

Appendix D – Sustainability Appraisal and Site Assessment

Summary of Sustainability Appraisal of housing growth options

The following updates pages 42 to 45 of the Revised Pre-Submission Local Plan Sustainability Appraisal (SA) (incorporating Strategic Environment Assessment (SEA)) Report and also Appendix 9 (Appraising housing growth options) of the SA (inc. SEA) Report. Updates will be shown in a revised version of the SA (inc. SEA) Report that will accompany the consultation on the updated Submission Local Plan.

The SA was used to assess the social, environmental and economic implications of different housing scenarios, including different growth level options. The growth options have been reviewed as the Local Plan has evolved to ensure that the most up-to date aspects of the Local Plan's evidence base are considered. Growth options of 400 dwellings per annum (dpa), 600 dpa, 750 dpa and 1,000 dpa have been assessed to consider the relative implications of housing development at each of these levels. A growth option of 850 dpa has now been assessed as part of the review of the evidence base following the Local Plan Exploratory meeting held on 12 December 2015. These growth options are considered to represent those reasonably available. All options will be supportive of economic growth but each option will provide different levels of support. The outcomes of the SA are shown in the Table below.

Table D1 – Summary of appraisal of housing growth options

Sustainability Objectives	1 – Low Growth (400)	2 – Medium Growth – Hybrid Zero Net Migration (600)	3 – Medium / High Growth – (750)	4 – High Growth – (1,000)	NEW 5 – Medium / High Growth (850)
1) To provide all residents with the opportunity to live in a sustainable, decent, affordable home.	--	+/?	+	++	+/?
2) To reduce deprivation and inequalities in quality of life between residents and neighbourhoods	-	+	+/?	++	++
3) To reduce and minimise emissions of greenhouse gases and manage the impact of climate change	+/?	-/?	-/?	-	-/?
4) To protect, and enhance local biodiversity, flora and fauna	?	?	?	?	?
5) To protect and enhance the distinctiveness and quality of the local landscape, soils, geological and geomorphologic interests	?/-	-/?	-/?	-	-/?
6) To maintain and improve the quality of water resources in the Borough	0/?	0/?	0/?	0/?	0/?
7) To reduce the risk of flooding and the resulting detriment to the local community, environment and economy	+	+	+	+	+
8) To improve sustainable accessibility to all services and facilities	-	0	0/+	+	0/+
9) To improve choice and access to sustainable transport options	-	0	0/+	+	0/+
10) To improve educational attainment and increase opportunities for new skills and learning to support the economic competitiveness of the Borough, and personal development.	0	0	0	0	0
11) To develop a diverse and competitive	-	+	+	++	+/?

knowledge-based economy					
12) To maintain high and stable levels of employment	+/-	+/-	+	+	++
13) To maintain and enhance sustainable economic growth	-	+	+	++	+/>++
14) To enhance the attractiveness of the Borough to visitors	?/+	?/+	?/+	+/?	+/?
15) To protect and enhance distinctive and high quality features of the local built environment	?	?	?	?	?
16) To improve the efficiency of resource use, including re-using previously developed land, existing buildings and materials, and encouraging the maximum use of sustainable design and construction technologies	-	-	-	--	-
(17) To create and sustain vibrant settlements and communities	-	+	+	+	+
18) To promote and improve access to open space and countryside	?	?	?	?	?
19) To improve community safety by reducing crime, the fear of crime, and antisocial behaviour	?	?	?	?	?
20) To improve health and well-being through the development of healthy communities	?	?	?	?	?

Key

++	Significantly positive effect
+	Positive effect
0	Neutral/negligible/no effect
-	Negative effect
--	Significantly negative effect
?	Uncertain outcome

Font colour of objectives – pink=social, blue=economic, green=environmental

Conclusions of the appraisal of growth options

Below provides conclusions on:

- the overall sustainability of the different options;
- identifies the preferred option for housing growth and why it has been selected;
- provides the reasons why the rejected options were not taken forward.

