale new development incorporating land to the north of the town as suggested by the South East Plan panel and other sites as appropriate.

- 4.3 Option 1 has the potential to deliver some of the growth specified for Winchester (as driven by the South East Plan), but there are key sustainability issues (particularly in relation to community, infrastructure, housing and economic SA objectives) regarding the ability of the planned boundaries option to deliver the volume and type of development necessary to meet the growth planned for the region. Option 1 does provide for increased housing and includes affordable housing provision. However, this option is potentially limited by the constraints of existing infrastructure and site availability in delivering the range of housing and the additional elements (facilities, infrastructure, commercial development, renewable energy supplies) that will make

an expanded community both sustainable in the long term and able to contribute positively to the existing/ identified sustainability issues in and around Winchester. New or improved infrastructure would be required in mitigation, if spatial constraints allow.

- 4.4 This option focuses on brownfield sites and proposals include less Greenfield land [than the step change option] an approach which is positive for biodiversity. However, outlying settlements will be required to accommodate development that cannot be contained within the existing planned boundaries and this incremental expansion may have cumulative impacts on habitats and established greenspace. Restricted development within and near the city boundaries will lead to greater need for commuting [to the city from outlying areas] which will require strong sustainable transport measures to avoid the exacerbation of existing negative trends.
- 4.5 The key adverse impacts associated with Option 2 relate to the loss of Greenfield land (with accompanying habitats/ biodiversity and landscape issues) and the increase of resource use/ pollution generation that comes with greater expansion and development. However, this option strongly progresses SA objectives for Winchester that are seeking to cater for a diversity of housing needs, provide new facilities for communities and support sustainable build options (for example, incorporating renewables). This option also allows a more holistic approach to be taken to providing sustainable transport solutions (including a reduction in car-based transport in and around the city centre which is a recognised long term aim). In terms of progressing social and economic objectives – this option is preferred.

2. Market Towns and Rural Areas

Option 1: Current Planned Boundaries

Maintain existing boundary (including release of site reserved for housing purposes under Policy H2 of the adopted Local Plan – Spring Gardens Alresford)

Option 2: Consolidation of Key Hub Role

Allow for some growth to ensure that the role and function of the hub is maintained and offer opportunities to become more sustainable.

Option 3: Step Change to become a larger or more specialised service centre.

Key hubs would be able to develop beyond their existing boundaries in a sustainable and planned manner to create a new specialist/ niche role for themselves by being a local focus for economic and commercial activity.

- 4.6 Option 1 Protects existing landscape/ greenspaces and heritage by limiting development to that already planned for or allocated. This option supports SA objectives for community and housing at a basic

level but its restrictions means that it is less able to progress key sustainability aspirations for these objectives e.g. to improve access to/ availability of affordable housing and to promote improved sustainable transport options that link communities. Commuting patterns that reflect the need to travel for goods and services are likely to continue if this option is pursued. The long term benefits for biodiversity, heritage and landscape of largely conserving existing settlements in their current form are likely to be offset by the identified negative trends in terms of pollution (e.g. from unsustainable travel patterns).

- 4.7 Option 2 progresses sustainability objectives for housing, the economy and balanced communities through its promotion of enhanced functions for key hubs. This increased growth has potential short and medium terms impacts for biodiversity and landscape objectives which would require mitigation measures. New development has the potential to exploit sustainable build techniques whilst reflecting local distinctiveness and the expansion of service/ employment provision may provide opportunities for a more cohesive community base that is less reliant on the larger urban centres for goods and services.
- 4.8 Option 3 promotes a step change in development around identified key hubs leading to significantly expanded settlements. This level of development has significant short and medium term impacts for core SA objectives relating to biodiversity, landscape and heritage (these impacts may be cumulative where settlements are close to urban/PUSH area). These impacts would require strong mitigation measures to ensure habitat integrity and cultural integrity is maintained. This option strongly progresses sustainability objectives for transport, economy and community by affording opportunity for new, more sustainable developments that address identified issues relating to unsustainable commuting patterns, the availability of affordable housing and the requirement to collocate jobs and homes, supporting the long term aspirations of the Government's Sustainable Communities Plan (2003). This option also creates opportunities for sustainable design and the incorporation of renewables into developments, promoting more sustainable settlements in the long term.
- 4.9 Both Option 2 and 3 accord with aspirations of the Hampshire Rural Market Towns initiative which aims to bring a new lease of life to market towns so that they provide convenient access to services both for townspeople and rural communities.

3. Market Towns and Rural Area – Local Hubs

Option 1: Current Planned Boundaries

Limit development to within the existing defined boundary which has planning permission + redevelopment and infilling.

Option 2: Consolidation of Local Hub Role

Allow limited growth to support the retention of local services and facilities including the release of local reserve sites.

Option 3: Step change to become a Key Hub

Promotion of sustainable development to enable the local hub to grow with a corresponding level of facilities and services to become a key hub.

- 4.10 Option 1 is largely neutral in relation to sustainability objectives as the scale of development is limited and opportunities to progress sustainability objectives are therefore also restricted. The exceptions to this occur in relation to landscape, soils and biodiversity issues which typically are most effectively supported where [development] interventions are minimal. This option performs least well in relation to economic, transport and community issues as limited development restricts opportunities to pursue social and economic growth for the benefit of existing and wider communities.
- 4.11 Option 2 whilst proposing a limited range of growth, implies an enhanced role for local hubs that is potentially beneficial for housing, transport, economics issues and wider community development. The progression of these sustainability objectives is synergistic. Potential adverse impacts relate to pressures on natural resources (water, biodiversity, landscape) and can be effectively mitigated at this level. There are also potential health impacts that relate to the accessibility to services where populations increase and the wider, less direct impacts on health and well being on existing communities that can occur as a result of development and change.
- 4.12 Option 3, the step change option strongly progresses SA objectives for housing, transport and the economy. These positive impacts are predicted as a result of both economies of scale and the ability to introduce environmentally proficient buildings and transport networks, waste management facilities close to source. The option provides less progression for SA objectives focused on natural resources (biodiversity, water, climate change) and natural features (landscape) on the basis that urbanisation of the scale suggested will impinge on the current baseline conditions. In particular, water resources for public water supplies are in deficit during warm dry summers in this region (SFRA for Winchester Halcrow, July 2007). The promotion of local hubs to key hubs will result in a significant concentration of key hubs in the southern area of the district (focused in the PUSH area). This may be the most sustainable approach given the concentration of population in this southern area and it has the potential to provide strong support for the development aims of PUSH. However, there is potential for the economic benefits of development to become disproportionately distributed in relation to the rural areas within the district.
- 4.13 There is clear potential to seek a hybrid option where only some local hubs are selected as key hubs and others are either consolidated or

maintained as local hubs. This approach accords with guidance from the emerging RSS South East Plan which states that local planning authorities should encourage and initiative schemes and proposals that help strengthen the vitality of small rural towns.

4. Market Towns and Rural Area

Options for the Rural Area – Settlement Hierarchy

Option 1: Allow infilling or redevelopment within the settlements defined in the adopted Local Plan Policy h3.

Option 2: Allow some small scale growth and change, including affordable housing and employment opportunities which have two or more of the following facilities to ensure these settlements remain sustainable.

- 4.14 Option 1 is largely neutral when assessed against the SA Framework. This level of development is unlikely to generate significant adverse effects for sustainability. The exceptions relate to transport and possibly housing, where infill (if primarily supplied to the private market) may result in a growth in commuter traffic (e.g. through second home ownership) and as a result of individual choices to live in the country either for quality of life issues or because house prices are proportionately cheaper than those in Winchester City.
- 4.15 Option 2 provides significant opportunity to progress SA objectives relating to communities, infrastructure, housing and economy by providing a level of growth that enable essential services to be maintained in the long term. This approach accords with the guidance set out in PPS7: Sustainable Development in Rural Areas. This option also recognises the strong support that exists (national and regional policy) for home working arrangements, or developments that allow rural based workers to live closer to their place of work. There are however, key sustainability issues with promoting development in smaller settlements in the rural area.
- 4.16 The potential impacts relate primarily to biodiversity and landscape – and this is particularly the case for settlements to the west of the district that would fall within the proposed boundary of the South Downs National Park. Mitigations measure would need to be considered on a case by case basis and be sufficiently robust to meet national and international legislative requirements. Option 2 accords with the wider objectives of PPS1 Planning for Sustainable development which seeks to locate development in a manner that supports and is in close proximity to services that can be accessed by foot, bicycle or by public transport and is therefore preferred from a sustainability perspective.

5. Market Towns and Rural Areas

Options for the Rural Area – Affordable Housing

Option 1: Retain the requirement to deliver 30% on sites which can accommodate 5 or more dwellings or exceed 0.17 hectares.

Option 2: Increase the requirement to provide 50% affordable housing (35% social rented and 15% intermediate) on all sites, either through on site provision or financial contribution.

- 4.17 Affordable housing will be provided as part of sites which can accommodate 5 dwellings or more or exceed 0.17 hectares and which will be subject to all other development control core policies and as such should not have adverse landscape, biodiversity or cultural heritage impacts. The differences in the options are the greater level of provision required by option 2 which should incorporate both social rented and intermediate housing and the reference to off site provision.
- 4.18 Option 2 progresses the economic and housing SA Framework objectives more effectively than Option 1 because of the numbers and range of housing which are required, but some reservation must be expressed that levels of affordable housing required should not render developments unviable. However, this concern is not sufficient to over ride the benefits of Option 2.

6. Market Towns and Rural Area

Options for the Rural Area: Rural Exception Sites

Option 1: Retain existing approach to allowing rural exception sites for the delivery of 100% affordable housing meeting demonstrable local needs.

Option 2: Explore more creative ways of delivering affordable housing by allowing a small percentage of market housing (25%) on a site to enable the provision of a higher proportion of affordable housing (75%).

- 4.19 Both options achieve the SA Framework objective of providing affordable housing in rural areas which reduces social exclusion and/or deprivation and contributes to balanced communities. Whilst allowing 25% of market housing on rural exceptions sites may facilitate the provision of rural affordable housing by increasing the willingness of landowners to sell land in appropriate locations, this mechanism will potentially increase the overall amount of new development in rural settlements which is contrary to the need to locate as much as development as possible in locations with good public transport and access to community facilities. This potentially has a negative impact on objectives for transport, climate change and landscape and soils.
- 4.20 Option 1 both maximises the number of new dwellings to those with proven need, and the amount of land take required and therefore progresses the relevant SA objectives more effectively than Option 2.

7. Market Towns and Rural Area

Options for the Rural Area: Redundant Rural Buildings

Option 1: Retain the existing approach to employment provision within the rural area by relying on the conversion of redundant rural buildings purely for employment purposes.

Option 2: a) Relax the existing approach to make it easier to convert or redevelop rural buildings for employment uses.
b) Allow redundant rural buildings to be converted to affordable housing units where there is a demonstrable local need.

- 4.21 Option 1 effectively progresses sustainability objectives for heritage, landscape and the built environment. Potential adverse impacts may occur where employment development is not supported by sustainable travel measures leading to an exacerbation of unsustainable travel patterns, and possibly localised pollution (air).
- 4.22 Option 2 combines two approaches which are largely compatible and provides good support for community, housing, economy and employment SA objectives. Allowing rural buildings to be used for affordable housing and/or employment uses supports recognised aims to diversify and enhance the rural economy and reduce the unsustainable levels of commuting that currently characterise Winchester's travel patterns. This option also provides good scope for sustaining heritage interests and promoting a long term sustainable use of the built environment – as such it provides the greatest benefit.

8. Partnership for Urban South Hampshire (PUSH) Area

Option 1: Expand Bishops Waltham, Wickham and Knowle

Option 2: Expand West of Waterlooville

Option 3: Concentrate growth at Whiteley

- 4.23 Option 1 – the key hubs have a functional relationship with the southern area, more so than with the rest of Winchester District, however they also have a strong rural character based on their setting. Development at these towns has significant potential to adversely impact natural resource and landscape settings. Wickham, Knowle and Bishops Waltham are close to the Strategic Development Areas of Hedge End and Fareham so these areas are likely to be impacted by increased traffic and the potential for employment growth elsewhere to induce commuting by resident populations. Some of the key hubs in this option also border the South Downs National Park. While increased recreation may be encouraged and the designation may serve to promote tourism opportunities, there is a strong likelihood that development pressures will lead to pressure on landscape and habitats requiring long term mitigation measures.

- 4.24 Option 2 at West of Waterlooville strongly progresses SA objective for housing, communities and infrastructure well. This is especially the case because planned sustainable development already exists at this location and issues regarding infrastructure, housing and wider community concerns have been addressed as part of this development. Any additional intensification or extension would however be required to be subject to assessment of its implications for flooding/ impacts on greenspace/ local gap.
- 4.25 Option 3 at Whiteley forms one side of the Meon Strategic Gap so potential issues of coalescence with other settlements exist. Significantly for long term development plans Whiteley is close to a Natura 2000 site and statutory European designation affords strong protection to the existing habitats and species. Development in this area would be required to prove that it will not have significant adverse impacts at this site in order to proceed. Strong precautionary measures surround development around Natura 2000 sites.
- 4.26 Each Option demonstrates clear opportunities to progress SA objectives, however, given the concentration of development and the sensitivity of the receiving environment [particularly where statutory designations are relevant] there is a sound case for considering a combination of options (possibly elements of option 1 combined with option 2) that takes account of settlement aspirations and seeks to distribute development between each of the areas identified as having potential.

9. Core Issues

Climate Change

Option 1: Meet Minimum Requirements

Option 2: More Ambitious Option

- 4.27 Option 1 performs well against the SA objectives relating infrastructure, health, climate change, waste and water. The policy proposes to adopt the Code for Sustainable Homes Level 6 by 2016 and that 10% of energy used in new development is produced on-site from renewable sources. These will help to meet the proposed target for carbon reduction within the District of 26% to 32% by 2020 and the objectives of the Winchester Climate Change Strategy. The production of 10% energy from on-site renewables along with energy and water efficient buildings will reduce pressure on existing infrastructures. The proposal for waste management, recycling and composting schemes will have a positive effect on infrastructure. The reduction in carbon emissions will have long-term positive effects on climate change, health and pollution. Sustainable Drainage Systems and measures contained within the Code for Sustainable Homes will help to reduce the risk of flooding, although the risk will be dependent on the location of the development.

- 4.28 Option 2 performs well against the majority of SA objectives, especially those relating to infrastructure, water, waste, climate change and sustainable construction. It sets targets for carbon reduction within the district of 35% to 40% by 2020 with tougher standards to ensure targets are met. The option will have positive impacts on infrastructure by producing 20% of energy in new developments with on-site renewable sources and through requiring high levels of the Code for Sustainable Homes/BREEAM, which will include water and energy efficiency measures. The reduction in carbon emissions will have long-term positive impacts on climate change, health and pollution. The use of micro-renewables and construction of biomass plants to meet this target could have a negative effect on heritage. There is potential for the option to encourage sustainable design, which would ensure new developments are sensitively designed in regard to heritage. Requiring high standards for the Code for Sustainable Homes and BREEAM could have a short-term negative impact on housing by increasing house prices in the area, therefore reducing accessibility of housing to people with lower incomes.
- 4.29 There is potential for the options to more explicitly address flooding, in particular long term adaptation measures as this is a serious issue as highlighted by the Winchester City Council SFRA 2007.

10. Transport and Connectivity

Option 1: Maintain/Improve Current Policies Option 2: More Radical Option

- 4.30 Option 1 performs well against the majority of SA objectives, especially against transport, climate change and health. The policy will deliver improvements to bus services, park and ride schemes, footpaths and cycle links, which will contribute to a reduction of car use in the district and increased access for rural communities. A reduction in car use will lead to improvements in air quality and a reduction of noise pollution, which will have long-term positive impacts on climate change, landscape and health in the district. Other positive measures contained within the policy in a bid to reduce private vehicle use, is for car parking to be minimised in new developments and for commercial development of 1000sq m floorspace to produce travel plans to encourage public transport use. There is potential for the policy to include rail and station improvements as well as bus service improvements as this would increase the policies effect on reducing poor access for rural communities.
- 4.31 Option 2 again performs well against the majority of SA objectives, positively progressing objectives relating to transport, climate change and health. It presents a more radical set of measures that include a large reduction in parking capacity and the introduction of vehicle

charges in urban areas at peak times. The income generated from parking and vehicle charges can then be used to fund sustainable transport measures within and around the key and local hubs. The option will have long-term positive impacts on reducing air and noise pollution within the district. Improving public transport, increasing parking restrictions and introducing charges for higher-emission vehicles will help to reduce the use of the private vehicle and therefore reduce the emissions and noise generated by them. An adequate level of affordable parking will need to be maintained within settlements to avoid the exclusion of the elderly or disabled who might need the continued use of the private vehicle for access to these areas. Improvements to the transport infrastructure would need to be appropriately phased in with car/parking restrictions to ensure that the issues surrounding access are not exacerbated.

- 4.32 Due to the high level of car use and issues surrounding access in Winchester a combination of the core measures in option 1 with the more progressive elements in option 2 would provide the most effective long term benefits.

11. Health and Wellbeing and Inclusive Society

Affordable Housing

Option 1 : Alternative measures of achieving affordable housing

Option 2 : Contributions from non-residential proposals

Option 3: Fully flexible approach

- 4.33 As these Options deal with the specific matter of how to determine Affordable Housing contributions, the majority of SA objectives are not relevant in this instance.
- 4.34 The key consideration in developing these options should be to maximise on-the-ground delivery of affordable housing in the District. As discussed in the Housing Market Assessment (DTZ 2007) in 2005/2006, only 23% of Winchester's new housing stock was developed as affordable housing. In order to meet the potential options of 40% affordable housing requirement being proposed for Winchester (and 50 % in towns and villages of less than 3000), Council needs to consider alternative means of funding. Both Options 1 and 2 are therefore considered worth exploring, as they may help in capturing more developer funding for affordable housing contributions (although it is noted this may leave less money in the pot for other developer-funded infrastructure). Option 3, whilst supported in principle is likely to lead to implementation and monitoring difficulties, and less certainty for developers which has long term negative consequences for the delivery of affordable housing.

12. Health and Wellbeing and Inclusive Society

Housing Mix

Option 1: Maintain existing approach as set out in the adopted Local Plan

Option 2: Deliver more medium sized dwellings

Option 3: Fully flexible Approach

- 4.35 Option 1 ensures that sites will provide 50% of dwellings as small units, which will help to provide for an identified ageing population. It will not however cater for the demand of medium sized dwellings for families and will therefore have a negative effect on building communities and housing.
- 4.36 Option 2 ensures that sites will provide 50% of dwellings as medium units, which will provide for the housing demand of families. The option will not however cater for the demand of small sized dwellings for the elderly and will therefore have a negative effect on building communities and housing.
- 4.37 Option 3 is preferred as it provides a fully flexible approach to housing mix, responding to market needs at the time of delivery. The option will have long-term positive effects on building communities and housing as it will cater to the needs of all sections of the community, and allows for integration of new development with existing context/ design.

13. Health and Wellbeing and Inclusive Society

Housing for Specific Communities

Option 1: Improve and extend existing facilities

Option 2: Give permanent status to some unauthorised sites

Option 3: Identify and allocate further sites

- 4.38 All of the three options perform well against the SA Framework objectives and there are no indications that any of the options are completely unacceptable or raise key sustainability issues.
- 4.39 The identification of the need for sites and positive steps to meet these needs mean that all options perform very well against housing and employment objectives as they will provide security of tenure, which also has indirect but synergistic benefits for health. More specific objectives such as landscape and biodiversity impact will be site specific and cannot be addressed at this strategic stage, individual sites should be subject to SA at a later stage. However, options should be cognisant of the sensitivities around designated sites/ landscape against which more stringent assessment criteria will apply.
- 4.40 However, each option raises different and unknown issues. Whilst Option 1 performs well, particularly in terms of transport, climate change, there is always the issue of the optimum size for sites and the need for this to be balanced with existing settled communities in order to promote social acceptance, integration and cohesion.

- 4.41 Option 2 has the advantage of authorising existing sites in locations which may have been chosen by the travelling communities themselves, but this approach does raise the issue of the long term and cumulative adverse impacts which can be caused by sites in unsustainable locations, particularly on objectives relating to transport and community objectives and impacts on natural resources (biodiversity/ landscape and soils).
- 4.42 Option 3 has the advantages of being able to be implemented through community consultation and the adherence to criteria which ensure that the Council's SA framework objectives are not comprised.
- 4.43 The most sustainable option could be achieved through an amalgamation of these options and thereby maximising the positive potential from all three and screening out the potential for adverse impact.

14. Health and Wellbeing and Inclusive Society

Economic Prosperity

Tourism

Option 1: Retain the existing approach

Option 2: Promotion of tourism

Option 3 : Promotion of 'green' tourism

- 4.44 One of the key aims of the Winchester Sustainable Community Strategy is to enhance the contribution of tourism to the local economy so the district maintains its competitive edge.
- 4.45 Option 1 presents a status quo position that whilst providing protection for core environmental assets, does not proactively support SA objectives. This approach is largely neutral when assessed against SA objectives.
- 4.46 Option 2 suggests a more dynamic approach that recognises the value of Winchester as a tourist destination. Winchester has national level ranking and tourism is far more important to the district than its resident population numbers would imply. Visitor spend is also high in the area and whilst unemployment is generally low and below the national average, the promotion of innovation and creativity in the tourist industry provides strong potential to progress employment objectives seeking to make Winchester a place where young people and graduates chose to work.
- 4.47 The Winchester District Economic Action Plan 2006-2009 has supporting sustainable tourism as one of its guiding principles. Option 3 provides a bold approach to this aspiration and actively seeks to put sustainable ('green') tourism at the forefront of new tourism growth in

the area. This option performs well against all relevant SA objectives as environmental, social and economic benefits are at its heart. Whilst Option 3 provides the clearest and most defined sustainability benefits, a combination of options 2 and 3 may have the best potential to deliver long term sustainability gains.

15. Health and Wellbeing and Inclusive Society

Economic Prosperity

Option 1: Encourage commercial uses with 'green' credentials
Option 2: Promote 'exemplar' sites offering a full range of 'green' credentials

- 4.48 Option 2 uses an incentive driven approach. In competitive markets where businesses are seeking either through their core business strategy or marketing strategies to achieve competitive advantage through sustainable development, support for best practice on environmental issues has significant potential for the District. This approach provides very strong support for and progresses SA objectives for the economy, climate change and sustainable construction.
- 4.49 Both options provide strong support for the Regional Economic Vision (SEEDA, 2006) which is focused on sustainable prosperity. The aspiration is that growth is pursued within ecological limits, such that the region's footprint is stabilised and reduced. Both options provide strong support for this Vision, as well as wider Government policy and strategy on sustainable development (Securing the Future, Defra 2005) that seeks to make business enterprises of all sizes more sustainable in support of the environment and communities that they serve.

16. High Quality Environment

Natural Environment

Option 1: Retain existing approach
Option 2: Review function and extent of 'gaps'
Option 3: Create an alternative approach

- 4.50 Winchester is a predominantly rural region that is valued by the resident population for providing a high quality environment. Diverse countryside widely regarded as one of Winchester's most valuable assets, as it network of parks and green spaces. The RSS South East Plan has concluded that green infrastructure is a cross cutting issue and that it needs to be proactively managed in a coordinated way. Local authorities are asked to consider this issue as a part of their plans.

- 4.51 The Winchester Community Strategy places open space and access to open space as a priority and Option 1 supports this commitment by retaining existing strategic and local gaps. Option 1 is less able to progress social objectives for housing and the community as it prevents development in areas where coalescence has been perceived to be undesirable.
- 4.52 Option 2 supports the intention and spirit of strategic gaps whilst applying a more considered approach. In particular, Option 2 provides acknowledgement that while there is a need to maintain both the character of landscape and settlements, not all development can be realistically accommodated in existing built up areas (Winchester LDF Green Infrastructure Technical Paper, 2007). The assessment indicates that change can support and progress key SA objectives when undertaken in an appropriate manner.
- 4.53 Option 3 cannot be comparatively assessed as an alternative without policy specifics. Other policy options may include, the total removal of a strategic gap/ local gap policy and an introduction of green corridors or wedges based on locally specific landscape features and biodiversity interest.

17/18 High Quality Environment

Open Space Standards
Green Infrastructure

Option 1: 17/18: Retain existing approach

Option 2: 17:Extend matters covered by the standards/ 18:Introduce a new standard

- 4.54 The Options appraisal for matters relating to open space standards and green infrastructure have been appraised together due to similarities between the two issues (both adopt a 'green infrastructure' approach). Both include a 'retain existing approach' option (Option 1), which involves the retention of existing Local Plan policies. Both include a new Option 2, which introduce new standards for the consideration of open space and green infrastructure provision that are more consistent with current good practice in sustainable planning.
- 4.55 In both instances, the new options (option 2) better progress the SA Framework than Option 1 does, with particular benefits for communities, infrastructure, economy and employment, transport, health and climate change.
- 4.56 Option 2 provides for a more holistic way of addressing a range of sustainability issues through provision of a network of green spaces (green infrastructure). Benefits of this approach include:

- opportunities to increase sustainable commuting (cycling and walking) through enhancing a District-wide network of footpaths and cycleways, hence reducing climate change impacts;
- opportunities for increased vegetation which can act as carbon sinks, reducing climate change impacts;
- assisting in adaptation to climate change (providing spaces for species and habitats to migrate);
- mitigating the effects of noise, water and air pollution through providing 'green lungs' for the Borough;
- helping to address obesity through promoting healthy lifestyles and increased physical activity;
- increasing the provision of and accessibility to community and recreational facilities in the District;
- opportunities to promote sustainable water and flood risk management.

19 Infrastructure and Implementation

Developer Contributions

Option 1: Improve existing system

Option 2: Introduce a Tariff

Option 3: Create a hybrid system

- 4.57 In terms of social provision, Option 2 would apparently be the preferred option but as noted in the options paper, care must be taken that the tariffs are not so extensive or set so high as to deter new development which would result in the required housing figures not being met and thereby undermining many of the social objectives.
- 4.58 Option 1 ensures the provision of affordable and intermediate housing but does not provide a mechanism whereby the cumulative impact and demands made by all new development, of whatever scale, can be addressed, unless the improvements to the system covers all potential contributions through the production of specific SPG which will then amount virtually to a tariff system although potentially with greater flexibility.
- 4.59 Option 3 has the benefits of flexibility but will need to be clearly expressed to provide clarity to developers and not causing lengthy delays over sec106 agreements which will undermine the short term provision of all forms of new housing.
- 4.60 The option refers to all developments – do these options then apply to residential and commercial development? If so Option 3 will necessarily be the option most likely to achieve sustainability benefits as it has the flexibility to address the needs and issues which are fairly related to the different types of development.

20 Infrastructure and Implementation

Exceptions

Option 1 : No Exceptions

Option 2: Exceptions

- 4.61 Option 1 provides good support for SA objectives on transport, health, communities and sustainable construction as it allows the council to specify where financial contributions are applied in support of SA objectives. As noted in relation to the infrastructure policies, the ability of this option to deliver against core SA objectives for housing and the economy is less certain as high tariffs may deter development and smaller developers which will have a direct impact on the delivery housing and employment. This may particularly be the case where development costs are high (e.g. due to remediation requirements).
- 4.62 Option 2 is supported where the development/ proposal is addressing a defined social need, e.g. for affordable housing or community facilities. Where this cannot be proven then the benefits are uncertain and the option has the potential to compromise delivery against core objectives for housing, infrastructure and transport.

Summary of Alternatives Appraisal and Selection

- 4.63 The following Table 4.1 summarises the options (alternatives) considered through the Issues & Options and accompanying SA processes. It provides an outline of the reasons for option progression or rejection, including SA commentary where relevant, as required by the European SEA Directive. As noted in Section 2 of this report, the SA findings provided alongside the Issues & Options form a part of the evidence supporting the development of the Plan, but are not the sole basis for decision-making. The Planning Authority considered the findings of the SA of the Issues & Options, alongside wider comments received through the various public consultation exercises undertaken, in the development of the next stage of plan-making - Preferred Option (see Section 5 of this SA Report).

Table 4.1: Summary of Alternatives Assessment and Selection

| Options Considered and Appraised | Reasons for Progressing or Rejecting the Option in Plan-Making and SA Findings |
|--|--|
| April 2008 Issues & Options SA Report | |
| Issue 1. Potential Broad Strategic Allocations for Winchester Town | |
| Option 1: Planned boundaries Approach To remain within its current planned limits Option 2: Step Change Option To raise the profile of the town through a step change in growth | Option 1 was not progressed as it was limited by constraints of existing infrastructure & site availability. Option 2 progressed as able to cater for diversity of housing needs, new supporting facilities & transport. The SA identified major positive socio-economic effects for Option 2 & opportunities for a more holistic sustainable approach to transport. |
| Issue 2. Market Towns and Rural Areas | |
| Option 1: Current Planned | Option 1 was rejected as it was less able to |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>Boundaries Maintain existing boundary Option 2: Consolidation of Key Hub Role Allow for some growth Option 3: Step Change to become a larger or more specialised service centre. Key hubs would be able to develop beyond their existing boundaries</p> | <p>progress community and transport objectives. Mix of options 2 and 3 progressed as stronger support for communities, transport, economy, sustainable design and renewables. The SA also noted the need for strong mitigation for potential cumulative effects on habitats and cultural integrity, particularly close to the urban/PUSH areas.</p> |
| <p>Issue 3. Market Towns and Rural Area – Local Hubs</p> | |
| <p>Option 1: Current Planned Boundaries Limit development to within the existing defined boundary Option 2: Consolidation of Local Hub Role Allow limited growth to support the retention of local services and facilities Option 3: Step change to become a Key Hub Promotion of sustainable development to enable the local hub to grow</p> | <p>Option 1 rejected because limited in possibilities to progress sustainable development. Mix of Options 2 and 3 progressed to support proposals that help strengthen vitality of small rural towns.</p> <p>The SA noted the relatively more significant cumulative adverse effects on the natural environment for Option 3; mitigation likely to be more effective for Options 2.</p> |
| <p>Issue 4. Market Towns and Rural Area Options for the Rural Area – Settlement Hierarchy</p> | |
| <p>Option 1: Allow infilling or redevelopment within the settlements defined in the adopted Local Plan Option 2: Allow some small scale growth and change</p> | <p>Option 1 rejected as less certain to promote sustainable communities. Option 2 progressed as more positive effects for communities and sustainable transport.</p> |
| <p>Issue 5. Market Towns and Rural Areas Options for the Rural Area – Affordable Housing</p> | |
| <p>Option 1: Retain the requirement to deliver 30% on sites Option 2: Increase the requirement to provide 50% affordable housing</p> | <p>An approach between Option 1 and 2 was progressed to increase range and numbers of affordable housing in rural areas.</p> |
| <p>Issue 6. Market Towns and Rural Area Options for the Rural Area: Rural Exception Sites</p> | |
| <p>Option 1: Retain existing approach to allowing rural exception sites for the delivery of 100% affordable housing Option 2: Explore more creative ways of delivering affordable housing</p> | <p>Option 2 was rejected as it does not progress sustainability objectives as effectively as Option 1 which maximises number of dwellings and amount of land take required.</p> |
| <p>Issue 7. Market Towns and Rural Area Options for the Rural Area: Redundant Rural Buildings</p> | |
| <p>Option 1: Retain the existing approach to employment provision Option 2: a) Relax the existing approach to make it easier to convert b) Allow redundant rural buildings to be converted</p> | <p>Option 1 rejected as employment may be less supported by sustainable transport; Option 2 progressed as it better enhances the rural economy and communities.</p> |

| Issue 8. Partnership for Urban South Hampshire (PUSH) Area | |
|--|---|
| Option 1: Expand Bishops Waltham, Wickham and Knowle Option 2: Expand West of Waterlooville Option 3: Concentrate growth at Whiteley | Option 1 rejected as potential for significant adverse effects on natural resources and landscape settings. A mix of Options 2 and 3 were progressed to distribute the development. The SA noted the potential adverse effects for coalescence and European protected sites for biodiversity with Option 3. |
| Issue 9. Core Issues: Climate Change | |
| Option 1: Meet Minimum Requirements Option 2: More Ambitious Option | A mix of Options 1 and 2 progressed in line with the Winchester Climate Change Strategy. The SA noted that the options should more explicitly address flooding and longer term adaptation measures. |
| Issue 10. Transport and Connectivity | |
| Option 1: Maintain/Improve Current Policies Option 2: More Radical Option | A mix of Options 1 and 2 was progressed to help provide the most effective longer term benefits. |
| Issue 11. Health and Wellbeing and Inclusive Society Affordable Housing | |
| Option 1 : Alternative measures of achieving affordable housing Option 2 : Contributions from non-residential proposals Option 3: Fully flexible approach | Option 3 rejected as difficulties in implementation identified. Mix of Options 1 and 2 progressed. |
| Issue 12. Health and Wellbeing and Inclusive Society Housing Mix | |
| Option 1: Maintain existing approach as set out in the adopted Local Plan Option 2: Deliver more medium sized dwellings Option 3: Fully flexible Approach | Option 1 rejected as does not address needs of families; Option 2 rejected as does not address the needs of elderly. Option 3 progressed as it better responds to needs. The SA also noted that this would have long term positive effects on communities. |
| Issue 13. Health and Wellbeing and Inclusive Society Housing for Specific Communities | |
| Option 1: Improve and extend existing facilities Option 2: Give permanent status to some unauthorised sites Option 3: Identify and allocate further sites | Elements of all 3 options progressed: Option 1 strong on transport, Option 2 very positive with regard to existing communities; and Option 3 could be implemented through community consultation. The SA also noted that Option 3 would allow adherence to Council's aims for sustainable development. |
| Issue 14. Health and Wellbeing and Inclusive Society Economic Prosperity: Tourism | |
| Option 1: Retain the existing approach Option 2: Promotion of tourism Option 3 : Promotion of 'green' tourism | Option 1 rejected as it does not promote the aims of the Community Strategy. Mix of Options 2 and 3 progressed as having the best potential to deliver long term sustainability gains. |
| Issue 15. Health and Wellbeing and Inclusive Society Economic Prosperity | |
| Option 1: Encourage commercial uses with 'green' credentials Option 2: Promote 'exemplar' sites offering a full range of 'green' | Consideration of both options progressed. The SA also noted the very positive effects indicated for Option 2. |

| | |
|---|---|
| credentials | |
| Issue 16. High Quality Environment Natural Environment | |
| Option 1: Retain existing approach Option 2: Review function and extent of 'gaps' Option 3: Create an alternative approach | Option 1 rejected as less able to progress objectives for communities and housing. Option 3 not progressed as there were no clear options identified. Option 2 progressed as it supports the intention of Gaps. |
| Issue 17/18 High Quality Environment Open Space Standards Green Infrastructure | |
| Option 1: 17/18: Retain existing approach Option 2: 17:Extend matters covered by the standards/ 18:Introduce a new standard | Option 2 progressed as more benefits for communities and environmental assets. The SA also noted that Option 2 provides for opportunities with Green Infrastructure. |
| Issue 19 Infrastructure and Implementation Developer Contributions | |
| Option 1: Improve existing system Option 2: Introduce a Tariff Option 3: Create a hybrid system | Option 1 rejected as the cumulative effects of all development not addressed. Option 2 not progressed as concerns that development might be deterred; Option 3 progressed with its benefits for flexibility. |
| Issue 20 Infrastructure and Implementation Exceptions | |
| Option 1 : No Exceptions Option 2: Exceptions | Option 2 progressed where a development proposal is addressing a social need. |

5.0 SA OF CORE STRATEGY PREFERRED POLICIES 2009

- 5.1 The Issues and Options document was made widely available and workshops were held across the Winchester District during early 2008. In the later part of the year stakeholder workshops were also held with key service providers and community representatives to discuss their views on the options given the evidence base and the regional requirements set by the South East Plan. This consultation input and the appraisal findings detailed in Section 4 informed the development of Preferred Options. This work was undertaken alongside the POs development to ensure that emerging findings could inform the development of the policy document.

SA of Core Strategy Vision and Objectives

- 5.2 A strategic compatibility analysis of the Core Strategy Vision and Objectives was carried out using the SA framework in April 2009. On the whole, the Core Strategy vision and objectives perform well against the majority of SA objectives. Some of the key sustainability issues are addressed through the objectives, such as the protecting and enhancing the character and quality of the landscape of the District and the promotion of health and well being through the promotion of more sustainable modes of travel, and the timely provision of infrastructure and services. SA objectives that do not appear to be particularly well addressed relate to protection and improvement of the water resource, although this is implicit in spatial planning objectives addressing environmental quality.

SA of Preferred Options

- 5.3 The Preferred Option policies as agreed by Winchester City Council (22 April 2009), were subject to detailed SA. A summary of the results of this appraisal is provided below, with the detailed working matrices provided in Appendix VI. On the whole, the findings of the SA suggest that the emerging Core Strategy policies will make significant contributions to the progression of SA objectives.

Policy SS1 Sustainable Development Principles

- 5.4 The policy sets out a sound base policy with which all development proposals should accord. Positive or neutral impacts are recorded for all the SA objectives. However, whilst understandable by the technical user, the policy intentions may not be immediately clear to other users of the plan. The plan provides a useful glossary and consideration could be given to including the terms 'environmental assets' and 'resources constraints and opportunities' to provide improved clarity and understanding for users of the plan. The importance of the water environment should also be recognised either by direct reference or a cross reference to Policy CP7. This issue of explicit recognition of the

water environment was also noted in the overarching compatibility analysis reported in para 5.2.

- 5.5 Waste management is covered by the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Core Planning Strategy and Project Integra Draft Action Plan 2007-2012. Although LDFs should not replicate other plan policy it would be useful if the domestic scale waste issues were highlighted or cross referenced either within the policy or in supporting text, as on site community recycling and composting facilities can be useful additions to sites where kerbside collections of all recyclables are not available.

Policy SS2 – Requirements for major large scale developments

- 5.6 This policy effectively progresses key sustainability objectives, in particular those addressing the provision of infrastructure and housing, which were identified as particular issues during the earlier SA Scoping process. No adverse impacts are identified by the appraisal process and the policy and should be instrumental in progressing sustainable development on the four major sites. Potential issues in relation to biodiversity are noted and cross reference should be made to the parallel HRA report which considers in more detail how specific major developments may impact European sites and how policies may avoid or mitigate those impacts.
- 5.7 It is noted that a number of the issues covered by the policy are generic to all major sites (e.g. 40% affordable housing) and all sites will also be subject to other specific policies relating to water, landscape, biodiversity, energy supply and design.

Policy WT1 Strategy for Winchester Town

- 5.8 The allocations at Barton Farm and Bushfield Camp have not been assessed as part of this policy as they are subject to detailed individual assessment under policies WT2 and WT3 respectively. However it is noted that these allocations maximise the benefits of the existing infrastructure of Winchester Town.
- 5.9 Generally the policy performs well against the SA objectives in light of the level of development Winchester Town is expected to accommodate, as directed by the RSS, the South East Plan. The tension between design policies and sustainable construction policies are also expressed elsewhere in the plan but with its emphasis on the density and appearance of new development, there are potentially issues with regard to how developers will be able to satisfactorily meet all these policy requirements. It is recommended that guidance is prepared for developers and householders to give clear examples of how the requirements can be achieved.

Policy WT2 Strategic Housing Allocation – Barton Farm

- 5.10 This site generally performs well against the SA objectives and, if required, will assist in meeting the District housing requirement and providing accommodation to meet a wide range of needs. The policy recognises the need to improve public transport, walking and cycling links to reduce carbon emissions and thereby progressing the climate change objectives. The site is well located to meet these requirements.
- 5.11 Awareness of the sensitivity of the River Itchen is expressed and issues relating the impacts on European designated biodiversity sites (River Itchen is an SAC) are addressed in the Habitats Regulations Assessment report which also accompanies the Preferred Option document. The appraisal makes two recommendations: the protection of the tracks crossing the site, and their role in integrating the on site GI; the adjacent GI and the risk of light and noise pollution on the northern boundary from development.

Policy WT3 Strategic Employment Allocation Bushfield Camp

- 5.12 The policy conveys some uncertainty about the viability of the site which raises potential questions about the provision of adequate infrastructure. The supporting text also acknowledges issues about the biodiversity and habitat sensitivity of the area earmarked for GI. The assessment notes parallel work being undertaken for the HRA and that given the sensitivities of the River Itchen, it is possible that Appropriate Assessment may be necessary. These factors require further detailed work and could result in the removal of the site from the plan on sustainability grounds unless no adverse impacts are proven.
- 5.13 In relation to the wider SA objectives, the site performs well in terms of location and has the potential to facilitate the long term aims of the Council and become part of the movement towards a low carbon economy. It is recommended that a comprehensive Green Travel plan is required.