Option 1 – Low growth (400 dpa)

This option would provide in the region of 400 dpa between 2011 and 2029. It is based on the number of births minus the number of deaths expected within the borough, but takes no account of changes in household size or the local economy. This approach will not fulfil the Vision for the borough, as set out in the draft Local Plan. It is expected that this option will deliver lower levels of affordable dpa. However, it will require the least amount of greenfield development.

Option 1 has been rejected and will not be taken forward through the Local Plan. Whilst it is likely to have the least environmental impact, primarily due to less need for greenfield sites, option 1 raises concerns regarding potential social and economic impacts, particularly regarding meeting housing needs and creating vibrant communities. This option would be the least attractive in terms of economic growth and is unlikely to maintain the necessary balance between resident workers and

the number of jobs. This could lead to increases in commuting, with its associated issues. The option would also lead to limited investment in infrastructure.

In summary, this option performs well against objective 7 (water environment) but may not help meet objectives 1 (housing), 2 (deprivation and social exclusion), 8 and 9 (access and transport), 11 and 13 (sustainable, prosperous economy), 16 (resource efficiency), 17 (sustaining vibrant communities).

Option 2 – Medium Growth (Hybrid Zero Net Migration) (600 dpa)

This option would provide in the region of 600 dpa until 2029. This figure is based on zero net migration (the number of people moving into the area is assumed to equal the number moving out) and takes into account declining household size, which reflects the rate of decline for the South East region. It also takes into account reductions in the number of vacant / second homes in the borough. This option is unlikely to fulfil the Vision for the borough, as set out in the draft Local Plan.

Option 2 has been rejected and will not be taken forward. This option would enable the provision of new housing to meet some of the local housing needs and provide moderate levels of affordable dpa. Over the plan period it would require a reasonable amount of new development on greenfield land with associated environmental impacts. Given that it is based on a 'hybrid zero net migration' scenario, this is expected to offer a reasonable balance in terms of housing and employment. However, a zero migration option is not considered to be consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework and National Planning Practice Guidance. It is expected that this level of housing growth would result in some economic growth. Whilst this option may support existing services and result in some infrastructure investment, this is likely to be limited compared to options 3 and 4.

In summary, this option performs well against objectives 2 (deprivation and social exclusion), 7 (flooding), 13 (sustainable, prosperous economy) and 17 (sustaining vibrant communities) but may not help meet objective 16 (resource efficiency).

Option 3 – Medium / High Growth (750 dpa)

This option would provide in the region of 750 dpa until 2029. This figure has been formulated, in the context of meeting objectively assessed need, through a combination of technical studies which form part of the evidence base for the Local Plan. It takes into account the following:

- Population size, including the number of births and deaths in the borough using information from the 2011 Census (i.e. the needs of the growing population);
- Net migration, including those moving into and out of the area from other parts of the UK and overseas; and
- Average household size, to reflect the way in which the population forms into households (i.e. the needs created from a reduction in the average household size).
- The number of people living in institutional accommodation (i.e. care homes)
- The proportion of vacant/second homes that are likely to be brought back into use in the future
- Population, household and housing forecasts using demographic modelling technology
- Sensitivity testing (e.g. the implications on the borough's housing requirement of the current government's intention to enforce a more stringent control on national immigration)

Option 3 has been rejected and will not be taken forward. The option would help deliver the Vision for the borough, as set out in the draft Local Plan and would enable the provision of new housing to meet a significant proportion of local housing needs, providing a suitable level of affordable dpa based on bands 1 to 3 of the Housing Register. Over the plan period it would require a significant amount of new development on greenfield land with associated environmental impacts. Given that this option also takes into account migration, the changing age structure of the population and many other factors, it is expected to offer a reasonably good balance in terms of meeting local housing needs. This option is also supportive of economic growth. Whilst this option may assist in supporting existing services and result in infrastructure investment, it is unlikely to result in as much investment in new services and infrastructure as options 4 and 5.