Policy SH1 Strategy for the South Hampshire Urban Areas

- 5.14 This policy is essentially a strategic policy which sets out how the required development in the South Hampshire area will be achieved. It refers to the policies SH2 - 5 which are assessed individually in this SA. When considering the cumulative impact of the elements of this policy, issues are raised over pollution and sustainable transport but when considered with the detail of transport improvements specified in the separate policies it is illustrated that mitigation is possible. Potential adverse impacts on biodiversity generally, and more specifically, on water quality and quantity will need to be resolved through further HRA work. This policy states that habitats of international and national importance will be protected and this must be carried through with

further guidance on the potential for mitigation when the information is available.

- 5.15 The SA raised some minor issues over the commercial floorspace which is '(mostly already committed)' and it is recommended that there is a commitment to monitoring the availability of commercial floorspace during the plan period. There will inevitably be adverse impacts arising from this scale of development which must be balanced against the expressed need for the housing and commercial development required. The need for mitigation must be recognised and this is clearly expressed in the individual development proposal policies and the appraisal of those policies.

Policy SH2 Strategic Housing Allocation – West of Waterlooville.

- 5.16 This site is greenfield and of some considerable scale which will inevitably have some short term adverse impacts but it is identified as being fundamental to meeting the District, and regional, housing requirement which meets social needs.
- 5.17 The site does offer a comprehensive range of social, residential and economic development which should help reduce carbon emissions in the long term. Concerns are raised through the appraisal process, over landscape and biodiversity issues and development proposals should consider and include any mitigation required ahead of development proceeding Reference should be made to the HRA report which assesses the nature impact and whether mitigation is possible in relation to the European Sites potentially affected.

Policy SH3 Strategic Housing Allocation – North Whiteley

- 5.18 The site will contribute to the community, housing and employment objectives of the plan and is also well placed to encourage less car dependency. However the appraisal has identified the potential for adverse impact on the water, landscape and biodiversity objectives given the proximity of the site to biodiversity designations. Where the designations are of European importance they will be considered through the parallel HRA process.

Policy SH4 North/North-East Hedge End SDA

- 5.19 The policy as written recognises the need for joint working with the adjacent authority to meet the South East Plan's requirements for a new settlement at Hedge End. The policy is limited in its extent but seeks to protect the integrity of Winchester District's existing settlements and the landscape in line with the Core Strategy Vision and Spatial Planning Objectives. The policy will potentially have a positive impact in protecting key assets in the District, however with limited definition there is uncertainty as to how key SA objectives will be progressed as result of implementation.

Policy SH5 North Fareham SDA

- 5.20 As noted in relation to Policy SH4, this policy recognises the need for cross boundary working with the adjacent authority to meet the South East Plan's requirements for a new settlement at North of Fareham. The policy specifically seeks to protect the integrity of Winchester District's existing settlements and the landscape in line with the Core Strategy Vision and Spatial Planning Objectives. The policy will have a positive impact in protecting key assets in the District.

Policy MTRA 1 Strategy for Market Towns and Rural Area

- 5.21 If considered individually, this policy promotes dispersed development which has the potential for adverse impacts on the landscape, the tranquillity of the countryside through light and noise pollution and on climate change through increased carbon emissions. Cumulative impacts on water quality from incremental development will also have to be monitored. However, this policy will be implemented in the context of overarching policies for sustainable development and against sustainable development principles, which will act to address and mitigate the potential negative effects of this policy.
- 5.22 Policy MTRA 2, addressed below, clarifies the scale of development which will be allowed and sets out a clear settlement hierarchy and a clear signpost and link in the text of this Policy MTRA 1 would clarify the intent of this policy and remove the doubts over the potential impacts.

Policy MTRA 2 Market Towns and Rural Area Settlement Hierarchy

- 5.23 This policy lends clarity over the scale of development but detailed impacts will still inevitably be site specific. The policy promotes a level of development across the rural parts of the District mostly in settlements with a certain level of facilities. Concern is expressed about the cumulative impact on biodiversity and the landscape, and also over the ability of small scale developments to meet the social needs generated by this overall quantum of development. There is not necessarily a correlation between new development and maintaining existing services as lifestyle patterns are changing, however, by encouraging limited levels of growth this provides opportunities for using local shops and schools.
- 5.24 All new development will bring about an increase in vehicle related emissions and this will necessarily be more marked in smaller settlements with poorer rail and bus links. Alternatively benefits will be found in the provision of affordable housing in smaller communities and the potential to provide a greater mix of dwellings in a wide range of settlements. The policy also recognises and facilitates the need to maintain and increase the diversity and location of employment opportunities across the District.

Policy MTRA 3 The Wider Countryside

- 5.25 The appraisal identified no significant impacts, although it is recognised that potential impacts will be site and location dependant. It is assessed that benefits will accrue for rural communities through allowing work places to be centred where they are required, and thereby reducing the need to travel. The policy will progress SA Objectives, particularly in relation to communities/ rural communities.

Policy MTRA 4 Re-use of Rural Buildings

- 5.26 Socially and economically the policy performs well against the SA objectives. The appraisal identified potential negative issues in relation to the environmental impacts of the policy. However, these can be effectively mitigated and managed through the implementation of: guidance; policy and conditions regulating traffic generation; noise and light pollution; and surveys to determine the ecological value of disused or under used buildings. The character and landscape impact of conversions can also be controlled in the same way.

Policy CP1 Open Space, Sport and Recreation

- 5.27 The policy will actively progress the SA Framework and Community Strategy objectives relating to a healthy population. There are also potential related benefits for biodiversity, the landscape and car related pollution. Overall this is a positive policy which will have long term, cumulative and synergistic benefits.

Policy CP2 Transport

- 5.28 The policy should have long term positive impacts in relation to access to facilities and trying to reduce reliance on the private vehicle. This in turn has positive benefits for the objectives relating to climate change and pollution. Indirect benefits will also accrue for the economy, health and biodiversity. The policy is particularly important and relevant for the Winchester District given that unsustainable transport patterns have been identified as one of the key sustainability challenges during the lifetime of the plan.

Policy CP3 Economic Growth and Diversification

- 5.29 The policy has the potential to have very positive impacts; direct, indirect and synergistic. In and out commuting levels are currently high in the Winchester District and the policy seeks to ensure that employment opportunities are available for the resident population and that job opportunities are expanded in line with the housing requirement.
- 5.30 The policy creates conditions which assist the potential for people to live and work in the district thereby reducing carbon emissions and

local pollution. The recognition of the importance of the tourist economy will indirectly lead to protection of the environment on which it is based, and will have a synergistic impact with policies directly seeking such protection.

Policy CP4 Major Commercial and Educational Establishments in the Countryside

- 5.31 This is a specific policy to retain significant employers which are part of the business and training sectors which support the District's five key economic sectors. Providing a policy background which meets the needs of established employers and aids their retention in the District helps to meet the employment needs of the area.
- 5.32 The sensitivity of the locations of these establishments is clearly recognised in the policy and potential adverse impacts on transport issues, the natural and built environment and existing communities are identified and measures put in place so that they will be avoided. The requirement for masterplans, which will address any constraints identified and present clear mitigation proposals, make this a policy which progresses sustainable development with positive impacts for the District.

Policy CP5 Green Infrastructure

- 5.33 As outlined in the supporting text to this policy, the introduction of GI into new developments will have multiple benefits which range across virtually the whole set of SA objectives. There are clear synergies between this policy and other policies protecting biodiversity, the water environment and managing climate change. To enable incorporation of appropriate GI at the early planning stages the policy should give clear guidance as to the recognised standards to which the policy refers.
- 5.34 The overall impact should be cumulative, long term and very positive for the Council's overarching aim to achieve sustainable development whilst meeting its share of the demands of the national housing requirement.

Policy CP6 Biodiversity

- 5.35 This is a specific policy to ensure protection of priority habitats and species identified in the Winchester BAP. While the body of the policy supports the aims of the BAP, the final paragraph is potentially open to an interpretation which concludes that mitigation is always possible.
- 5.36 It is recommended that the policy is amended by the addition of: 'Where adverse impacts are unavoidable and satisfactory mitigation cannot be achieved, development proposals will only be supported if the benefits of the development clearly outweigh the harm to the habitat and/or species'. This would improve the performance of the policy to progress this SA objective.

Policy CP7 Flooding, Flood Risk and the Water Environment

- 5.37 The Council has adopted a holistic approach to all issues concerning the water environment. Localised surface water flooding is a problem for the district and there may be future issues over water supply. The policy also will assist the plan in meeting the requirements of the Water Framework Directive (2000/60/EC). The policy will be instrumental in meeting the Council's vision to achieve sustainable development for the District but would be much improved if the policy required, rather than sought, compliance with the criteria.

Policy CP8 Cultural Heritage and Landscape Character

- 5.38 The district has a rich and varied historic environment both man made and natural which should be protected for its own sake; and the policy clearly provides this protection by progressing the relevant SA objectives. The policy will also have additional long term, cumulative benefits for the economy, biodiversity and the quality of life of residents through ensuring that key assets are protected and enhanced.

Policy CP9 South Downs National Park/Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty

- 5.39 This policy reinforces and provides support for designations that are designed to protect landscape and wider cultural areas within the District. This approach will progress key sustainability objectives for the biodiversity, heritage and specifically the character and quality of Winchester's landscape. National Park designations, and this policy's support for those aims, also provides additional benefits for the tourism sector, by increasing the attractiveness and desirability of the location as an area to visit and recreate in which has potential long term benefits for Winchester's wider economy, in particular rural businesses. Wider benefits for existing and new residents are also possible where accessibility to the countryside is improved and supported in the context of new/ permitted development.

CP10 Settlement Gaps

- 5.40 The policy will be an important tool for managing development in an area of high pressure. In addition to the direct impacts of preventing settlement coalescence and protecting the setting of historic settlements, the policy will also bring about indirect benefits for the landscape, design through the better integration of new development, health and biodiversity. Hedge End and Fareham Strategic Gaps are assessed separately under Policies SH4 and SH5.

Policy CP 11 Ensuring high quality sustainable design

- 5.41 The appraisal shows that this policy address the core aims and objectives contained in the SA framework and no adverse effects are identified through the process. The policy provides good foundations

for ensuring long term support for and improvements to sustainable design which will be instrumental in assisting in the creation of good quality development.

Policy CP12 Ensuring the effective use of land

- 5.42 The policy performs well against the SA objectives and no adverse impacts are identified. The policy will assist in producing a wider range of accommodation, increase the potential for public transport use (through location and density) and therefore be positive for climate change and reduce the need for greenfield sites. Overall there are positive and long term, cumulative benefits possible through the implementation of this policy.

Policy CP13 Sustainable Low and Zero Carbon Built Development

- 5.43 The policy will be instrumental in meeting the Governments targets relating to climate change and the impact of new development. No adverse impacts are identified but the issue of the increased costs of these construction techniques is identified and noted in the appraisal. Some uncertainty regarding costs may influence the extent to which the policy is effectively implemented and the commensurate benefits realised. There may also be indirect benefits for health and biodiversity which will accrue over time from a more sustainable approach to building.

Policy CP14 Renewable and Decentralised Energy

- 5.44 The SA has identified the potential for adverse impact, for example, in the use of monoculture to produce fuel crops which will reduce the amount of land available for food production and have adverse impacts on local biodiversity. However the clearly identified beneficial impacts for climate change, pollution and health, which are likely to be medium to long term must also be reflected. Studies to address the potential for renewable generation in the Winchester District and the most appropriate forms of energy have supported the development of this policy.

Policy CP15 Housing Provision

- 5.45 This policy outlines the overall dwelling requirement for the plan period to the Core Strategy. Appraisal of the apportionment and expected level of development has been appraised at policies WT1-3 and SH1-5 when considering the strategy and the site allocations. Any new development has the potential to lead to some adverse impact, depending on the location and existing sensitivities and it is the detail of other policies and the location and detail of strategic allocations, which will mitigate against the potential impacts (as discussed in earlier appraisal summaries).

Policy CP16 Housing Priorities

- 5.46 Policies CP 18, 19 and 20 all deal with the provision of both urban and rural affordable housing and this policy adds that priority will be given to that provision but does not explain how.
- 5.47 The second part of the policy requires that all dwellings meet a wide range of community requirements, however the intent of the policy is not entirely clear. It appears to refer to the need that a wide range of community requirements such as sheltered housing, special needs housing, residential accommodation for the elderly and nursing homes, should be provided. If this is the case, then this need cannot be met by all new dwellings but, it can be met by some of them, thereby progressing sustainability objectives for housing, community and health. To contribute more effectively to the sustainability of the plan this policy should be given careful consideration and clarified.

Policy CP17 Housing Mix

- 5.48 This is very specific policy which is intended to avoid the saturation of the market with standard units. The appraisal indicates that the policy will bring about indirect benefits for communities and general health. No adverse impacts identified that require mitigation were identified by the SA.

Policy CP18 Affordable Housing

- 5.49 The policy sets out the requirements for affordable housing and will generally have no specific negative impacts on the majority of objectives because the housing is "affordable" i.e. for social rent or shared equity, and will mainly be a component of the large allocated sites. Therefore the impact of the affordable housing is encompassed in impacts as they relate to the overall housing requirement. The exception to this will be the smaller sites built on infill plots and on publicly owned land and the "local connections" housing. The different types of provision are fully assessed under Policies CP19 and 20 below. The policy will progress sustainability objectives in relation to communities, housing provision and health in the long term.

Policy CP19 Affordable Housing – Quota Sites

- 5.50 The quota housing will be part of the housing requirement met on the allocated sites and as such which will have no extra impact over and above that already assessed for previous policies. In addition, all other housing developments, of which the affordable housing will be a component, will have undergone rigorous assessment of impact on historic built environment, landscape and biodiversity issues. There will be a long term and cumulative impact on one of the District's main objectives and identified sustainability issue of providing good quality housing for all. As noted under Policy CP18, most housing association

development is already subject to meeting level 3 of the CSH which includes water and energy demand techniques.

Policy CP20 Affordable Housing – Local Connection Homes

- 5.51 The policy appears to extend the concept of rural exception sites and has been appraised from this perspective. Overall the policy is generally positive for SA framework objectives and no significant adverse effects were identified. The Government's recent response to the Taylor Report which considers 'enabling development' should be noted in relation to this policy. 'It is important to clarify that the Government has no intention of allowing market housing to be built on rural exception sites as this would undermine their very purpose.' [The Government Response to the Taylor Review of Rural Economy and Affordable Housing (Department for Communities and Local Government, March 2009)].

Policy CP21 Sites for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople

- 5.52 The SA has identified no adverse impacts and the policy supports a cultural tradition and ensures that all members of society have the opportunity to have appropriate accommodation. There is clear progression of relevant social objectives, whilst key District assets, e.g. cultural and landscape are protected. Reference to relative scale of sites, provision of services and the provision of play space for younger children would improve the policy still further.

Policy CP22 retention of local services and facilities

- 5.53 The SA demonstrates that this is an effective policy which has benefits for community and social inclusion. There are associated benefits for transport, climate change and pollution if communities are supported through the provision of local facilities and therefore need to travel less distance for essential goods and services. The benefits are likely to be medium to long term and synergistic where support for local facilities provides economic viability for wider goods and service businesses.

Policy CP23 Infrastructure and Community Benefit

- 5.54 A clear and direct policy which requires appropriate and necessary infrastructure to support development proposals. The policy ensures that development will not be deterred through demands for infrastructure and contributions by recognising that the cumulative effect of such requirements can make sites unviable. Therefore, the level of commercial and residential development required through the RSS will have a positive chance of being delivered. This policy also recognises that there is key role in promoting GI and its wider benefits as part of a mitigation package for the biodiversity interest in sensitive development areas. The HRA report accompanying the POs document considers this issue in more detail.

6.0 SUMMARY AND CUMULATIVE EFFECTS ANALYSIS

- 6.1 In addition to the appraisal of individual policies undertaken in SA/SEA, the SEA Directive requires consideration of the overall effects of the plan, including the secondary, synergistic and cumulative effects of plan policies. This may include incremental effects that can have a small effect individually, but can accrue to have significant environmental effects.
- 6.2 In good practice SA/SEA, the analysis of cumulative effects should also consider the significant effects of the plan in combination with the effects of other plans, policies and proposals.
- 6.3 This section summarises the key effects, including the cumulative effects of the plan policies (known as the intra-plan effects) and the combined effects with other relevant plans and projects (known as the inter-plan effects).

Cumulative effect of Plan Policies (Intra-plan effects)

- 6.4 To assist in considering the overall effects of policies within the plan when assessed against the different SA Framework objectives, a summary has been prepared, illustrating how each policy has performed against each SA Objective. This is provided in the following table:

Table 6.1: Intra-plan effects: Cumulative summary of Core Strategy policies 2009

| Policy | SA Objective | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|-----|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 |
| SS1 Sustainable Development Principles | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | ? | + | + | + | + | + | 0 | 0 ? |
| SS2 Requirements for major lg scale devp | + | ++ | ++ | + | + | + | + | 0 | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| WT1 Strategy for Winchester Town | + | 0 | + | + | + | - | 0 | 0 | + | - | + | + | ? | + | + |
| WT2 Strategic Housing Alloc. Barton Farm | + | + | + | + | + | + | ? | + | + | - | + | ? | + | 0 | + |
| WT3 Strategic Employ. Alloc. Bushfield Cp | + | ? | 0 | ++ | + | + | ? | ? | + | 0 | ? | - | + | 0 | + |
| SH1 Strategy for South Hamp. Urban Areas | + | + | + | ? | + | - | + | 0 | - | + | ? | ? | 0 | 0 | - |
| SH2 Strategic Housing Alloc. W of Waterl | + | + | ++ | ++ | + | + | ? | + | + | - | + | ? | + | 0 | + |
| SH3 Strategic Housing Alloc. North Whit. | + | + | ++ | + | + | - | - | + | + | - | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | + |
| SH4 North/NE Hedge End SDA | + | ? | ? | + | ? | - | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | + | + | ? | ? |
| SH5 North Fareham SDA | + | 0 | + | + | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | ? | + | + | 0 | 0 |
| MTRA1 Strategy for Market Towns & RAs | ++ | - | ++ | + | + | + | ? | + | - | 0 | + | 0 | - | 0 | - |
| MTRA2 MTs and RA Settlement Hierarchy | + | ? | - | ++ | + | - | + | ? | + | - | 0 | ? | ? | 0 | - |
| MTRA3 The Wider Countryside | + | 0 | 0 | + | + | 0 | 0 | + | ? | + | ? | ? | ? | ? | + |
| MTRA4 Re-use of Rural Buildings | + | 0 | + | ++ | - | ? | 0 | 0 | + | + | - | - | + | - | - |
| CP1 Open Space, Sport and Recreation | ++ | ++ | + | 0 | + | ++ | - | 0 | - | + | 0 | + | 0 | + | + |
| CP2 Transport | + | + | 0 | + | ++ | ++ | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | + |
| CP3 Economic Growth & Diversification | ++ | 0 | 0 | ++ | ++ | + | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | + | + | + | 0 | + |
| CP4 Major Commer. & Edn. Est. in Cside | + | 0 | 0 | + | + | + | + | 0 | + | + | + | + | + | + | 0 |
| CP5 Green Infrastructure | 0 | ? | 0 | + | + | + | + | 0 | ++ | ++ | ++ | + | + | + | + |
| CP6 Biodiversity | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| CP7 Flooding, Flood Risk & Water Env. | 0 | + | 0 | + | 0 | + | ++ | 0 | + | ++ | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | + |
| CP8 Cultural Heritage & Landscape Charc. | + | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | + | + | + | 0 |
| CP9 South Down NP area/ AONB | + | 0 | 0 | + | + | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | ++ | + | ++ | + | 0 |
| CP10 Settlement Gaps | + | ? | 0 | + | 0 | + | ? | 0 | + | ? | + | + | + | + | + |
| CP11 Ensuring high quality design | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | + | 0 | + | 0 | + | + | + | 0 | + | 0 |

| Policy | SA Objective | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--------------|----|----|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 |
| CP12 Ensuring effective use of land | 0 | 0 | ++ | + | + | + | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | + | + | + | ++ |
| CP13 Sustainable low and zero carbon | + | 0 | ? | + | ? | 0 | ++ | ++ | ++ | ++ | + | ? | 0 | ? | + |
| CP14 Renewable and decentral. Energy | + | 0 | + | + | 0 | + | - | 0 | 0 | ++ | + | - | 0 | + | + |
| CP15 Housing Provision | + | 0 | ++ | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 | - | 0 | 0 |
| CP16 Housing Priorities | ++ | 0 | ++ | + | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| CP17 Housing Mix | + | 0 | ++ | + | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| CP18 Affordable Housing | ++ | 0 | ++ | + | + | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| CP19 Affordable Housing Quota sites | ++ | 0 | ++ | + | + | + | + | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| CP20 Affordable Housing – local connc. | ++ | 0 | ++ | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | - |
| CP21 Sites for Gypsies, Trav. & Trav Show | + | + | ++ | + | + | ++ | + | + | + | + | + | ++ | + | + | ? |
| CP22 Retention of local services and facil | ++ | + | 0 | + | + | + | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + |
| CP23 Infrastructure & Comm. Benefit | ++ | ++ | 0 | 0 | + | + | + | + | + | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

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

Significant positive cumulative effects of plan policies (Intra-plan effects)

- 6.5 The SA found that the majority of policies were found to have significant positive sustainability benefits for the Winchester District. The following table summarises the significant positive effects identified:

Table 6.2: Significant positive effects of the emerging Core Strategy 2009

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

Significant negative cumulative effects of plan policies (Intra-plan effects)

- 6.6 Alongside the many positive effects of the plan, potential negative sustainability effects were also identified. These primarily relate to the increased residential and employment development proposed in the plan, although it is noted that the scale of the housing requirement is determined at a higher policy level in the South East Plan. Negative effects identified are summarised below:

Table 6.3: Significant negative effects of the emerging Core Strategy 2009

| Key relevant SA Objective: | Negative Effects identified: |
|--|--|
| Climate Change Biodiversity Landscape & townscape | <p>The cumulative effects of increased development, including housing, employment development, and other infrastructure. These effects include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ increased air pollution (local and regional); ■ direct land-take; ■ pressures on water resources and water quality; ■ increased noise and light pollution, particularly from traffic; ■ increased waste production; ■ potential loss of tranquillity ; ■ implications for human health (e.g. from increased pollution); and ■ incremental effects on landscape and townscapes. <p>It is noted that whilst policies relating to the overall amount of residential and employment development, are determined at a higher policy level in the South East Plan, potential significant environmental effects are evident for the Winchester District. It is important that these effects are recognised in the SA so that adequate mitigation can be set in place in the LDF.</p> |
| Climate Change and Energy/ | <p>An increase in the District's contribution to greenhouse gas production- this is inevitable given the amount of new development proposed, and includes factors such as increased transportation costs, embodied energy in construction materials and increased energy use from new housing and employment development.</p> |
| Cultural Heritage Landscape & Townscape Building Communities | <p>Less tangible effects of significant physical, economic and social changes for local communities, including impacts on cultural heritage, landscape, community cohesion particularly in locations where there will be significant increases in development.</p> |

Interactions with other relevant plans and projects (Inter-plan effects)

- 6.7 In considering the in-combination effects of other plans and projects, priority has been given to key documents that affect planning and development in Winchester and its neighbouring authorities. The aim of the analysis of inter-plan effects was to identify how other plans and key projects may affect the sustainability of the Winchester District. Whilst it is recognised that there are wider sustainability implications

beyond Winchester's boundaries, it is considered that sustainability concerns for the wider Hampshire sub-region should be covered in the South East Plan and the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal.

- 6.8 Key documents considered were the South East Plan, neighbouring authorities LDFs- in particular for the PUSH area, and Regional and County-level transport planning and economic and cultural strategy documents. It is noted that this is not an exhaustive list of plans; however its focus on the most influential documents has allowed a strategic level appraisal of Inter-Plan effects suited to the purposes of this SA.
- 6.9 The results of this analysis illustrate a range of positive and negative effects for the Winchester District and the wider environment. Positive effects relate primarily to social and economic benefits: an increase in affordable housing, enhanced infrastructure, including community facilities, healthier lifestyles and enhanced employment and economic opportunities, and improved access to services, employment and facilities.
- 6.10 Negative effects identified from the inter-plan analysis relate to the cumulative and incremental effects of development: noise, air, light and water pollution, incremental effects on biodiversity, indirect effects on cultural heritage, landscape, community cohesion and identity, loss of Greenfield land, increased waste production and an increase in greenhouse gas emissions.
- 6.11 In preparing plan policies, Winchester City Council has already sought to mitigate many of these negative effects and is commended for the work undertaken to date. It is also recognised that some mitigation measures are more appropriately dealt with at lower tiers of plan-making, for example in Development Management Policies. Further iterations of the Core Strategy should seek to continue to address these matters, as per the recommendations in section 7 of this report.

Table 6.4: Significant Inter-Plan Cumulative Effects 2009

Note: Negative effects coloured in red text, positive in black.

| SA Topics Summary | Other plans, projects or policies | Significant effects identified in other plans, projects or policies | Significant combined effects of Winchester Core Strategy with other plans, projects or policies |
|-------------------------------|--|---|---|
| Building Communities | South East Plan (sub regional framework for South Hampshire, e.g. policy SH1) & neighbouring LDFs-provision for a wide range of infrastructure; regeneration policies. | Positive effect through providing increased infrastructure to meet community needs; enhancement & regeneration of existing communities. | Yes- When combined with provision of strategic infrastructure (South East Plan) and neighbouring authorities; positive effects for Winchester's population. |
| | Housing & employment allocations in South East Plan (SH12, 80,000 homes in South Hampshire up to 2026) | Indirect negative effects on cultural heritage, landscape, community cohesion and identity due to physical, economic and social changes. | Yes- particularly in locations where high levels of development proposed. |
| Health/ Infrastructure | South East Plan Strategic Development Areas (SH2) (Fareham, Hedge End) | Potential negative effects through increased noise, air and light pollution. Potential loss of tranquillity, implications for human health (local effects). | Yes- through increased traffic generation and pressures on rural/ open spaces. |
| | South East Plan policies Sub Regional Gaps (SH3) and Environmental Sustainability, encouraging cycling/walking (SH14) | Positive effects through encouraging healthy, active lifestyles. | Yes- when combined with Winchester's policies encouraging increased walking and cycling, and Leisure Provision (CP1&2) significant positive effects. |

| SA Topics Summary | Other plans, projects or policies | Significant effects identified in other plans, projects or policies | Significant combined effects of Winchester Core Strategy with other plans, projects or policies |
|---------------------------------|---|---|---|
| Housing | Housing & employment allocations in South East Plan (80,000 homes for South Hampshire) & Neighbouring LDFs (East Hampshire, Test Valley). | Positive Effects through meeting housing need, including affordable housing in South East England, and specifically the Hampshire Region. | Yes- The housing allocations for Winchester when combined with those for the wider South Hampshire Area (80,000 overall, including a 6,700 contribution from Winchester) will have a significant positive effect in meeting affordable housing. |
| Economy & Employment | South East Plan, Regional Economic Strategy & Neighbouring LDFs Economic policies. | Positive effects- increased employment opportunities for Winchester residents; enhanced economy for South East region. | Yes- Significant positive effects in providing employment opportunities for Winchester Residents. Yes- positive synergistic effects of economic improvements across south East England. |
| | South East Plan & Neighbouring LDFs Economic policies. | Negative effects- increased competition for Winchester resident labour force (through potential for enhanced employment opportunities in other areas). | Uncertain proposals in Winchester LDF and focus of Regional Economic Strategy on 'Regional Hubs' may assist in mitigating negative effects of competition from other areas in employment and retail. |
| Transport | South East Plan policies (e.g. SH10), SE Regional Transport Strategy & Hampshire Local Transport Plan. | Positive effects- enhancing accessibility through improvements to local roads, and support for sustainable transport, walking and cycling. | Yes- Significant positive effects through enhancing accessibility across the District. |
| Biodiversity | South East Plan & neighbouring LDFs | Positive effects- Green infrastructure proposals seek to provide linkage for biodiversity, mitigate potential impacts and provide- enhanced connectivity in assisting adaptation to climate change. | Yes- Significant positive effects through enhanced habitat connectivity. |

| SA Topics Summary | Other plans, projects or policies | Significant effects identified in other plans, projects or policies | Significant combined effects of Winchester Core Strategy with other plans, projects or policies |
|-------------------------------------|---|--|---|
| | South East Plan (delivery of 80,000 homes in the South Hampshire area) & economic growth. | Negative Effects- Increased air, noise, water and light pollution and increased recreational impacts (land and water based recreation) from housing and economic growth. Changes to natural drainage and effects on water resources. | Yes, potential cumulative/ incremental effects for biodiversity across the region, and [particularly for sensitive riverine and connected estuarine environments. Plans aims to mitigate through protecting Winchester's known biodiverse areas. Also potential for synergistic effects (for example effects on one species or habitat can have indirect effects on another). |
| Heritage/ Culture | South East Plan & South East Regional Cultural Strategy | Positive effects- role of culture in regeneration/ urban and rural renaissance; provision of strategic cultural facilities. Positive effects for communities and culture. | Yes minor, and the SA notes the key role that culture and heritage play for Winchester in providing an environment that is productive and healthy – which overall should lead combined positive effects. |
| Landscape/ Built Environment | Housing & employment allocations South East Plan & Neighbouring LDFs | Negative effects on landscape through loss of open space and encroachment into strategic gaps <i>Uncertain effects on townscape- increased development can lead to positive and negative impacts, particularly significant for Winchester City where townscape defines the distinctiveness of the City.</i> | Yes - Negative effects most likely in relation to Market Town settlements on periphery of District. |
| Climate Change/ Pollution/ | Housing & employment allocations South East Plan & Neighbouring LDFs | Negative effects through increased greenhouse gas emissions (effects global) | Yes, increased development in Winchester District will lead to increased greenhouse gas emissions. This is inevitable given the amount of new development proposed, and includes factors such as increased transportation costs, embodied energy in construction materials and increased energy use from new housing and |

| SA Topics Summary | Other plans, projects or policies | Significant effects identified in other plans, projects or policies | Significant combined effects of Winchester Core Strategy with other plans, projects or policies |
|--|---|---|--|
| | | | employment development. Mitigation through transport/ sustainable construction and economic policies. |
| Water | Housing & employment allocations South East Plan & Neighbouring LDFs | Negative effects- increased demand for domestic consumption. | Yes- Increased development in Winchester District will lead to increased pressure on water environment; however policies within the plan seek to mitigate this. |
| Landscape & Soil | South East Plan & Neighbouring LDFs (housing and employment allocations) | Negative effects- increased land-take. Positive effects- return to productive use and remediation of previously-developed land. | Yes, new urban extension areas (where straddling Winchester) require greenfield land likely negative effects on land and soil, though also dependent on individual allocations and management/ mitigation measures. Yes- Plan will assist in returning land to productive use and remediation of contaminated land. |
| Air Quality | Housing & employment allocations South East Plan & Neighbouring LDFs | Negative effects- Increased air traffic and associated road traffic likely to lead to decline in air quality (effects local- regional). | Yes, increased development in Winchester District will lead to increased air pollution (effects local- regional). Identified as key issue by plan which includes measures to minimise this effect. |
| Sustainable Construction/ Waste | South East Plan & Neighbouring LDFs (housing and employment allocations) Hants Minerals and Waste Core Strategy | Negative effects through increased production of waste (construction & householder/commercial waste). | Yes- increased development in Winchester District will lead to increased production of household and commercial waste and increased waste from demolition and construction. |

7.0 SA OF CORE STRATEGY PREFERRED POLICIES 2009: RECOMMENDATIONS FOR MITIGATION & ENHANCEMENT

- 7.1 The SA process predicted the significant environmental and wider sustainability effects likely to occur as a result of the implementation of the Winchester City Council's Core Strategy. Where possible, the process also identified opportunities to enhance the positive effects of the plan and mitigate the negative effects. This is in addition to the mitigation and enhancement measures already contained within the plan. However, the appraisal recognises the need to consider the wider policy and operational context of the implementation of plan policies, and hence wider recommendations that may be applied to further development plan documents and to processes including development management and site master planning, are also included.
- 7.2 A detailed table of recommendations for enhancement and mitigation is provided in Appendix VII. Some key points raised include:
- Further consideration should be given to the potential impacts on the water environment, e.g. through an explicit reference with the overarching sustainable development principles policy.
 - The appraisal noted the potential for impacts arising from strategic housing allocations at Winchester and recommends that site plans are explicitly required to link existing green spaces with the provision of Green Infrastructure.
 - The appraisal recommends that the potential traffic/ transport impacts arising from strategic employment allocations be mitigated through the requirement for Green Travel Plans and where appropriate wider sustainability strategies.
 - Development in rural areas must be contained, given the valued, rural nature of the District in order to avoid creating a dispersed form of new development that is highly car reliant.
 - Clarity should be provided for developers where reference is made to specific standards e.g. in relation to sustainable design and Green Infrastructure and re-use of rural building policies, where appropriate. This recommendation may be carried forward to lower tier DPDs.

8.0 SA OF JOINT CORE STRATEGY PRE-SUBMISSION 2011

Introduction

- 8.1 The Winchester District Local Plan Part 1 – Joint Core Strategy Pre-Submission (December 2011) sets out the next stage of the development plan for the Winchester District area. The draft document provided to Enfusion in November 2011 reflected the consultation responses on the Preferred Options and extensive further consultation carried out since 2009, including the Blueprint process⁹ for Plans for Places. It also reflects developments with the Winchester District Community Strategy¹⁰ that now recognises key issues of older people, access to services, and reducing carbon footprint to be addressed in the shorter term (2010-14).
- 8.2 The draft Joint Core Strategy also reflected significant changes in planning during 2010-2011, including the emerging Localism Bill¹¹ (became an Act on 15 November 2011), the revocation¹² of regional strategies including the South East Plan, and enabling the development of more locally derived housing targets (the proposals and policies in the JCS remain in general conformity with the SE Plan). There was also progression with the development proposals associated with (Partnership for Urban South Hampshire) PUSH¹³ and the designation of the South Downs National Park¹⁴ (SDNP) with its operational status. The SDNP Authority will be preparing its own Core Strategy with anticipated adoption in 2014. In the meantime, the Winchester District Part 1 Joint core Strategy is jointly adopted by the NPA and the City Council.
- 8.3 The draft Joint Core Strategy has taken forward and refined the preferred option for Winchester District's strategic major development locations, rural areas, and core policies. The policies set out in the Preferred Option Plan 2009 have been updated and clarified variously as a result of the current situation and baseline evidence, the findings of the SA, and in consideration of the consultation responses received.
- 8.4 The following table 8.1 sets out the changes to proposals and policies and outlines the key reasoning for progressing or rejecting the details of the preferred option for the Winchester District:

⁹ Winchester City Council/South Downs National Park Authority (June 2011) Plans for Places after Blueprint <http://www.winchester.gov.uk/plans4places>

¹⁰ <http://www.wdsp.co.uk/community-strategy/>

¹¹ <http://www.communities.gov.uk/localgovernment/decentralisation/localismbill/>

¹² <http://www.communities.gov.uk/documents/planningandbuilding/pdf/1631904.pdf>

¹³ <http://www.push.gov.uk/>

¹⁴ <http://www.southdowns.gov.uk/>

Table 8.1: Changes to Policies between Preferred Option 2009 and Pre-Submission 2011

| Core Strategy Preferred Option Policy 2009 | Joint Core Strategy Pre-Submission Policy 2011 Outline of Changes Made |
|---|--|
| | |
| Vision | Vision |
| | Vision amended to be more locally specific, reflect recent evidence, and follow principles of what, where, when and how. |
| Objectives | Objectives |
| | Objectives amended to be more locally specific, reflect recent evidence and follow principles of what, where, when and how; and to reflect changes to the Community Strategy (from 5 to 3 themes). |
| Policy SS1 Sustainable Development Principles | Policy DS1 Development Strategy and Principles |
| | Amended to be more locally specific, reflect evidence, and follow principles of what, where, when and how; relate to each spatial area (by incorporating part of policy SS2) and include broad development strategies. |
| Policy SS2 - Requirements for major large scale developments | Policy deleted |
| | Incorporated partly into DS1 (see above); spatial requirements included in spatial strategies policies WT1, SH1 and MTRA1. |
| Policy WT1 Strategy for Winchester Town | Policy WT1 Strategy for Winchester Town |
| | Amended to reflect what, where, when, how and be more locally specific, and recent evidence; vision include separately in text – not policy. |
| Policy WT2 Strategic Housing Allocation – Barton Farm | Policy WT2 Strategic Housing Allocation – Barton Farm |
| | Policy updated with more recent evidence and to reflect SA findings. |
| Policy WT3 Strategic Employment Allocation – Bushfield Camp | Policy WT3 Bushfield Camp Opportunity Site |
| | Policy and text amended to reflect that the site is not deliverable in the short term and a number of constraints need to be addressed and resolved, including findings from the SA and HRA. |
| Policy SH1 Strategy for | Policy SH1 Strategy for South Hampshire |

| | |
|---|--|
| South Hampshire Urban Areas | Urban Areas |
| | Policy updated to be more locally specific, to include amounts of development, and clarity on type and range of housing. |
| Policy SH2 Strategic Housing Allocation – West of Waterlooville | Policy SH2 Strategic Housing Allocation – West of Waterlooville |
| | Policy updated to be more locally specific. |
| Policy SH3 Strategic Housing Allocation – North Whiteley | Policy SH3 Strategic Housing Allocation – North Whiteley |
| | Policy updated to reflect on-going discussions, with more specific elements in relation to mitigation, requirement for full Transport Assessments, and including consideration of SA findings. |
| Policy SH4 North/North-East Hedge End SDA | Policy deleted- |
| | Policy deleted as Eastleigh Council not pursuing its element of the Strategic Development Area (SDA). |
| Policy SH5 North Fareham SDA | Policy SH4 North Fareham SDA |
| | Policy updated to reflect adoption of Fareham Core Strategy and ongoing discussions. |
| Policy MTRA 1 Strategy for the Market Towns and Rural Area | Policy MTRA1 Market Towns and Rural Area Development Strategy |
| | Policy more locally specific and reflects Blueprint consultation responses |
| Policy MTRA1 Market Towns and Rural Area Development Strategy | Policy MTRA 1 Development Strategy Market Towns and Rural Area |
| | To be more specific, relate to Blueprint consultation responses, and to move away from a settlement hierarchy; also consideration of SA findings. |
| Policy MTRA2 Market Towns and Rural Area Settlement Hierarchy | MTRA 2 Market Towns and Larger Villages |
| | Move away from a settlement hierarchy to more local approach as requested through Blueprint and Plans for Places consultations, and SA findings; includes part of MTRA2 (2009) |
| | Policy MTRA 3 Other Settlements in the Market Towns and Rural Area |
| | Be more locally specific and reflect Blueprint |

| | |
|---|--|
| | aspirations for small scale local development only; includes part of MTRA2 (2009) and includes MTRA 4 (2009) on re-use; additional explicit requirements of development. |
| Policy MTRA 4 Re-use of Rural Buildings | Deleted as merged with MTRA 3 above |
| | Re-use merged with other development requirements |
| Policy MTRA 3 The Wider Countryside | Policy MTRA 4 Development in the Countryside |
| | Includes parts of MTRA 3 and 4 (2009) made more explicit. |
| Policy CP4 Major Commercial and Educational Establishments in the Countryside | Policy MTRA 5 Major Commercial and Educational Establishments in the Countryside |
| | Separated policy from economic section as this only applies to MTRA spatial area. |
| Policy CP1: Open Space, Sport and Recreation | Policy CP7 Open Space, Sport and Recreation |
| | Updated and more specific. |
| Policy CP2 Transport | Policy CP10 Transport |
| | Minor amendments. |
| Policy CP3 Economic Growth and Diversification | Policy CP8 Economic Growth and Diversification |
| | Policy updated to reflect latest evidence base commissioned in response to economic conditions. |
| Policy CP5 Green Infrastructure | Policy CP15 Green Infrastructure |
| | Policy updated and made more specific with greater clarity. |
| Policy CP6 Biodiversity | Policy CP16 Biodiversity |
| | Policy updated and made more specific |
| Policy CP7 Flooding, Flood Risk and the Water Environment | Policy CP17 Flooding, Flood Risk and the Water Environment |
| | Policy updated and made more specific with additional requirements clarified as a result of detailed consultations. |
| Policy CP8 Cultural Heritage and Landscape Character | Policy CP20 Heritage and Landscape Character |
| | Policy updated and made more specific; including findings of SA. |
| Policy CP9 South Downs National Park/Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty | Policy 19 South Downs National Park |
| | Updated to reflect SDNP now designated and operational. |

| | |
|---|--|
| Policy CP10 Settlement Gaps | Policy CP18 Settlement Gaps |
| | Policy updated and made more specific. |
| Policy CP 11 Ensuring high quality sustainable design | Policy CP 13 High Quality Design |
| Policy CP12 Ensuring the effective use of land | Policy CP14 The Effective Use of Land |
| Policy CP13 Sustainable Low and Zero Carbon Built Development | Policy CP11 Sustainable Low and Zero Carbon Built Development |
| | Updated to reflect current standards, clearer direction and more specific with additional requirements. |
| Policy CP14 Renewable and Decentralised Energy | Policy CP12 Renewable and Decentralised Energy |
| | Policy updated to reflect recent evidence, clearer and recognising impacts on other factors. |
| Policy CP15 Housing Provision | Policy CP1 Housing Provision |
| | Policy updated to reflect Blueprint consultation responses and generation of locally derived housing targets as a result of the Localism Bill and the revocation of regional planning and the SE Plan. |
| Policy CP16 Housing Priorities | Policy deleted |
| | Policy deleted and incorporated in others as necessary and priorities listed as a series of objectives. |
| Policy CP17 Housing Mix | Policy CP2 Housing Provision and Mix |
| | Policy amended to include housing mix and priorities |
| Policy CP18 Affordable Housing | Policy CP3 Affordable Housing Provision on Market Led Housing Sites |
| | Policy updated to reflect evidence and local aspirations; merging CP18 & 19 (2009). |
| Policy CP19 Affordable Housing - Quota Sites | Policy deleted |
| | Policy deleted and merge with above |
| Policy CP20 Affordable Housing – 'Local Connection Homes | Policy CP4 Affordable Housing on Exception Sites to Meet Local Needs |
| | Policy updated and clarified. |
| Policy CP21 Sites for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople | Policy CP5 Sites for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople |
| | Policy updated to reflect recent government consultation and Informal Scrutiny Group |

| | |
|--|---|
| | outcomes. |
| Policy CP22 Retention of local services and facilities | Policy CP6 Local Services and Facilities |
| | Policy extended to refer to provision of additional services not just retention of existing |
| Policy CP23 Infrastructure and Community Benefit | Policy CP21 Infrastructure and Community Benefit |
| | Updated and including requirements on capacity, timely provision, and reference to the new Community Infrastructure Levy when introduced. |

- 8.5 The key findings of the SA process are summarised below. Full details of the appraisal, including the detailed working matrices, are presented in this SA Report in Appendix VIII: Compatibility Analysis Joint Core Strategy Vision, Objectives & Development Strategy, and Appendix IX: SA of Joint Core Strategy: Pre-Submission 2011.