In summary, this option performs well against objectives 1 (housing), 2 (deprivation and social exclusion), 7 (flooding), 11, 12 and 13 (sustainable, prosperous economy), 17 (sustaining vibrant communities). It may not help meet objective 16 (resource efficiency). This option performs better than option 2 particularly against objectives 1 (housing), 2 (deprivation and social exclusion).

Option 4 – High growth (1,000 dpa)

This option would provide in the region of 1,000 dpa until 2029 and is based upon in-migration as well as affordable housing needs. The option would help deliver the Vision for the borough, as set out in the draft Local Plan. It is expected that this high level of growth would meet future housing needs and provide a high level of affordable dwellings per year. This level of growth would require the largest amount of greenfield development and have a greater environmental impact.

Option 4 has been rejected and will not be taken forward. This option is likely to have the highest environmental impact of all options and potentially the most implications due to climate change. Due to increased development levels a large number of greenfield sites are required. Further assessment would be needed to ensure that this level of growth can be delivered taking into account the sites currently available. However, this option is the most supportive of economic growth. It is also more supportive of investment in infrastructure, the provision of a wider choice of housing, and support for services.

In summary, this option performs well against objectives 1 (housing), 2 (deprivation and social exclusion), 7 (flooding), 8 and 9 (access and transport), 11, 12 and 13 (sustainable, prosperous economy), 17 (sustaining vibrant communities). It may not help meet objectives 3 (climate change), 5 (landscape), 16 (resource efficiency). This option performs better than option 5 against objectives 1 (housing), 8 and 9 (access and transport) and 11 and 13 (sustainable, prosperous economy). However, this option does not perform as well as option 5 against objectives 3 (climate change), 5 (landscape), 12 (sustainable, prosperous economy) and 16 (resource efficiency).

It is considered that the environmental impacts of this option would outweigh the social and economic benefits. In particular because of the significant amount of greenfield land that would be required (more than any other option).

Option 5 – Medium/ High Growth (850 dpa)

This option would provide in the region of 850 dpa until 2029. This figure has been formulated, in the context of meeting objectively assessed need, through a combination of technical studies which form part of the evidence base for the Local Plan. This option falls within the objectively assessed housing need range. It takes into account the following:

- Population size, including the number of births and deaths in the borough using information from the 2011 Census (i.e. the needs of the growing population);
- Net migration, including those moving into and out of the area from other parts of the UK and overseas; and
- Average household size, to reflect the way in which the population forms into households (i.e. the needs created from a reduction in the average household size).
- The number of people living in institutional accommodation (i.e. care homes)
- The proportion of vacant/second homes that are likely to be brought back into use in the future
- Population, household and housing forecasts using demographic modelling technology
- Sensitivity testing (e.g. the implications on the borough's housing requirement of the current government's intention to enforce a more stringent control on national immigration)

This is the preferred housing growth option. Option 5 would help deliver the adopted Vision, the provision of new housing to meet local housing needs and provide a high level of affordable dpa

based on bands 1 to 3 of the Housing Register. This option also presents an appropriate balance between housing and jobs.

Given that this option takes into account migration and the changing age structure of the population, it is expected to offer a good balance in terms of meeting local housing needs. This option is more supportive of economic growth when compared to Options 1, 2 and 3. This option will assist in supporting existing services and result in infrastructure investment, although not as much investment as option 4. Over the plan period, it would require a significant amount of new development on greenfield land, with associated environmental impacts.

In summary, this option performs well against objectives 1 (housing), 2 (deprivation and social exclusion), 7 (flooding), 11, 12 and 13 (sustainable, prosperous economy), 17 (sustaining vibrant communities). It may not help meet objective 16 (resource efficiency). Option 5 performs better than option 3 particularly against objectives 1 (housing), 2 (deprivation and social exclusion), 11, 12 and 13 (sustainable, prosperous economy).