SA of Spatial Vision, Strategic Objectives, Development Strategy & Principles

Vision

- 8.6 The vision has developed from earlier iterations (Issues & Options (2008), Preferred Option (2009)). It has been amended to be more locally specific, better reflect evidence, and follow principles of what, where, when and how. The statement continues to provide strong, clear commitments to delivering economic growth whilst ensuring that the Winchester District area remains an attractive place to live. The recognition of three key areas with particular characteristics strengthens the commitment to maximising change in a positive way.
- 8.7 This revised approach is highly compatible with SA objectives on community, infrastructure, housing and economy. The focus on promoting knowledge, creative and educational sectors in Winchester Town strengthens the high compatibility with SA objectives for community and economy. Similarly, making the statement more locally specific for the separate characters of the South Hampshire Urban Areas, and the rural areas, clarifies and improves the commitments to communities and a diverse economy.
- 8.8 The positive compatibility of the vision in terms of design, biodiversity, heritage, and landscape SA objectives are confirmed as the rich heritage and attractive countryside is acknowledged, together with the role of the South Downs National Park. The extent of the positive compatibility of the vision in terms of water, waste, climate change, and pollution is dependent on factors such as the phasing of development; the positive compatibility of climate change and sustainable construction is also dependent upon other factors such as

the details of development management and thus the compatibility analysis notes some uncertainty.

- 8.9 Overall, the vision is highly compatible with the key objectives set out in the SA Framework and provides for a robust strategic framework for delivering long term sustainable development for the economy, communities and environment of the Winchester District area.

Strategic Objectives

- 8.10 The spatial objectives for active communities are highly compatible with SA objectives for building communities, housing, and transport. Improvements to housing through provision of a range of types and tenures, together with sustainable transport options, are key factors in wider health improvements and these Core Strategy objectives are particularly compatible with SA objectives for health and transport. Improvements to communities and provision of services will have positive effects associated with economic development. Compatibility with environmental SA objectives is uncertain since effects are dependent upon other environmental CS objectives and development management policies.
- 8.11 The approach set out by the CS objectives is highly compatible with SA objectives for economy and building communities by providing support for existing industries and promotion of developing assets of historic towns, villages and valued landscapes. Positive compatibility with SA objectives for health since employment is a wider determinant of health and well-being. Positive compatibility with landscape since specific aims for valued landscape and support for purposes of South Downs National Park. The focus on energy efficiency and renewable energy technologies strengthens the positive compatibility for SA climate change objective. Compatibility with other environmental and design SA objectives is uncertain since effects are dependent upon other CS objectives and development management policies.
- 8.12 The approach set out by the Winchester Core Strategy objectives for a high quality environment is highly compatible with the SA environmental objectives, in particular those for design, sustainable construction, the built environment, climate change, water, biodiversity and landscape; these highly compatible objectives contribute to a high compatibility with building communities – directly and indirectly over the long term. The focus on sustainable design principles and high quality that recognises local character strongly supports SA objectives for communities and environmental factors; aiming for high quality indicates compatibility with reducing pollution and protecting valued assets and resources. Specific mention of reducing waste and carbon emissions, and sustainable drainage, is strongly compatible with SA objectives on climate change, waste and water.
- 8.13 Overall the development objectives are highly compatible with the key objectives set out in the SA Framework and provide a robust strategic framework for delivering long term sustainability led

improvements for the economy, communities and the environment of the Winchester District.

DS1 Development Strategy and Principles

- 8.14 Since the PO stage in 2009, the principles for development in DS1 have developed to incorporate the broad development strategies from the previous policy SS2 Requirements for Major Large Scale Developments (now deleted) to relate better to the three spatial areas (Winchester Town (WT); South Hampshire Urban Areas (SHUA); Market Towns & the Rural Area (MTRU)) each with its own characteristics. The qualities, challenges and opportunities for each of the three areas are described in the Profile of the Winchester District in the Core Strategy, and are summarised in the Policy DS1.
- 8.15 **Socio-Economic Compatibility:** The development strategy principles are strongly compatible with the SA objectives for communities, infrastructure, housing, economy and transport since the policy sets out the development strategy including housing numbers and employment types for each of the three spatial areas related to their particular characteristics. The broad development strategy for WT aims to meet the needs of the whole community, for the SHUA sustainable communities are planned, and for the MTRU specifically refers to promoting the vitality and viability of communities. The principles are compatible with the SA objective health – community services and employment are wider determinants of health and well-being.
- 8.16 **Environmental Compatibility:** The Development Strategy & Principles remain strongly compatible with the SA objectives on climate change and have been strengthened by the explicit mention of impacts on the water environment (as recommended by the previous SA). The positive compatibility of the DS1 with SA objectives on sustainable construction, biodiversity, heritage, and landscape is retained through the commitment to considering the importance of environmental assets and scarce resources; waste/recycling is now specifically stated. The positive compatibility with the built environment SA objective is clear from the commitment to high standards of appropriate design. The extent of the compatibility with SA objective on pollution is dependent on factors such as the details of development management - thus the compatibility analysis notes some uncertainty.
- 8.17 **Overall** the Policy DS1 Development Strategy and Principles set out a strong framework to guide development, recognising the particular characteristics and issues for each of the three spatial areas, requiring high design standards, promoting inclusive communities, sustainable transport, recognising the importance of environmental assets and efficient use of scarce resources, and requiring that issues relating to climate change, waste, energy, green infrastructure and the water environment are properly addressed

SA of Spatial Strategies

Winchester Town

- 8.18 **Vision:** The role of the vision is to set out the spatial strategy intent for the Winchester Town area, in accordance with the overarching vision for the District and having regard to the particular characteristics and issues for the area. The statement provides strong, clear commitments to delivering locally specific housing and economic development, retaining the desirability of the town area and especially recognising its special heritage and setting.

WT1 Development Strategy for Winchester Town

- 8.19 Generally, the policy provides strong positive support in the medium to long term for SA objectives aiming to build communities, provide good quality housing for all, maintain economy and develop diversity, as well as positive effects indicated for SA objectives on infrastructure, health, transport, the built environment and pollution. The approach of promoting development in the town where sustainable transport options are more readily available also enables behavioural choices that will realise lower carbon footprints for both individuals and communities overall.
- 8.20 With the extent of proposed development, there are potential adverse effects for landscape and water but these should be mitigated by other topic specific policies and be neutral in the longer term. The particular issue of sustainable water planning and management is addressed since the SA in 2009 by the inclusion of water in the overarching development principles DS1. Whilst the particular heritage qualities for Winchester Town are stated in the vision text, this is not explicitly referred to in the policy. All new development is required to be of the highest design quality and further details are set out in Policy CP13.
- 8.21 Overall the policy WT1 effectively supports and progresses social, economic and environmental SA objectives; and no significant adverse effects are identified.

SA Recommendations:

- The policy should include explicit consideration of the particular historic heritage and settings.
- Consideration is given to preparing design guidance that brings together various elements in the Core Strategy on high quality design and sustainable construction

WT2 Strategic Housing Location – Barton Farm

- 8.22 The policy has been updated since 2009 to reflect consultation, the current situation and the previous SA. A key feature of the updating is the requirement for substantial areas of on-site open space to meet recreational needs, including retention of existing tracks to provide links for green infrastructure. This change has improved the sustainability of the policy with regard to more positive progression of SA objectives for

communities and their health; it should also have positive effects on biodiversity/ecosystem services but the significance of this is uncertain and dependent on the details of masterplanning and supporting EIA.

- 8.23 The proposals for this site positively support the SA objectives for housing, communities and their health, infrastructure and the economy by providing a range and diversity of housing types that can be integrated into Winchester Town. The requirement for sustainable transport systems should have positive effects on both the new and existing communities and contribute to the SA objective for climate change. The policy requires protection and enhancement of landscape and this should mitigate potential adverse effects; the significance will be dependent on the implementation of other policies and the details of masterplanning and EIA.
- 8.24 The potential for adverse effects on the water environment and the inter-relationships with biodiversity, particularly the River Itchen, is recognised in the policy. The effects are also controlled by other policies, and the effectiveness of mitigation/enhancement will be dependent on the details of masterplanning and supporting EIA. The HRA recommends seeking the incorporation of higher water efficiency measures in developments where suitable, in particular for strategic sites.; and require monitoring of air quality to confirm no adverse effects on European sites.
- 8.25 The policy is strong on design and requires incorporation of the highest standards, reflecting the location and context of the site. This will have positive effects for SA objectives on sustainable construction and design, the significance of which is dependent on the implementation of other policies and the details of masterplanning and EIA. Although the site is greenfield, it is not of the higher grades of agricultural land and the size of the proposals with around 2000 dwellings and supporting uses offers opportunities of scale with regard to sustainable design and construction. Overall this Policy WT2 positively progresses SA objectives for housing, communities and local economy; the potential for adverse effects on water, landscape and biodiversity is recognised with mitigation/enhancement required, together with the highest standards for sustainable design.

WT3 Bushfield Camp Opportunity Site

- 8.26 The policy has been updated since 2009 to reflect consultation, the current situation and the previous SA. The updating changes the site from a strategic employment allocation to an opportunity site recognising that there are issues to resolve and that there is uncertainty about the viability and delivery. The policy now enables the opportunities for the site to be explored, acknowledging its unique characteristics, and recognising its potential for contributing to the aims for Winchester Town in the longer term.
- 8.27 The policy would positively support SA objectives for employment, communities and their health; also positive potential for green

infrastructure and recreation. The location of the site enables sustainable transport systems with positive effects on SA objectives for transport, climate change. There is uncertainty of effects on water, biodiversity and landscape due to the sensitivity of the site with designated nature conservation, nearby European protected River Itchen, and its visibility from the wider area. However, the policy requires specific consideration of these issues, including exemplary design which should mitigate adverse effects. The HRA recommends seeking the incorporation of higher water efficiency measures in developments where suitable, in particular for strategic sites; and require air quality monitoring to confirm no adverse effects on European sites. The uncertainty remains at this stage of appraisal since the extent of the mitigation will be dependent on other policies and the details of proposed use, masterplanning, and the EIA. The SA recommended that the positive effects of sustainable transport could be further enhanced through requiring Green Travel/Transport Plans by the occupier(s).

South Hampshire Urban Areas

- 8.28 **Vision:** The role of the vision is to set out the spatial strategy intent for the South Hampshire Urban Areas, in accordance with the overarching vision for the District and having regard to the particular characteristics and issues for the area. The statement provides strong, clear commitments to delivering a series of large scale, high quality development areas. Development at larger scales should enable strong sustainable design and construction. Compatibility with environmental SA objectives is generally positive through the requirement for sustainable communities and opportunities, but uncertain since dependent upon specific policies. Overall, the vision is highly compatible with the key socio-economic SA objectives and provides a robust strategic framework for promoting the sustainable development.

SH1 Development Strategy for South Hampshire Urban Areas

- 8.29 This policy remains as a strategic policy which sets out how the required development in the South Hampshire area will be achieved. It refers to the policies SH2 - 4 which are assessed individually in this SA. The policy strongly supports SA objectives for communities and housing with employment, although it is noted that most commercial floorspace is already committed. Protection of natural assets, particularly international and nationally important habitats, and Gaps which are important in defining the urban/countryside boundaries, is specifically required by the policy. The effects associated with many of the SA objectives are addressed for each site in Policies SH2-4 and controlled by other policies.
- 8.30 The large scale of the sites enables more effective sustainable design and construction, including transport, water and energy management. The significance of effects is uncertain at this strategic stage and associated with the locally specific policies SH2-4; other policies and the overarching development principles SS1 provide mitigation. There

will be short term adverse effects during construction and these may be mitigated through appropriate timing in masterplanning and environmental management agreed as part of EIA.

- 8.31 When considering the cumulative effects of this strategic policy, adverse effects are indicated for transport (and associated emissions for pollution and climate change) but when considered with the detail of transport improvements specified in the separate policies it is illustrated that mitigation is possible and existing sustainability problems may be resolved. Generally, there may be adverse effects on biodiversity, particularly with regard to internationally protected sites on the River Hamble. However, this was identified in the earlier SA/HRA work and the policy clearly states that habitats of international and national importance will be protected. The HRA Report (2011) recommends seeking the incorporation of higher water efficiency measures in developments where suitable, in particular for strategic sites..
- 8.32 There will inevitably be adverse impacts of this scale of development which must be balanced against the expressed need for the housing and commercial development required. The need and possibilities for mitigation are recognised and this is clearly expressed in the individual development proposal policies (SH2-4) and addressed by other specific policies. Overall, the policy provides the strategic framework for major development in the South Hampshire area.

SH2 Strategic Housing Allocation – West of Waterlooville

- 8.33 The policy has been updated since 2009 to reflect consultation, the current situation and the previous SA. The requirement for provision of employment land has changed from 30 hectares to at least 23 hectares. It is assumed that there remains a mix of housing and commercial such that the positive effects on SA objectives for economy remain. The proposals for this site have very positive effects to progress SA objectives for communities and housing, together with positive effects in the long term for infrastructure and health, transport and contribute to objectives for climate change. The site does offer a comprehensive range of social, residential and economic development which should help reduce carbon emissions in the long term.
- 8.34 This is a large greenfield site and will have some short term adverse effects but it is fundamental to meeting the District and regional housing requirement which meets social needs. Details of significance and effectiveness of mitigation will be in the masterplanning and supporting EIA. The HRA Report (2011) recommends seeking the incorporation of higher water efficiency measures in developments where suitable, in particular for strategic sites.. Overall this Policy SH2 positively progresses SA objectives for housing, communities and local economy; minor adverse effects are indicated for landscape and suggestions made to improve the effectiveness of mitigation for water and protected biodiversity effects.

SH3 Strategic Housing Allocation – North Whiteley

- 8.35 The policy has been updated since 2009 to reflect consultation, the current situation and the previous SA. Key elements of the policy updating include the requirement to maximise opportunities presented by the open space areas, ensuring adequate provision for primary health care, undertaking a full traffic assessment to ensure more sustainable transport systems, and to include a green infrastructure strategy that sets out mitigation measures for adverse effects (and specifically including noise and light pollution) to European sites and the wider biodiversity. The changes to the policy have significantly improved the sustainability of the effects of implementation by requiring assessments to detail significance of effects with measures of mitigation and stating commitments to mitigation through a specified green infrastructure strategy.
- 8.36 The proposal for this major development positively supports the SA objectives for communities and their health, housing and employment. The requirement for a full transport assessment should maximise opportunities for sustainable transport systems and have positive effects on both existing and new communities, and contribute to the SA objective on climate change. The previous SA in 2009 identified the potential for adverse effects on the water, landscape and biodiversity objectives given the proximity of the site to international and wider biodiversity designations. The policy now includes commitments to mitigation. Although the site is greenfield, it is not of higher grades of agricultural land and the size of the proposals offers opportunities for scale with regard to sustainable design and construction.
- 8.37 Overall the Policy SH3 strongly progresses SA objectives for housing, communities and the local economy; the potential for adverse effects on water, landscape and biodiversity is recognised and mitigation commitments are required. The HRA Report (2011) recommends seeking the incorporation of higher water efficiency measures in developments where suitable, in particular for strategic sites.; also consider effects of recreation on water eg dog-walking; and require monitoring of air quality to confirm no adverse effects on European sites.

SH4 North Fareham Strategic Development Area (SDA)

- 8.38 The policy recognises the need for cross boundary working with the adjacent authority to help deliver the strategic growth required in the South Hampshire sub-region and as set out in Fareham Council's Core Strategy. The policy has been updated to reflect the adoption of the Fareham Core Strategy and ongoing discussions – the housing numbers have reduced from 10,000 to 6500-7500 dwellings which will reduce the potential for effects. The policy seeks to protect the integrity of existing settlements and the landscape - effects are either positive or not relevant to Winchester. The HRA Report (2011) recommends seeking the incorporation of higher water efficiency measures in developments

where suitable, in particular for strategic sites to protect European sites; and require monitoring of air quality to confirm no adverse effects on European sites

Market Towns and Rural Area

- 8.39 **Vision:** The role of the vision is to set out the spatial strategy and policy intent for the market towns and rural area, in accordance with the overarching vision for the District and having regard to the particular characteristics of the areas. Compatibility with environmental SA objectives is positive through the requirement for sustainable locations, but uncertain since dependent upon specific policies. Overall, the vision is highly compatible with the key socio-economic SA objectives and provides a robust strategic framework for promoting the sustainable communities.

MTRA1 Development Strategy Market Towns and Rural Areas

- 8.40 The policy has been significantly improved since 2009 as a result of the Blueprint consultations and the previous SA recommendations. It is more locationally specific now and gives clear direction on providing for the needs of each settlement relative to its role and function. This includes a more specific range of housing types, sizes and tenures to improve the positive effects on social inclusion and SA objectives for communities and housing. It includes more explicit requirements regarding local employment with retention of land and expansion at appropriate scale – improving the positive effects for SA objectives on communities and economy. The specific reference to including information technology will positively benefit all communities directly and indirectly with positive cumulative effects. The policy does not include specific support for rural transport initiatives and improvement of public transport; this reduces the certainty of positive effects for accessibility, although the provision of housing and employment in existing settlements will reduce outcommuting.
- 8.41 Overall, the policy now provides for clear strong guidance to promote sustainable communities and strongly progresses SA objectives for communities, housing and local economy; any adverse effects on other SA objectives are mitigated by specific CP topic-based policies and the DS1 overarching policy principles

MTRA2 Market Towns and Larger Villages

- 8.42 This policy provides clarity over the scale and type of development for the larger rural settlements and towns. The policy has been considerably improved since 2009 as a result of Blueprint consultations and the previous SA recommendations. It gives clear direction on providing for the needs of each settlement relative to its role and function, and that development should be appropriate to scale of each settlement with opportunities being accommodated initially within existing settlement boundaries. This approach will enable better progression towards sustainable development generally.

- 8.43 All new development will bring about an increase in vehicle related emissions and this will necessarily be more marked in smaller settlements with poorer rail and bus links. The policy requires improvement in public transport provision where possible. Alternatively benefits will be found in the provision of affordable housing in smaller communities and the potential to provide a greater mix of dwellings in a wide range of settlements. The policy also recognises and facilitates the need to maintain and increase the diversity and location of employment opportunities across the District.
- 8.44 Overall, the policy strongly supports SA objectives on communities, housing and employment. There is some uncertainty on the significance of positive effects on other SA objectives but these are mitigated by the protection afforded by specific control policies CP1-21 and the overarching DS1 development principles. Specific reference to Neighbourhood Plans and Village Design Statements acknowledges the role of community planning involvement in developing sustainable communities.

MTRA3 Other Settlements in the Market Towns and Rural Area

- 8.45 This policy lends clarity over the scale of development but detailed impacts will still inevitably be site specific. The Policy has significantly changed since 2009 as a result of the Blueprint consultation and the previous SA recommendations. The policy promotes a level of development across the rural parts of the District where it meets a community need and is supported by a Neighbourhood Plan or Village Design Statement to demonstrate clear community support. Development should be appropriate to scale of each settlement and capacity of services and infrastructure; this approach will enable better progression towards sustainable development generally.
- 8.46 There are potential adverse cumulative effects on water, biodiversity and the landscape, but these should be mitigated by other policies CP15, CP16, 16, CP17, CP18, CP19, and CP20. All new development will bring about an increase in vehicle related emissions and this will necessarily be more marked in smaller settlements with poorer rail and bus links. Alternatively benefits will be found in the provision of affordable housing in smaller communities and the potential to provide a greater mix of dwellings in a wide range of settlements.

MTRA4 Development in the Countryside

- 8.47 The policy has been amended and updated to reflect the current situation, the Blueprint Consultation aspirations for only small scale development, merging requirements for re-use of buildings with other development requirements, and the previous SA findings. The appraisal identified no significant adverse effects, although it is recognised that potential impacts will be site and location dependant. Any such adverse effects will be mitigated through the implementation of other guidance, policy and conditions regulating traffic generation, ecological, heritage and landscape values. The updated policy

includes a specific requirement for no inappropriate noise, light or traffic generation (as recommended by the previous SA).

- 8.48 Overall the updated policy progresses SA objectives in relation to rural communities and through allowing work places to be centred where they are required, thereby reducing the need to travel.

MTRA5 Major Commercial and Educational Establishments in the Countryside

- 8.49 The policy has been moved from previous CP4 and revised to be MTRA5 since it is only relevant to the MTRA spatial area. This policy acknowledges rural communities' aspirations for only small scale development and recognises that any major commercial and educational establishments in the countryside should contribute to the District's economic prosperity whilst respecting the sensitivity of rural communities and environments.
- 8.50 The policy will positively progress SA objectives for rural communities and economy. Through allowing work places to be centred where they are required and thereby reducing the need to travel, positive effects are likely for SA objectives on transport and climate change. Other effects are uncertain since they are dependent on location and site; any adverse effects will be mitigated through the policy requirement to prepare a masterplan to limit impacts and other plan policies. Overall, the policy will support rural communities and economy and contribute to the wider District's economic prosperity.

SA of Core Policies

Active Communities CP1 Housing Provision

- 8.51 The policy has been updated since 2009 to reflect consultation and the generation of locally derived housing targets with a reduction in overall housing number from at least 12740 (2006-2026) to about 11000 dwellings (2011-2031). The policy sets out the housing figures and refers to the spatial strategy for each of the three spatial areas WT, SH and MTRA to provide clarity on housing numbers for the plan period.
- 8.52 Sustainability Appraisal of the apportionment and expected level of development has been covered earlier in this document when considering the strategic and rural allocations. This level of housing development is likely to have some cumulative effects on environmental factors – the significance and nature is uncertain and it is the detail of other policies, location and detail of strategic allocations, that will mitigate against the potential adverse effects on water, landscape and biodiversity.
- 8.53 Overall, this policy strongly supports SA objectives for communities and housing; the significance of potential cumulative adverse effects on

water, landscape and biodiversity are uncertain and will be mitigated by other specific topic policies.

CP2 Housing Provision and Mix

- 8.54 The policy has been amended to include the housing mix and priorities, including a clear requirement with priority being given to the provision of affordable housing. This is a specific policy which is intended to avoid the saturation of the market with standard units. The SA indicates that the policy will provide very positive effects for housing and communities. No significant adverse effects were identified. Most SA objectives are not relevant to this specific policy and effects on environmental topics are addressed by other specific policies.

CP3 Affordable Housing Provision on Market Led Housing Sites

- 8.55 The Policy has been updated to reflect evidence and local aspirations. The policy sets out the requirements for affordable housing and will generally have no specific effects on the majority of SA objectives because the housing is "affordable" i.e. for social rent or shared equity, and will mainly be a component of the large allocated sites. Therefore the effect of the affordable housing is encompassed in that related to the overall housing requirement. The exception to this will be the smaller sites built on infill plots and on publicly owned land. The policy will positively progress sustainability objectives in relation to communities, housing provision and health, with major cumulative effects for promoting housing for all and social inclusion.

CP4 Affordable Housing on Exception Sites to Meet Local Needs

- 8.56 The policy has been amended to ensure that proposals are of a design and character appropriate to its area, and to include more detail with regards to exceptional circumstances for other tenures. No significant adverse effects were identified and the effect on environmental factors is covered by other specific policies. Overall the policy is strongly positive for SA objectives in relation to communities and housing provision, with major cumulative effects for promoting housing for all and social inclusion.

CP5 Site for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople

- 8.57 The policy has been updated to reflect consultation, the WCC Informal Scrutiny Group (Nov 2011), and the previous SA findings. The policy clarifies and is more specific about location, accessibility, acceptable standards of facilities, consistency with other policies, including the statutory purposes of the South Down National Park. These amendments improve the sustainability of the policy according to the SA objectives for the Winchester District area.
- 8.58 The Policy strongly progresses SA objectives for communities and their health; it includes clarity and detail on location and requires minimisation of tension with existing communities. It details requirements for provision of facilities to appropriate standards. The SA has identified no significant adverse effects and overall the policy

supports a cultural tradition, ensuring that all members of society have the opportunity to have appropriate accommodation.

CP6 Local Services and Facilities

- 8.59 The policy has been extended to refer to provision of additional services, not just retention of existing services. The SA demonstrates that this is an effective policy which has benefits for community and social inclusion. There are minor associated benefits for transport, climate change and pollution if communities are supported through the provision of local facilities and therefore need to travel less distance for essential goods and services. Any minor adverse effects on environmental factors will be dependent on size and location, and will be mitigated by other policies. The benefits are likely to be medium to long term and synergistic where support for local facilities provides economic viability for wider goods and service businesses. Overall the policy strongly supports SA objectives for communities with their services and facilities.

CP7 Open Space, Sport and Recreation

- 8.60 The policy has been updated to included details of the current open space standards, thus providing additional clarity. Mitigation by CP17 protects the water environment including water quality and flooding. The policy could be improved by making specific reference to the effects of water-based leisure activities on the water environment. The policy will strongly progress the SA objectives for communities, their services and their health. There are also potential related positive cumulative effects for biodiversity, the landscape and car related pollution; overall a positive policy which will have long term benefits.

SA Recommendation:

- This policy CP7 (or CP17) could be enhanced by making specific reference to the effects of water-based leisure activities on the water environment.

CP8 Economic Growth and Diversification

- 8.61 This policy has been updated to reflect the latest economic situation and sets out the 5 key economic sectors for the District. The policy now includes specific commitment to promote self-employment, working from home, and ensuring good access to modern communications technology.
- 8.62 For the District, In and out commuting levels are high and the policy seeks to ensure that employment opportunities are available for the resident population and that job opportunities are expanded in line with the housing requirement. The policy creates conditions which assist the potential for people to live and work in the district thereby reducing carbon emissions and local pollution. There is now commitment to ensuring good access to modern communications technology which will strengthen the positive effects of the policy. The recognition of the importance of the tourist economy will indirectly

lead to protection of the environment on which it is based, and will have a synergistic impact with policies directly seeking such protection.

- 8.63 Overall, the policy has major positive effects for communities and the local economy, with benefits for SA objectives on health, climate change, pollution, and transport; synergistic and cumulative positive effects are predicted for landscape, biodiversity and heritage by the commitment to support the tourist economy that depends upon a high quality environment.

CP9 Retention of Employment Land and Premises

- 8.64 The policy sets out clear criteria for determining whether an existing site in employment use should be retained; as stated in the supporting text, this is aligned with strategic housing land availability in accordance with Government guidance. The supporting text includes a commitment maintaining an up to date employment land review and this will strengthen the effectiveness of implementation.
- 8.65 This is a specific policy relating to retention of employment land and overall, the approach will have major positive effects for communities and the local economy. Cumulative positive effects are predicted through the support for reducing car travel by retaining existing employment land for SA objectives on transport, climate change and pollution.

CP10 Transport

- 8.66 This policy should have long term positive effects in relation to communities and access to facilities, helping to reduce the need to travel, and trying to reduce the reliance on the private vehicle. This in turn has cumulative positive effects for the objectives relating to climate change and pollution. Indirect benefits will also accrue for the economy and biodiversity. The policy is particularly important and relevant for the Winchester District given that unsustainable transport patterns have been identified as one of the key sustainability challenges during the lifetime of the plan.
- 8.67 Effects from transport on environmental factors are locationally specific and significance is uncertain but any adverse effects are mitigated by other policies. Walking and cycling routes have indirect benefits as habitat corridors, especially as part of wider green infrastructure strategies and plans. Overall the policy will have positive effects on communities and progressing sustainable transport systems.

SA Recommendation:

- This policy CP10 could be strengthened by referring to the role of green infrastructure in sustainable transport through the provision of greenways incorporating pedestrian and cycle routes (Green Infrastructure is covered by CP15)

CP11 Sustainable Low and Zero Carbon Built Development

- 8.68 The policy will be instrumental in meeting the Government's targets relating to climate change and the impact of new development. No significant adverse effects are identified but the issue of the increased costs of these construction techniques is identified and noted in the appraisal. Some uncertainty regarding costs may influence the extent to which the policy is effectively implemented and the commensurate benefits realised. There may also be indirect benefits on health and biodiversity which will accrue over time from a more sustainable approach to build.
- 8.69 The supporting text recognises that there may be particular circumstances of a development's location where it may not be practical or viable, or in the interests of conserving character in sensitive areas, to incorporate all the measure required by this policy CP11. Overall, the policy positively supports Government's requirements to address climate change and has major positive effects on the sustainable use of resources.

CP12 Renewable and Decentralised Energy

- 8.70 The policy has been updated to reflect recent evidence, previous SA findings, and consultation. There is more clarity including considerations of effects on environmental factors, development and communities. The previous SA identified the potential for adverse effects, for example, in the use of monoculture to produce fuel crops which will reduce the amount of land available for food production and have adverse impacts on local biodiversity; and the adverse effects of wind turbines in sensitive landscape. The policy now includes explicit reference to taking account of environmentally sensitive locations, including the South Downs National Park; it also refers to proximity to the energy network and other relevant infrastructure – thus overall adding clarity and strengthening the sustainability of the policy.
- 8.71 There are clearly identified strong positive effects for climate change, pollution and health, which are likely to be medium to long term and cumulative. Overall, the policy strongly supports objectives for climate change and sustainable use of resources.

CP13 High Quality Design

- 8.72 The appraisal shows that this policy address the core aims and objectives contained in the SA framework and no significant adverse effects are identified through the process. The policy provides good foundations for ensuring long term support for and improvements to high quality design for development.

CP14 The Effective Use of Land

- 8.73 The policy performs well against the SA objectives and no adverse impacts are identified. The policy will assist in producing a wider range of accommodation, increase the potential for public transport use (through location and density) and therefore be positive for climate change and reduce the need for greenfield sites. Overall there are positive and long term cumulative benefits through implementation.

CP15 Green Infrastructure

- 8.74 The policy has been updated and made more specific for GI on-site and immediate areas, and where not appropriate - with provision for financial contributions. As clearly explained in the supporting text to this policy, the introduction of GI into new developments will have multiple benefits which range across the whole framework of SA objectives. There are clear synergies between this policy and other policies protecting biodiversity, the water environment and managing climate change, with positive cumulative effects increasing over longer terms.
- 8.75 The supporting text refers to the value of GI to encourage people to use routes for walking and cycling, and lists key GI assets and opportunities in the District. Any conflicts of use between recreational use and wildlife can be mitigated through other policies eg CP16. Overall, the effects of this policy should be cumulative, long term and major positive on the Council's overarching aim to achieve sustainable development whilst meeting its share of the demands of the national housing requirement.

CP16 Biodiversity

- 8.76 This policy has been updated and amended as a result of the recommendations from the previous SA and to be more specific. The policy now makes commitment to supporting development that maintains, protects and enhances biodiversity across the District, delivering a net gain in biodiversity. Specific requirements are set out with regard to design and implementation, mitigation/compensation, adaptation to climate change, and relevant assessments and surveys. Clarity is provided for the range of important sites from international to local.
- 8.77 The policy now includes specific requirements to protect sites of international and European importance from inappropriate development. The requirement to undertake HRA (EU Habitats Directive) will ensure that any adverse effects are avoided or mitigated (and see HRA Report, Enfusion for Winchester District, 2011). The policy has been amended as a result of the recommendations of the previous SA – and it now states that development proposals will only be supported if the benefits of the development clearly outweigh the harm to the habitat and/or species. There is also a new requirement to enable biodiversity to respond and adapt to the impacts of climate change; this contributes to adaptation aims of the Winchester Climate change Strategy although the significance of positive effects is uncertain.
- 8.78 Overall, the policy has been improved significantly since 2009 with regard to sustainability outcomes and it now provides a clear strong framework to maintain, protect and enhance the many areas in Winchester that are noted for their rich biodiversity value and importance.

CP17 Flooding, Flood Risk and the Water Environment

- 8.79 The Council has adopted a holistic approach to all issues concerning the water environment and this is strongly supportive of sustainable development principles. This could be further enhanced by reference to the ecosystems approach (www.defra.gov.uk) and a commitment to require rather than support for proposed development. The policy has been updated and clarified, including as a result of considerable consultation with key stakeholders. The supporting text sets out the inter-relationships with requirements for good ecological quality (Water Framework Directive) and European protected sites (Birds and Habitats Directives).
- 8.80 Localised surface water flooding is a problem for the District and there may be future issues over water supply. The policy will be instrumental in meeting the Council's vision to achieve sustainable development for the District and provides a clear, strong commitment to sustainable water management; overall positive cumulative effects for water and inter-relationships with biodiversity, pollution and climate change.

SA Recommendation:

- The SA recommended that either CP7 or this policy CP17 included consideration of water-based recreation on water quality and biodiversity.

CP18 Settlement Gaps

- 8.81 The policy will be an important tool for managing development in an area of high pressure. In addition to the direct positive effects of preventing settlement coalescence and protecting the setting of historic settlements, the policy will also bring about indirect benefits for the landscape, design through the better integration of new development, health and biodiversity. The North Fareham SDA Strategic Gap is assessed separately under Policy SH4. Overall, the policy has strong clear positive and inter-related cumulative effects for communities and their environments.

CP19 South Downs National Park

- 8.82 The policy has been updated to reflect the designation of the National Park and that it is now operational. It reinforces and provides support for designations that are designed to protect landscape and wider cultural areas within the District. This approach will progress key sustainability objectives for the biodiversity, heritage and specifically the character and quality of Winchester's landscape.
- 8.83 The National Park designation, and this policy's support for its aims, also provides additional benefits for the tourism sector, by increasing the attractiveness and desirability of the location as an area to visit and recreate in which has potential long term benefits for Winchester's wider economy, in particular rural businesses. Wider benefits for existing and new residents are also possible where accessibility to the countryside is improved and supported in the context of new/

permitted development. Overall, the policy has major positive effects on the natural environment, the communities and tourism/recreation economy of the District.

SA Recommendation:

The policy CP19 could be enhanced by reference to the ecosystems approach (www.defra.gov.uk) that recognises that the natural environment provides diverse functions and services that are inter-related.

CP20 Cultural Heritage and Landscape Character

8.84 The district has a rich and varied historic environment both man made and natural which should be protected for its own sake; and the policy clearly provides this protection by progressing the relevant SA objectives. The policy will also have additional benefits for the economy, biodiversity and the quality of life of residents through ensuring that key assets are protected and enhanced. The policy has been updated and clarified to make more specific, including recommendations made by the previous SA. It has been expanded to include the wider importance of archaeological sites, which whilst not of such significance as scheduled monuments, should also be protected. Also the local distinctiveness has been clarified.

8.85 Overall, the policy has strong positive effects on heritage and landscape, together with further synergistic positive effects on communities and local economy, as well as biodiversity.

SA Recommendation:

The policy CP20 could be further enhanced by reference to the ecosystems approach (www.defra.gov.uk) that recognises that the natural environment provides diverse functions and services that are inter-related.

CP21 Infrastructure and Community Benefit

8.86 This is a clear and direct policy which requires appropriate and necessary infrastructure to support development proposals. It has been updated and clarified. The policy ensures that development will not be deterred through demands for infrastructure and contributions by recognising that the cumulative effect of such requirements can make sites unviable. Therefore, the level of commercial and residential development required will have a positive chance of being delivered.

This policy also recognises that there is key role in promoting Green Infrastructure and its wider benefits as part of a mitigation package for the biodiversity interest in sensitive development areas.

8.87 Overall, the policy has major positive effects for communities and the timely delivery of infrastructure needs. Through the requirement for testing existing capacities and clarity regarding on-site and off-site

provision, there are also positive effects indicated for sustainable water systems and progression of green infrastructure strategies.

9.0 SUMMARY AND CUMULATIVE EFFECTS ANALYSIS 2011

- 9.1 In addition to the appraisal of individual policies undertaken in SA/SEA, the SEA Directive requires consideration of the overall effects of the plan, including the secondary, synergistic and cumulative effects of implementing plan policies. This may include incremental effects that can have a small effect individually, but can accrue to have significant environmental effects.
- 9.2 In good practice SA/SEA, the analysis of cumulative effects should also consider the significant effects of the plan in combination with the effects of other plans, policies and proposals. This section summarises the key effects, including the cumulative effects of the plan policies (known as the intra-plan effects) and the combined effects with other relevant plans and projects (known as the inter-plan effects).
- 9.3 A cumulative effects assessment (CEA) was undertaken of the Core Strategy Preferred Option in 2009 and this has been reported previously and is set out in Section 6 of this SA Report. The plan policies have progressed since 2009 and changed as a result of wide consultation, including the Blueprint process, and updating of evidence. The previous 2009 findings from the CEA were also taken into account when further developing the plan policies presented in the 2011 Pre-Submission Joint Core Strategy.