Option 5 performs better than option 4 against objectives 3 (climate change), 5 (landscape) and 12 (sustainable, prosperous economy). Also, option 5 will require less Greenfield land (objective 16) than option 4. It performs better than options 3 and 4 against objective 12 (Sustainable, prosperous economy) as it is expected to present an appropriate balance between housing and jobs.

Conclusions

In summary the appraisal of each of the options found that there are a number of positive and negative impacts with each one. It is important to find an appropriate balance between social, environmental and economic objectives and to allow for sustainable communities to develop that will benefit as many people as possible.

The SA identifies that options 3 (750 dpa) and 5 (850 dpa) are the most appropriate when assessing their overall impact against the sustainability objectives. However, in terms of SA objectives 1 (housing), 2 (deprivation and social exclusion), 11, 12 and 13 (Sustainable, prosperous economy) 850 dpa is the most effective of these two options. This is because the figure of 850 responds better to meeting the objectively assessed need in the borough. Option 5 is also expected to present an appropriate balance between housing and jobs, so that housing provision does not constrain job growth. This option does require additional greenfield allocation, but the social and economic benefits can be seen to outweigh the environmental impacts. Option 5 should be taken forward as the preferred option for Basingstoke and Deane Borough and these SA findings should influence the decision on the appropriate housing growth option included in the Submission Local Plan.

Sustainability appraisal and site assessment conclusions for Hounsome Fields

The following provides the sustainability appraisal and site assessment conclusions for:

- i. BAS133: Hounsome Fields
- ii. Site combination BAS114 Kennel Farm, BAS132 Basingstoke Golf Course and BAS133 Hounsome Fields

A sustainability appraisal and site assessment has also been undertaken for site combination BAS144 Kennel Farm and BAS133 Hounsome Fields. It has not been included in this appendix but can be viewed in the council's Housing Site Assessment document ([Examination Document HO05](#)).

BAS133 – Hounsome Fields

Site Assessment conclusions:

Past consultation events raised concerns regarding impact on the rural landscape and AONB, impact on the natural boundary and ridgeline to the town, proximity to the M3 and A30 and insufficient capacity of the sewerage infrastructure. The site has relatively few biodiversity constraints subject to a development layout that protects the SINC's and incorporates woodland and hedgerows. There is, therefore, good scope to mitigate and enhance biodiversity. The Landscape capacity of the site is deemed to be low. As indicated in the council's Landscape Capacity Study "...the design and layout of any development would need to minimise impact upon the wider area, particularly to the south and south-west, limiting visual intrusion in views from the wider landscape and utilising as much green infrastructure as possible. A high standard in all aspect of design would be essential." To minimise impact strong landscape buffers would be required.

A large part of the site is high quality agricultural land. The site lies beyond the settlement boundary and the development of the site in isolation would be unacceptable, although the presence of the M3 could help prevent coalescence. Kennel Farm is adjacent to the northern boundary of the site. Outline planning permission on the Kennel Farm site was allowed at appeal for 310 dwellings on 15 January 2014. Archaeological concerns regarding the nationally significant monument on the site border can be mitigated subject to an investigation. The relationship of the development to the Roman road is sensitive but provides opportunity to engage with the historic environment. There is a listed building in the south west corner of the site and development is unlikely to be permitted within its setting. The site would be affected by traffic noise from the A30 and a detailed noise assessment could be required to ensure acceptable noise standards can be met. Whilst this has resulted in a negative assessment, it is not deemed to be a significant constraint to development.

In terms of infrastructure, on site-provision and/or financial contributions would be required towards community facilities, sports provision, libraries, health care and waste. Open space and play requirements would have to be met on site due to the distance of the site from existing provision. There are insufficient primary and secondary education facilities currently and due to the lack of capacity at local primary schools a new school would need to be provided, to be funded by developer contributions. Existing secondary schools will be expanded as necessary to respond to the demand from the site. Major infrastructure is required to convey sewage effluent to the treatment works and further investigations are

required into this issue. However, this matter is not a significant constraint to development as sewage and urban drainage can be provided to serve the location subject to investigations and phasing. In terms of accessibility, the site is located in an edge of urban area location and is disconnected from any existing development. Most services lie to the east of the A30 so improved links would be needed. The site may need to deliver wider highways improvements. The site could provide small scale services to neighbouring area and improvements to the wider highway network could benefit others. The site is on an urban edge location where links to walking and cycle route and additional bus services would be required although this is not deemed to be a significant constraint to development. Overall the most significant constraint to development is landscape impact.