Cumulative effect of Plan Policies (Intra-plan effects) 2011

- 9.4 To assist in considering the overall effects of policies within the plan when assessed against the different SA Framework objectives, a summary has been prepared, illustrating how each policy has performed against each SA Objective. This is provided in the following table:

Table 9.1: Intra-plan effects: Cumulative summary of Joint Core Strategy policies 2011

| SA Framework Objectives | | Building Communities | Infrastructure | Housing | Economy & Employment | Transport | Health | Water | Waste | Climate Change | Sustainable Construction | Biodiversity | Heritage | Landscape & Soils | Built Environment | Pollution |
|--|---|----------------------|----------------|---------|----------------------|-----------|--------|-------|-------|----------------|--------------------------|--------------|----------|-------------------|-------------------|-----------|
| Winchester Pre-Submission Preferred Option Objectives (see SA of I&O and POs for previous iterations) | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 |
| Winchester Town Policies Appraisal Summary | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WT1 | Development Strategy for Winchester Town | ++ | + | ++ | ++ | + | + | ○? | ○ | +? | ○? | + | -?/+ | ○? | + | + |
| WT2 | Strategic Housing Allocation – Barton Farm | + | + | ++ | + | + | + | ○-? | + | +/-? | + | ? | ○ | + | ○ | ○/? |
| WT3 | Bushfield Camp Opportunity Site | ? | +? | ○ | + | + | +? | ? | ○? | + | + | ? | ○ | +? | +? | +? |
| South Hampshire Urban Area Policies Appraisal Summary | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SH1 | Strategy for South Hampshire Urban Areas | ++ | + | ++ | ? | + | + | -? | + | - | + | -? | ? | +? | + | -? |
| SH2 | Strategic Housing Allocation – West of Waterlooville | ++ | + | ++ | ++ | + | + | ? | + | + | + | ? | + | -? | + | ○? |
| SH3 | Strategic Housing Allocation – North Whitely | ++ | ++? | ++ | + | + | +? | ○? | + | + | + | ? | + | -? | + | +? |
| SH4 | North Fareham SDA | + | ○ | + | + | ○ | + | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ? | + | + | ○ | ○ |
| Market Towns and Rural Area Policies Appraisal Summary | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| MTRA1 | Development Strategy Market Towns & Rural Area | ++ | ++ | ++ | ++ | +? | +? | ? | + | -? | ○ | + | ○ | ○ | ○ | -? |
| MTRA2 | Market Towns and Larger Villages | ++ | + | ++ | ++? | -? | +? | ? | + | -? | ○ | ? | +? | +? | + | -? |
| MTRA3 | Other Settlements in the Market Towns & Rural Area | ++ | +? | +? | +? | -? | +? | ? | + | -? | ○ | ? | +? | +? | + | -? |
| MTRA4 | Development in the Countryside | + | ○ | + | + | +? | ○ | ○ | + | + | + | ○ | + | + | ○? | + |
| MTRA5 | Major Commercial & Educational Establishments | ++ | +? | ○ | + | + | +? | ○ | + | +? | + | ? | ? | ? | ? | + |

| SA Framework Objectives | | Building Communities | Infrastructure | Housing | Economy & Employment | Transport | Health | Water | Waste | Climate Change | Sustainable Construction | Biodiversity | Heritage | Landscape & Soils | Built Environment | Pollution |
|--|--|----------------------|----------------|---------|----------------------|-----------|--------|-------|-------|----------------|--------------------------|--------------|----------|-------------------|-------------------|-----------|
| Winchester Pre-Submission Preferred Option Objectives (see SA of I&O and POs for previous iterations) | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 |
| Core Policies Appraisal Summary | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Active Communities | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| CP1 | Housing Provision | + | ○ | ++ | ○ | -? | ○ | ? | ○ | -? | ○ | -? | ○ | -? | ○ | ○ |
| CP2 | Housing Provision and Mix | ++ | ○ | ++ | ? | ○ | + | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| CP3 | Affordable Housing on Market Led Housing Sites | ++ | ○ | ++ | + | ? | + | ○ | ○ | ○ | + | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| CP4 | Affordable Housing Exception Sites to Meet Local Needs | ++ | ○ | ++ | + | ? | + | ○ | ○ | ○ | + | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| CP5 | Sites for Gypsies, Travellers & Travelling Showpeople | ++ | + | ++ | ○ | + | ++ | + | + | + | + | + | ++ | + | + | ? |
| CP6 | Local Services and Facilities | ++ | ++ | ○ | + | + | + | ○ | ○ | + | + | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○? | + |
| CP7 | Open Space, Sport and Recreation | ++ | ++ | ○ | ○ | + | ++ | ? | ○ | + | ○ | + | ○ | + | ○ | + |
| Prosperous Economy | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| CP8 | Economic Growth and Diversification | ++ | ○ | ○ | ++ | ++ | + | ○ | ○ | + | ○ | + | + | + | ○ | + |
| CP9 | Retention of Employment Land and Premises | + | ○ | ○ | ++ | + | + | ○ | ○ | + | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | + |
| CP10 | Transport | + | + | ○ | + | ++ | + | ? | ? | + | + | + | ? | ? | ○ | + |
| High Quality Environment | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| CP11 | Sustainable Low and Zero Carbon Built Development | + | ○ | + | + | ○ | + | ++ | ++ | ++ | ++ | + | ? | ○ | ? | + |
| CP12 | Renewable and Decentralised Energy | + | ○ | + | + | ○ | + | ○ | ○ | ++ | + | ○ | - | ○ | + | + |
| CP13 | High Quality Design | + | ○ | ○ | ○ | + | + | ○ | ○ | + | ○ | + | + | ○ | + | ○ |
| CP14 | The Effective Use of Land | ○ | ○ | ++ | + | + | + | ○ | ○ | + | ○ | ○ | + | + | + | + |
| CP15 | Green Infrastructure | + | ++ | ○ | + | + | ++ | + | ○ | ++ | ++ | ++ | + | + | + | + |

| SA Framework Objectives | | Building Communities | Infrastructure | Housing | Economy & Employment | Transport | Health | Water | Waste | Climate Change | Sustainable Construction | Biodiversity | Heritage | Landscape & Soils | Built Environment | Pollution |
|--|--|----------------------|----------------|---------|----------------------|-----------|--------|-------|-------|----------------|--------------------------|--------------|----------|-------------------|-------------------|-----------|
| Winchester Pre-Submission Preferred Option Objectives (see SA of I&O and POs for previous iterations) | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 |
| CP16 | Biodiversity | ○ | +? | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | +? | ○ | +? | ○ | + | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| CP17 | Flooding, Flood Risk and the Water Environment | ○ | + | + | + | ○ | + | ++ | ○ | + | + | ○ | ○ | +? | ○ | + |
| CP18 | Settlement Gaps | + | ? | ○ | + | ○ | + | ? | ○ | + | ? | + | + | + | + | + |
| CP19 | South Downs National Park | + | ? | ○ | + | ○ | ? | ○ | ○ | ○ | + | ++ | + | ++ | + | ○ |
| CP20 | Heritage and Landscape Character | + | ○ | ○ | + | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | + | ++ | ++ | + | ○ |
| CP21 | Infrastructure and Community Benefit | ++ | ++ | ○ | +? | + | + | + | + | + | ○ | + | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |

| SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL KEY | |
|------------------------------|---|
| ++ | Major Significant Positive Effects: development actively encouraged as it would resolve an existing sustainability problem |
| + | Minor Significant Positive Effects: No Sustainability constraints and development acceptable |
| ○ | Neutral |
| ? | Unknown/uncertain effect |
| - | Minor Significant Negative Effects: potential sustainability issues; mitigation and /or negotiation possible |
| -- | Major Significant Negative Effects: problematical & improbable because of known sustainability issues ; mitigation or negotiation difficult and /or expensive |
| x | Major Significant Negative Effects: absolute sustainability constraints to development |

Significant positive cumulative effects of plan policies (Intra-plan effects)

- 9.5 The SA found that the majority of policies were found to have significant positive sustainability benefits for the Winchester District. As a result of further development of the policies since 2009, overall there is less uncertainty and the significance of the positive effects of implementing the Joint Core Strategy has improved. The following table summarises the significant positive cumulative effects identified:

Table 9.2: Significant positive effects of the Joint Core Strategy

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

Significant negative cumulative effects of plan policies (Intra-plan effects)

- 9.6 Alongside the many positive effects of the plan, potential negative sustainability effects were also identified. These primarily relate to the increased residential and employment development proposed in the plan. It is noted that the scale of the housing requirement has now

been determined at the local level since the revocation of the South East Plan. Overall there is less uncertainty and the significance of negative effects of implementing the Joint Core Strategy has generally improved with enhanced clarity of avoidance or mitigation. Negative effects identified are summarised below:

Table 9.3: Significant negative effects of the Joint Core Strategy

| Key relevant SA Objective: | Negative Effects & Mitigation identified: |
|--|---|
| Biodiversity Landscape & Townscape | <p>The cumulative effects of increased development, including housing, employment development, and other infrastructure. These effects include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ increased air pollution (local and regional); ■ direct land-take; ■ pressures on water resources and water quality; ■ increased noise and light pollution, particularly from traffic; ■ increased waste production; ■ potential loss of tranquillity ; ■ implications for human health (e.g. from increased pollution); and ■ incremental effects on landscape and townscapes. <p>The overarching Development Strategy DS1, Strategic Allocations, and Core Policies have been strengthened such that strong mitigation measures are in place.</p> |
| Climate Change and Energy | <p>An increase in the District's contribution to greenhouse gas production- this is inevitable given the amount of new development proposed, and includes factors such as increased transportation costs, embodied energy in construction materials and increased energy use from new housing and employment development.</p> |
| Cultural Heritage Landscape & Townscape Building Communities | <p>Less tangible effects of significant physical, economic and social changes for local communities, including impacts on cultural heritage, landscape, community cohesion particularly in locations where there will be significant increases in development. The overarching Development Strategy DS1, Strategic Allocations, and Core Policies have been strengthened such that stronger mitigation measures are in place.</p> |

Interactions with other relevant plans and projects (Inter-plan effects)

- 9.7 In considering the in-combination effects of other plans and projects, priority has been given to key documents that affect planning and development in Winchester and its neighbouring authorities. The aim of

the analysis of inter-plan effects was to identify how other plans and key projects may affect the sustainability of the Winchester District. Whilst it is recognised that there are wider sustainability implications beyond Winchester's boundaries, it is considered that sustainability concerns for the wider Hampshire sub-region should be covered in the South East England area and the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal.

- 9.8 Key documents considered were the South East Plan, neighbouring authorities LDFs- in particular for the PUSH area, and Regional and County-level transport planning and economic and cultural strategy documents. It is noted that this is not an exhaustive list of plans; however its focus on the most influential documents has allowed a strategic level appraisal of Inter-Plan effects suited to the purposes of this SA. In 2010, the Government gave intent to revoke the Regional Spatial Strategies. The Winchester Joint core Strategy remains generally in conformity with the SE Plan. The revocation of regional strategies has been subject to SEA with a consultation draft Environmental Report¹⁵ for the SE Plan published in October 2011. The findings of this SEA has been taken into account in considering the cumulative effects of proposed development in SE England and likely to cause significant effects for the Winchester District.
- 9.9 The results of this analysis illustrate a range of positive and negative effects for the Winchester District and the wider environment. Positive effects relate primarily to social and economic benefits: an increase in affordable housing, enhanced infrastructure, including community facilities, healthier lifestyles and enhanced employment and economic opportunities, and improved access to services, employment and facilities.
- 9.10 Negative effects identified from the inter-plan analysis relate to the cumulative and incremental effects of development: noise, air, light and water pollution, incremental effects on biodiversity, indirect effects on cultural heritage, landscape, community cohesion and identity, loss of Greenfield land, increased waste production and an increase in greenhouse gas emissions.
- 9.11 In preparing plan policies, Winchester City Council has already sought to mitigate many of these negative effects and is commended for the work undertaken to date. It is also recognised that some mitigation measures are more appropriately dealt with at lower tiers of plan-making, for example in Development Management Policies.

¹⁵ <http://www.communities.gov.uk/publications/planningandbuilding/revocationserss>
(accessed 25 November 2011)

Table 9.4: Significant Inter-Plan Cumulative Effects 2011

Note: Negative effects coloured in red text, positive in black.

| SA Topics Summary | Other plans, projects or policies | Significant effects identified in other plans, projects or policies | Significant combined effects of Winchester Core Strategy with other plans, projects or policies |
|-------------------------------|--|---|---|
| Building Communities | South East Plan (sub regional framework for South Hampshire, e.g. policy SH1) & neighbouring LDFs-provision for a wide range of infrastructure; regeneration policies. | Positive effect through providing increased infrastructure to meet community needs; enhancement & regeneration of existing communities. | Yes- When combined with provision of strategic infrastructure (South East Plan) and neighbouring authorities, positive effects for Winchester's population. |
| | Housing & employment allocations in South East Plan (SH12, 80,000 homes in South Hampshire up to 2026) | Indirect negative effects on cultural heritage, landscape, community cohesion and identity due to physical, economic and social changes. | Yes- particularly in locations where high levels of development proposed. |
| Health/ Infrastructure | South East Plan Strategic Development Areas (SH2) (Fareham) | Potential negative effects through increased noise, air and light pollution. Potential loss of tranquillity, implications for human health (local effects). | Yes- through increased traffic generation and pressures on rural/ open spaces. |
| | South East Plan policies Sub Regional Gaps (SH3) and Environmental Sustainability, encouraging cycling/walking (SH14) | Positive effects through encouraging healthy, active lifestyles. | Yes- when combined with Winchester's policies encouraging increased walking and cycling, and Leisure Provision (CP1&2) significant positive effects. |

| SA Topics Summary | Other plans, projects or policies | Significant effects identified in other plans, projects or policies | Significant combined effects of Winchester Core Strategy with other plans, projects or policies |
|---------------------------------|---|---|--|
| Housing | Housing & employment allocations in South East Plan (80,000 homes for South Hampshire)) & Neighbouring LDFs (East Hampshire, Test Valley). SEA on revocation of SE Plan consultation Environmental Report (October 2011) | Positive Effects through meeting housing need, including affordable housing in South East England, and specifically the Hampshire Region. | Yes- The housing allocations for Winchester when combined with those for the wider South Hampshire Area will have a significant positive effect in meeting affordable housing. Revocation of SE Plan allows local authorities to identify local housing needs; Winchester proposes about 11000 dwellings in the period 2011-2031. |
| Economy & Employment | South East Plan, Regional Economic Strategy & Neighbouring LDFs Economic policies. | Positive effects- increased employment opportunities for Winchester residents; enhanced economy for South East region. | Yes- Significant positive effects in providing employment opportunities for Winchester Residents. Yes- positive synergistic effects of economic improvements across south East England. |
| | South East Plan & Neighbouring LDFs Economic policies. | Negative effects- increased competition for Winchester resident labour force (through potential for enhanced employment opportunities in other areas). | Uncertain with new Local Enterprise Partnerships; retention of Regional Hubs may assist in mitigating negative effects of competition from other areas in employment and retail. |
| Transport | South East Plan policies (e.g. SH10), SE Regional Transport Strategy & Hampshire Local Transport Plan. | Positive effects- enhancing accessibility through improvements to local roads, and support for sustainable transport, walking and cycling. | Yes- Significant positive effects through enhancing accessibility across the District. |
| Biodiversity | South East Plan & neighbouring LDFs | Positive effects- Green infrastructure proposals seek to provide linkage for biodiversity, mitigate potential impacts and provide- enhanced connectivity in assisting adaptation to climate change. | Yes- Significant positive effects through enhanced habitat connectivity. |

| SA Topics Summary | Other plans, projects or policies | Significant effects identified in other plans, projects or policies | Significant combined effects of Winchester Core Strategy with other plans, projects or policies |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | South East Plan (delivery of 80,000 homes in the South Hampshire area) & economic growth. | Negative Effects- Increased air, noise, water and light pollution and increased recreational impacts (land and water based recreation) from housing and economic growth. Changes to natural drainage and effects on water resources. | Yes, potential cumulative/ incremental effects for biodiversity across the region, and [particularly for sensitive riverine and connected estuarine environments. Plans aims to mitigate through protecting Winchester's known biodiversity areas. Also potential for synergistic effects (for example effects on one species or habitat can have indirect effects on another). |
| Heritage/ Culture | South East Plan & South East Regional Cultural Strategy | Positive effects- role of culture in regeneration/ urban and rural renaissance; provision of strategic cultural facilities. Positive effects for communities and culture. | Yes minor, and the SA notes the key role that culture and heritage play for Winchester in providing an environment that is productive and healthy – which overall should lead combined positive effects. |
| Landscape/ Built Environment | Housing & employment allocations South East Plan & Neighbouring LDFs. SEA of Revocation of SE Plan - consultation draft Environmental Report (October 2011) | Negative effects on landscape through loss of open space and encroachment into strategic gaps <i>Uncertain effects on townscape- increased development can lead to positive and negative impacts, particularly significant for Winchester City where townscape defines the distinctiveness of the City.</i> | Yes - Negative effects most likely in relation to Market Town settlements on periphery of District. ER on revocation of SE Plan suggests that revocation would remove top-down pressure on local authorities to review the extent of their Green Belt. |
| Climate Change/ Pollution/ | Housing & employment allocations South East Plan & Neighbouring LDFs | Negative effects through increased greenhouse gas emissions (effects global) | Yes, increased development in Winchester District will lead to increased greenhouse gas emissions. This is inevitable given the amount of new development proposed, and includes factors such as increased transportation costs, embodied energy in construction materials and increased energy use from new housing and |

| SA Topics Summary | Other plans, projects or policies | Significant effects identified in other plans, projects or policies | Significant combined effects of Winchester Core Strategy with other plans, projects or policies |
|--|---|---|--|
| | | | employment development. Mitigation through transport/ sustainable construction and economic policies. |
| Water | Housing & employment allocations South East Plan & Neighbouring LDFs | Negative effects- increased demand for domestic consumption. | Yes- Increased development in Winchester District will lead to increased pressure on water environment; however policies within the plan seek to mitigate this. |
| Landscape & Soil | South East Plan & Neighbouring LDFs (housing and employment allocations) | Negative effects- increased land-take. Positive effects- return to productive use and remediation of previously-developed land. | Yes, new urban extension areas (where straddling Winchester) require greenfield land likely negative effects on land and soil, though also dependent on individual allocations and management/ mitigation measures. Yes- Plan will assist in returning land to productive use and remediation of contaminated land. |
| Air Quality | Housing & employment allocations South East Plan & Neighbouring LDFs | Negative effects- Increased air traffic and associated road traffic likely to lead to decline in air quality (effects local- regional). | Yes, increased development in Winchester District will lead to increased air pollution (effects local- regional). Identified as key issue by plan which includes measures to minimise this effect. |
| Sustainable Construction/ Waste | South East Plan & Neighbouring LDFs (housing and employment allocations) Hants Minerals and Waste Core Strategy | Negative effects through increased production of waste (construction & householder/commercial waste). | Yes- increased development in Winchester District will lead to increased production of household and commercial waste and increased waste from demolition and construction. |

10.0 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR MITIGATION AND ENHANCEMENT: PROGRESSION 2009-2011

- 10.1 The SA process has predicted the significant environmental, social and economic effects likely to occur as a result of the implementation of the Winchester District's Local Plan Part 1- Joint Core Strategy. The SA process identified suggestions/recommendations to mitigate significant negative effects and also identified possibilities for enhancement, where possible. A detailed table of recommendations and suggestions for mitigation and enhancement from the SA of the Preferred Option 2009 is provided in this SA Report in Appendix VII.
- 10.2 During the SA process for the Pre-Submission Joint Core Strategy, the changes in policies were noted, including those arising as a result of the recommendations made by the SA in 2009. The following table sets out the key changes made as a result of the SA findings and thus demonstrates the difference the SA has made to the preparation of the Plan.

Table 10.1: SA Recommendations Progressed from 2009 to 2011

| Preferred Option Policies 2009 | SA Recommendations and Suggestions | Pre-Submission Policies: Progression |
|--------------------------------|--|--|
| SS1 SD Principles | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> specific reference to water environment in District clarify sustainable construction | DS1 – explicit requirement for water environment and recycling/waste; sustainable construction covered by CP11. |
| WT2 Barton Farm | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> include network of site tracks in GI light & noise pollution on northern rural edges | WT2 – both SA recommendations included in policy. |
| WT3 Bushfield Camp | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> green transport plans corporate sustainability strategies light & noise pollution on rural edges | WT3 – includes requirements for exemplar design and an HRA to avoid/mitigate adverse effects on environmental factors. |
| SH1 SHUA Strategy | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> monitoring available commercial floorspace design solutions | |
| SH2 Waterlooville | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> light & noise pollution on rural edge | |
| SH3 N Whiteley | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> light & noise pollution on rural edge | SH3 – much improved mitigation requirements including full transport & biodiversity assessments, & a GI Strategy. |
| MTRA1 Strategy | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> contain development in rural areas clarify levels of | MTRA1 – much improved with clarity & requirements re local character & meeting local |

| | | |
|---------------------------|--|--|
| | supporting infrastructure | growth, specifically communication technology. |
| MTRA2 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> improve public transport strict controls over traffic; light & noise | MTRA2 &3 – more clarity and explicit re requirements for capacity & setting/character of settlements. |
| CP1 Open Space | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> impacts of leisure on water quality | Not taken forward into CP7 |
| CP2 Transport | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> deliverable improvements | |
| CP5 GI | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> wider range of benefits for GI | CP15 sets out the range of benefits from GI |
| CP6 Biodiversity | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> not all adverse effects can be mitigated | CP16 clearly sets out that compensation is last resort & development proposals will only be supported if benefits outweigh harm to biodiversity. |
| CP7 Water | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> require vs support wording | Not taken forward to CP17 |
| CP8 Heritage & Landscape | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> wider archaeology to be included | CP20 – includes reference to the wider archaeology |
| CP11 High Quality Design | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> clarify re walking & cycling | |
| CP15 Housing | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> move away from car dependency required | Effective through reorganisation of strategic allocations MTRA policies. |
| CP16 Housing Priorities | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> additional clarity needed | Effected through CP2-4. |
| CP21 Gypsies & Travellers | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> services can be from diverse & sustainable sources access & essential services needed | CP5 – both SA recommendations integrated into revised policy. |

10.3 Overall, the policies in the 2011 Pre-Submission Joint Core Strategy have been developed with significant improvements by incorporating findings from the 2009 SA, the responses received, updating evidence, and by the wider consultation undertaken including the Blueprint process. The improvements with regard to progressing objectives for sustainable development in the Winchester District are associated with the following:

- increasing significance of positive effects for communities, housing and local economy
- increasing positive significance and reducing uncertainty by including clarity in policies and explicit requirements for mitigating adverse effects.

10.4 The revised policies in the Pre-Submission Joint Core Strategy were appraised in November 2011 and only a small number of minor suggestions for enhancement and recommendations for mitigating

minor adverse effects were identified. These are set out in the following table:

Table 10.2: SA Suggestions for Enhancement and Recommendations for Mitigation for Policies 2011

| SA Suggestions for Enhancement | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| 1 | CP19 include reference to ecosystems approach |
| 2 | CP20 include reference to ecosystems approach |
| 3 | Consider preparing specific Design Guidance to integrate and explain all the design requirements variously through the JCS. |
| SA Recommendations | |
| 4 | Consistency for all policies re inclusive communities, for example, some policies make specific reference to the elderly but others do not and this is a know sustainability issue for Winchester. |
| 5 | WT1 include specific reference to particular historic heritage and settings |
| 6 | CP7 or CP17 include reference to effects of water-based recreation on water quality and biodiversity. |

11.0 PROGRESSION FROM PRE-SUBMISSION TO SUBMISSION LOCAL PLAN PART 1 – JANUARY – JUNE 2012

- 11.1 The Winchester District Local Plan Part 1 (LPP1) Joint Core Strategy Pre-Submission was published on the Council's website for a 6 week (25 January 2012 to 12 March 2012) consultation period on the soundness and legal conformity of the Plan. Following this consultation, and taking into account changes in Government policy, modifications were made to the Plan and a Schedule of Modifications has been published. This, together with the Submission LPP1 comprises the Plan submitted to the Secretary of State to be examined.
- 11.2 The modifications to the Plan were associated with:
- Updating, for example, through provision of further information
 - Clarification, such as reordering text, removing duplication, and providing consistency
 - Demonstrating compliance, for example, with the implementation of the National Planning Policy Framework and the bringing into force of the Localism Act
 - Indicating delivery mechanisms, for example, through the LPP2 and making explicit how key delivery policies relate to outcomes and objectives
 - and other minor corrections, such as typographical errors.

SA/SEA of Submission LPP1 May 2012

- 11.3 Modifications made to the Winchester LPP1 following consultation in January – March 2012 are considered to be matters of clarification and updating. These modifications do not constitute significant changes to the Plan and therefore, do not require further SA/SEA. The SA/SEA was reviewed and it was established that the SA/SEA remained consistent with the Plan. The Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) was also reviewed and updated. The majority of HRA recommendations have been incorporated into the Submission LPP1; certain matters, for example, requiring phasing and management of construction to minimise impacts on air quality, will be addressed in the development management and site allocations details of LPP2. The HRA is reported separately.
- 11.4 The key modifications to the Plan with implications for the SA/SEA are set out in the table following:

Table 11.1: Key Modifications to LPP1 for Submission 2012 and Implications for SA

| Plan Section | Summary of Modification Reasoning | Implications for SA/SEA Findings |
|--------------|--|--|
| Intro 1.42 | New text to demonstrate compliance with NPPF – positive approach that reflects presumption in favour of sustainable development | Overall positive: makes explicit that development is sought to improve economic, social & environmental conditions |
| 2.7 | Updated retail growth evidence ¹⁶ indicates reduced floorspace (36,524 to 12,000 sq m) requirement due to effects of the recession. | Insignificant or neutral as SA effects are in line with community needs |
| 2.34 | As a result of consultation responses, spatial planning objectives for a high quality environment include new text – <i>“maintain...whilst respecting its setting within the South Downs National Park.”</i> | Overall enhances positive effects on the environment of the District |
| DS1 | Clarification for hierarchy of town centres; applying high standards of design to include <i>“cultural heritage”</i> ; and addition of <i>“or measures to mitigate impact”</i> for testing infrastructure provision; | Overall enhances positive effects on the environment of the District through confirming protection of environment and delivery through Plan policies |
| 3.18 | Updated retail growth evidence ¹⁷ indicates reduced floorspace (22,000 to 9,000 sq m) requirement in Winchester Town. | Insignificant or neutral as SA effects are in line with community needs |
| WT1 | Clarification of delivery through other policies in the Plan; role of development management and LPP2 – in supporting text. | Confirms effectiveness of mitigation |
| WT2 | Clarification of delivery and requirement for a flood risk | Confirms and clarifies effectiveness of |

¹⁶ Retail and Town Centre Uses Study, NLP, 2012

¹⁷ Retail and Town Centre Uses Study, NLP, 2012

| | | |
|-----------------------|---|---|
| | sequential approach with adequate separation from the Harestock WWTW – in supporting text. | mitigation |
| WT3 | Additional policy text on “ <i>appropriate strategic landscaping</i> ” and mitigation of impacts on strategic highway network; confirms commitment to further investigations for infrastructure requirements. | Confirms and clarifies effectiveness of mitigation |
| SH1 | Clarification of delivery through other policies in the Plan; role of development management and LPP2 in supporting text. | Confirms effectiveness of mitigation |
| SH2 | Clarification of delivery in supporting text. | Confirms and clarifies effectiveness of mitigation |
| SH3 | Clarification of delivery in supporting text and additional site-specific requirements in policy text to protect water resources and provide a “ <i>fully integrated Sustainable Drainage System</i> ” and “ <i>apply a flood risk sequential approach...</i> ”; requirement “ <i>to assess the potential for prior extraction of minerals...</i> ” | Confirms and clarifies effectiveness of mitigation |
| MTRA Spatial Strategy | Additional text to reflect status of South Downs National Park and implementation of the NPPF. | Neutral/Positive overall by confirming objectives of the SDNP |
| 3.66 | Updated retail growth evidence ¹⁸ indicates that there is not a need for further floorspace growth (5,900 to 0 sq m) in the short to medium term in New Alresford, Bishops Waltham, Wickham and Denmead. | Insignificant or neutral as SA effects are in line with community needs |

¹⁸ Retail and Town Centre Uses Study, NLP, 2012

| | | |
|---------------|--|---|
| MTRA1 3.71 | Clarification of delivery through other policies in the Plan - added to policy text. | Confirms and clarifies effectiveness of mitigation |
| MTRA2 | Added to policy text - Inclusion of locally derived floorspace thresholds for town centre uses to ensure development is consistent with the retail hierarchy and the NPPF and clarification of delivery. | Confirms and clarifies effectiveness of mitigation |
| CP7 | Added to policy text, clarification to allow for other community benefits to be taken into account. | Confirms and clarifies effectiveness of mitigation |
| CP12 | Text amended to clarify – <i>“areas designated for their local or national importance, such as Gaps and the South Downs National Park...”</i> | Confirms and clarifies protection of environmentally sensitive areas, and effectiveness of mitigation |
| CP 15 | Additional text to clarify; reference to Map 9 and Green Links and Blue Corridors plan; and link with Policy CP7 | Confirms and clarifies effectiveness of mitigation |
| CP20 | Additional text <i>“...and their settings”</i> . Supporting text includes reference to avoidance and mitigation measures to protect sites designated for their local or national importance. | Overall Positive; confirms and clarifies effectiveness of mitigation |

11.5 The SA was carried out in an iterative manner with plan-making. The January 2012 consultation Pre-Submission LPP1 documents included a paper¹⁹ that sets out the way in which the LPP1 had incorporated the 2011 recommendations from the SA and HRA. The review of the SA in May 2012 has confirmed and clarified the effectiveness of mitigation through Plan policies, and overall, the positive effects are enhanced through making explicit that development is sought to improve economic, social &

¹⁹ <http://www.winchester.gov.uk/assets/files/2157/PreSubSummarySASEAandHRA.pdf>

environmental conditions in DS1. Additional text in the Environmental Objectives and a number of Policies as set out in the Table 11.1 above, confirms and clarifies the effectiveness of mitigation to protect and enhance the environment of the Winchester District area.

Responses to Consultation on the SA Report accompanying the Pre-Submission LPP1 (2011)

- 11.6 A small number of responses were received specifically on aspects of the SA Report. These are summarised and presented in the updated Appendix II (summary of Responses to SA Consultation 2007, 2008, 2009, 2011). A commentary from the assessors is given to each SA response; these acknowledge the response with clarification and signposting, where necessary, to sections of the SA Report that deal with the issue raised. No further action was required for the SA of the Submission LPP1.

SA of Housing Technical Paper May 2012

- 11.7 In response to changes in planning, including the implementation of localism and the Government's intention to abolish Regional Strategies, Winchester City Council took the opportunity to review its housing needs and to develop a locally-derived housing target. The Council drew upon various sources of technical evidence, as well as responses to its Blueprint public involvement exercise, to devise a suggested new target for housing provision in the Winchester District.
- 11.8 The Housing Technical Paper (published in June 2011) considered various scenarios for population and housing change. It reached a conclusion that Scenario 1 should form the basis for the future level of housing development and that Scenarios 2 and 3 would not meet the District's needs or be suitable for adoption. It concluded that the technical basis on which Scenario 4 was developed is not robust (and thus not a reasonable alternative). The need for some further work on updating economic needs, which might result in some changes to the housing requirement proposed, was identified. This was undertaken for the Council and published²⁰ in August 2011. The employment and population figures for Scenario 3 were revised to take into account the effects of the economic recession. This resulted in a reduction in overall economic growth for the District and housing numbers

²⁰ Review of Employment Prospects, Employment Land & Demographic Projections (Aug 2011) DTZ for WCC

were reduced correspondingly to a level that was similar to those numbers predicted for Scenario 1.

- 11.9 The Housing Technical Paper comprised part of the evidence base that was used in the wide public consultation as part of the *Plans for Places...after Blueprint* engagement process during the summer of 2011. The analysis of the potential four options for locally-derived numbers for housing throughout the District and the preferred option (Scenario 1) were considered by the public at this time. The views of the public, together with additional information including the further studies on employment and population, were taken into account in preparing the next stages of the plan-making. This additional evidence informed the preparation of Core Policy CP1 Housing Provision which was subject to SA and the findings published in the SA Report accompanying the Pre-Submission Local Plan Part 1 (December 2011).
- 11.10 Recent High Court Judgments^{21 22} have provided further guidance in the practical implementation of the SEA Directive for the appraisal of spatial plans. With regard to alternatives assessment, the environmental report accompanying the draft plan must refer to, summarise or repeat the reasons that were given for rejecting the alternatives at the time when they were ruled out, and those reasons must still be valid. An SA was carried out of the Housing Technical Paper to demonstrate that the reasons for rejecting and selecting alternatives in the summer of 2011 were still valid in May 2012.
- 11.11 The method and the detailed findings of the SA are set out in Appendix X (SA of Housing Technical Paper) of this SA Report. Scenarios 1-3 were appraised using the framework of SA objectives developed for the Local Plan. For Scenario 3, two commentaries are given to show the difference in appraisal findings between those found for the original Scenario 3 and those found for the revised Scenario 3 based on a reduced economic growth. In practice, the further studies reduced the housing numbers predicted for Scenario 3 to a similar level to those predicted for Scenario 1. Thus the further studies also confirmed that the prediction for 11,000 dwellings overall was a reasonable figure for the Winchester District.

²¹ *Save Historic Newmarket Ltd v Forest Heath District Council* (2011) EWHC 606

²² *Heard v Broadland District Council, Norfolk DC, Norwich City Council* (2012) EWHC 344

11.12 The SA and its consideration of the appraisal of alternative options in June 2011 and in May 2012 confirmed that the reasons for selection/rejection of the reasonable alternatives are still valid and as summarised by the following table:

Table 11.2: Summary Reasons for Selection/Rejection of Alternative Overall Housing Scenarios

| No | Scenario | Summary Reasons for Selection/Rejection |
|----|--|--|
| 1 | Government Projections | Based on robust data Very positive effects on population, balanced communities, housing & supporting infrastructure Very positive effects on the economy Overall scale of development on environmental factors likely to be mitigated by other policies and location. Selected. |
| 2 | Zero Net Migration (Natural Change) | Very negative effects on population, balanced communities; concern about meeting affordable housing needs Very negative effects on the economy Neutral or uncertain positive effects on the environment. Rejected. |
| 3 | Economic-Based Projections | Positive effects on population and communities; uncertain negative effects on capacity of supporting services and infrastructure Very positive effects on the economy but doubt about deliverability. Overall scale of development on environmental factors may difficult to mitigate by other policies and location. Rejected. <i>Further studies reduced employment (& population) figures down to similar numbers of dwellings as to the preferred Scenario 1.</i> |
| 4 | Affordable Housing-led Projections | Technically unsound, data double-counted, based on too many assumptions that are changeable & thus not a reasonable alternative with regard to the SEA Directive. Rejected. |
| | | |

12.0 IMPLEMENTATION & MONITORING

Introduction

12.1 This section discusses indicators and targets to help monitor the sustainability effects of the LDF. Targets and/or indicators for each sustainability objective have been identified (from the SA Framework) to provide a suggested list for discussion, and refined further to consider the significant sustainability effects of the plan, as required by the SEA Directive. ODPM's SA Guidance (November 2005) specifies that monitoring arrangements should be designed to:

- highlight significant effects;
- highlight effects which differ from those that were predicted; and
- provide a useful source of baseline information for the future.

SA monitoring proposals for the Winchester Local Plan – Part 1 Joint Core Strategy

12.2 Government requires local planning authorities to produce Annual Monitoring Reports (AMRs). According to guidance from ODPM, "These need to include the findings of SA monitoring"²³. Accordingly, the monitoring strategy for the SA should be integrated with the LDF AMR. Winchester City Council is currently in the process of preparing proposals for the LDF AMR, and will consider this chapter in the preparation of the AMR. The proposals for monitoring Winchester's LDF take into account the following proposals for SA monitoring and also include indicators that are relevant to the Sustainable Communities Strategy, Local Area Agreement and the overarching AMR report

12.3 The proposed LDF monitoring strategy should:

- Clearly set out who is responsible for the monitoring, as well as it's timing, frequency and format for presenting results;
- By collecting new information, update and strengthen original baseline data, rectifying any deficiencies, and thereby provide an improved basis for the formulation of future plans;
- Establish a mechanism for action to enhance positive effects of the plan, mitigate any negative ones and assess any areas that were originally identified as containing uncertainty. The aim should be to keep the LDF working at maximum effectiveness for the benefit of the community; and,
- Empower all of the community by providing a clear and easily understandable picture of how actual implementation of the LDF is affecting the District. Is it moving the area towards or away from the

²³ *Sustainability Appraisal of Regional Spatial Strategies and Local Development Documents* ODPM, November 2005

more sustainable future we intended? Are any significant effects identified actually happening? Are any unforeseen consequences being felt? Are any mitigation measures that were proposed operating effectively?

12.4 Indicators aim to measure all relevant aspects of life in the District – social and economic as well as environmental. These are drawn from:

- Objectives and targets set out in the LDF – these will mostly be quantitative and may be expressed as maps, graphs, diagrams or percentages (e.g. Percentage of new housing built on brownfield land, target of 10% of energy on major new developments to be provided by renewables etc.);
- Indicators already identified and used in the SA process, again mostly likely to be quantitative;
- Measures drawn from the baseline data collected during the early stages of the LDF or from the previous Local Plan (e.g. air quality, extent of wildlife habitats, need for affordable housing); and,
- Any other measures suggested by the community. These might be more qualitative (e.g. quality of life) and could be useful in enriching understanding and giving people a sense of ownership of the LDF.

12.5 The table below contains a list of proposed SA indicators and targets to be incorporated into the AMR as considered appropriate by Council. These take into account consultation comments received throughout the SA process, and may be further refined for the submission document.

Table 12.1: Potential Indicators

| Potential Indicators |
|--|
| 1. Building Communities: To create and sustain communities that meet the needs of the population and promote social inclusion <i>SEA topics: Population</i> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Accessibility: % of households that can reach local facilities by foot or public transport within 15 mins |
| 2. Infrastructure: To provide for the timely delivery of infrastructure suitable to meet community needs <i>SEA topics: Material Assets</i> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Proportion of population [%] with access to open space, built and recreational facilities (in line with open space study accessibility standards) ■ Provision (kms) of cycle routes |
| 3. Housing: To provide good quality housing for all <i>SEA topics: Population</i> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Affordable housing: % of housing stock available/ number of affordable housing unit completions per year |
| 4. Economy and Employment To maintain the buoyant economy and develop greater diversity that meets local needs <i>SEA topics: Population</i> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Number of new business start-ups ■ Business % with stated sustainable development goals |

| Potential Indicators |
|---|
| 5. Transport: To increase accessibility; reduce car usage and the need to travel <i>SEA topics: Air, Climatic Factors, Population, Material Assets</i> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Share % of passenger travel on public transport Distances people travel to work and modes of travel Percentage of out and in commuting Percentage using sustainable modes for school trips Percentage of development (including dwellings / employment and services) which is served by public transport and cycle / pedestrian routes The proportion of new development which is meeting its travel plan objectives Car ownership within Winchester The level of growth of traffic on key A-roads and motorways within Winchester |
| 6. Health: To improve the health and well being of all <i>SEA topics: Human Health</i> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recorded crime No of new allotment spaces available |
| 7. Water: To protect, enhance and manage water resources in a sustainable way <i>SEA topics: Water, Climatic Factors, Biodiversity, Health</i> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Water consumption per household Development % with sustainable drainage |
| 8. Waste: To ensure sustainable waste management <i>SEA topics: Material Assets</i> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Waste % recycled or composted |
| 9. Climate Change: To address the causes of climate change and to mitigate and adapt in line with Winchester's Climate Change Strategy <i>SEA topics: Climatic Factors, Air, Water</i> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> New developments % with adaptation measures as standard Renewable energy % sourced in new developments |
| 10. Sustainable Construction: To promote the sustainable design and construction of buildings and places <i>SEA topics: Air, Water, Climatic Factors, Material assets</i> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> % of new development meeting BREEAM and/or Code for Sustainable Homes Level 3 |
| 11. Biodiversity: To conserve and enhance biodiversity <i>SEA topics: Biodiversity, Fauna and Flora</i> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> BAP priority species and habitat % change The loss/gain of Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation % of SSSIs in favourable condition |
| 12. Heritage: To protect and enhance built and cultural heritage <i>SEA topics: Cultural Heritage</i> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Buildings at risk: % absolute reduction year on year |
| 13. Landscape & Soils: To protect and enhance the character and quality of the landscape of Winchester District <i>SEA topics: Landscape, Soils</i> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tranquillity: traffic volume at sensitive sites Change in land use (ha) (e.g. from agriculture or other Greenfield use to housing, industry, minerals, recreation etc), by Agricultural Land |

| Potential Indicators |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Classification grade/soil type ■ New developments on previously developed land ■ Area of current mineral workings covered by restoration and aftercare conditions |
| 14. Built Environment: To secure high standards of design <i>SEA topics: Cultural heritage, Population, Material Assets</i> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Design quality, public perception, approvals ratings ■ Number of village design statements and market town health checks completed |
| 15. Pollution: Minimise local and global sources of pollution <i>SEA topics: Air, Climatic Factors, Human Health, Soils, Water</i> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ River and groundwater quality change ■ Number Air Quality Management Areas (i.e. Winchester City Centre) |

13.0 CONCLUSIONS AND NEXT STEPS

- 13.1 The SA of the Winchester District's Local Plan Part 1 - Joint Core Strategy Submission has appraised the effects of individual policies, as well as the overall effect of the plan, including cumulative and incremental effects. The SA has found that the Winchester Local Plan Part 1 - Joint Core Strategy will make a significant contribution to sustainability in the District, with a particularly strong focus on meeting housing and community needs, enhancing accessibility and protecting the District's natural environment. The key negative effects identified relate to increased housing and employment development and the potential cumulative effects of development arising in the PUSH area. It is recognised that these actions have been determined at a higher policy level (the South East Plan) and that the Council has refined housing targets to be more locally derived.
- 13.2 The SA has shown that the proposals and policies in the Local Plan Part 1 were developed since 2009 and in 2011 more positively progressed the objectives for sustainability for the Winchester District through less uncertainty of effects and stronger mitigation requirements for potential adverse effects. During the development of the Local Plan Part 1, the Council has integrated the findings and recommendations from the SA since 2006 and through to 2012 as part of the ongoing and iterative processes. As to be expected, at the Pre-Submission stage of plan-making, the SA identified only a small number of suggestions for enhancement and recommendations for mitigation of minor adverse effects.
- 13.3 As a result of the pre-submission public consultation and changes in planning, the Submission Local Plan Part 1 has been revised. The modifications made are associated with updating, clarification and making more explicit the delivery mechanisms through policies in Part 1 and the details to be developed in the Local Plan Part 2. The modifications to the Plan are not considered to be significant with regard to the SEA Directive and there is no requirement to carry out further appraisals. However, overall it is considered that the modifications will generally improve the sustainability of the development proposed in the Winchester Local Plan Part 1.
- 13.4 This SA Report is published alongside the Winchester Submission Local Plan Part 1 – Joint Core Strategy and will be subject to public examination.