Sustainability Appraisal conclusions:

The development of this site would have the negative effect of resulting in the loss of green field land, but in the absence of a sufficient supply of brown field sites it is acknowledged that green field land will be required to meet the borough's housing need. There could be potential negative impacts on landscape as the site has been assessed as having a low capacity for development. The site is located on extensive sloping land to the south of a ridgeline that contains much of the urban development to north.

Developing the site for housing would have some potential impacts relating to the environment given that it could potentially result in an isolated settlement due to its separation from the built form of Basingstoke and the fact it does not relate well to the existing settlement in terms of form or character. Further negative impacts have been raised in terms of environmental and social objectives of the sustainability appraisal which aim to reduce and minimise emissions of greenhouse gases and manage the impact of climate change and avoid areas at risk of flooding. However, there are opportunities to site and design any development to avoid adverse impacts. Development of the site would largely have a neutral impact on economic objectives – it does not entail the loss of any employment land, but is within sufficient distance of employment sites to enable commuting and support economic growth in principle. There is no indication that the site would provide new commercial development opportunities, and the site does not currently have high broadband speeds at present to support working from home. The site's main positive contribution is the opportunity to provide a range of dwellings to meet local needs given its overall size.

Current uncertainties and potentially negative impacts would need to be addressed through the inclusion of a mechanism in the Local Plan (such as a detailed allocation policy) to ensure that a sustainable development is achieved. This includes ensuring that the siting and design of the development avoids constrained or inappropriate areas for development including areas of landscape sensitivity particularly to the south and southwest, noise sensitive locations, areas at risk of flooding and future surface water flooding, areas of biodiversity interest and that the setting of the heritage asset is respected. Adequate infrastructure is required to be provided including improvements to the highway network and general improvements to the transport network, sewerage infrastructure provision, provision of a new primary school on site, address secondary education impacts, provision of affordable housing, appropriate green infrastructure and open space/recreational provision. Development must also be of a sustainable design and construction and manage surface water as part of an overall strategy.

Site combination BAS114 Kennel Farm, BAS132 Basingstoke Golf Course and BAS133 Hounsme Fields

Site Assessment conclusions:

In terms of biodiversity, a neutral 'score' was given, reflecting the cumulative impacts of this combination of sites in relation to indirect impacts on the adjacent SINCs. The combination of sites has a medium-low capacity for development in terms of landscape capacity. Any development could be more readily accommodated to the east of the A30. The area to the west of the A30 is elevated and is prominent within the landscape having a strong rural character which continues to the wider countryside. Development of this site combination would result in an undesirable urban spread into the surrounding countryside. The site would extend beyond the existing strong boundary of the A30 and therefore would have a limited relationship to the existing settlement in terms of form, scale and character. However, the development would be within the strong boundary of the M3 and the boundary of the Roman Road and there is potential for mitigation. This site would relate well to existing, adjoining development to the east at Beggarwood. However, as there is a ridge along the northern boundary to the site and a park further north, housing could appear somewhat detached from adjacent development in these locations. This could be addressed through siting and layout. Development would not result in coalescence. Development in this location would have a neutral impact on heritage features (listed farmhouse) which can be wholly mitigated. The sites are affected by traffic noise from the A30 and M3. There is a small area of localised flooding at the southern tip of the site but this is not considered to be a significant constraint to development. The development of the site would lead to the loss of primarily Grade 3b (good quality) with a very small element of Grade 2 (very good quality) agricultural land. In terms of contamination, soil permeability and the presence of mineral resources the site 'scored' positively.

In terms of accessibility, the combined site was given a neutral 'score'. The site is well located for a range of services and the larger scale of development on the combined sites is likely to lead to the provision of some new facilities which may lead to a degree of self containment. Subject to the provision of improved walking and cycling infrastructure and the site being served by a frequent bus service, it would be relatively well connected to the town centre and services. Highway improvements in the vicinity of the development may be required and the scale of the site could deliver some moderate wider improvements to the highway network. Walk/cycle routes would need to be provided within the sites and connect up to the existing network and improvements to pedestrian crossings on the A30 would be required to connect the sites and subsequent provision of facilities.

In terms of other infrastructure, given the scale of potential development there is insufficient current provision in GP facilities, primary and secondary education; community, sport and recreation facilities, libraries, and waste facilities. However, financial contributions would be sought to expand or provide new on-site facilities as appropriate. Therefore none of these elements are seen as an overriding constraint on the site's deliverability. Major infrastructure is required to convey sewage effluent to the treatment works and further investigations are required into this issue. However, this matter is not a significant constraint to development as sewage and urban drainage can be provided to serve the location subject to investigations and phasing. Whilst Hatch warren and Beggarwood do not have a deficit of open space in terms of quantity the combined sites have the potential to address the poor distribution of

larger open spaces across Beggarwood as a whole. Part of the combined site is not currently available as it is owned and used by Basingstoke Golf Club and the final decision to sell the site has not yet been taken. In conclusion, the combined site has a number of constraints, including a negative impact on the landscape, noise and availability issues.

Sustainability Appraisal conclusions:

The development of this combination of sites would have the negative effect of resulting in the loss of greenfield land, but in the absence of a sufficient supply of brownfield sites it is acknowledged that greenfield land will be required to meet the borough's housing need. Development of the three sites is likely to have some potentially significant effects, particularly relating to the environmental objectives of the sustainability appraisal such as protecting and enhancing the distinctiveness and quality of the local landscape. Some of these effects are due to the location of the combined site on the edge of the urban area, and the potential for housing to appear somewhat detached from adjacent development in these locations. These issues would only be partially addressed through siting and layout. In terms of the accessibility objective, parts of the site are well located for a range of services and the larger scale of development on the combined sites is likely to lead to the provision of some new facilities which may lead to a degree of self containment. Subject to the provision of improved walking and cycling infrastructure and the site being served by a frequent bus service, it would be relatively well connected to the town centre and services. There would largely be a neutral impact on the economic objective – the development of these sites would not entail the loss of any employment land, but is within sufficient distance of employment sites to enable commuting. There are a number of areas of uncertainty in terms of social objectives, particularly in terms of the need to increase capacity in primary and secondary education; however this will be subject to the provision of infrastructure and developer contributions.

Current uncertainties and potentially negative impacts would need to be addressed through the inclusion of a mechanism in the Local Plan (such as a detailed allocation policy) to ensure that a sustainable development is achieved. This includes ensuring that the siting and design of the development responds to the impact on the wider countryside; avoids areas constrained or inappropriate for development including areas at risk of flooding and areas affected by noise pollution; adequate infrastructure is provided on-site including the provision of affordable housing and open space; and off-site contributions are sought towards habitat conservation and management to off-set indirect impacts on biodiversity, community facilities and education provision. Development must also be of a sustainable construction and design and incorporate a Drainage Strategy/Surface Water Plan. In addition, a sewage feasibility study would need to be commissioned from the water company by the developer to ensure that there is no increase in flood risk in the drainage system, as there is currently insufficient capacity in the network.

Sustainability Appraisal of New Policy SS3.12: Hounsome Fields

Policy SS3.12 – Hounsome Fields

This 43 hectare site lies to the south west of Basingstoke and will deliver a high quality mixed-use development that will:

- a) Make provision for approximately 750 dwellings;
- b) In addition to the mix of dwelling sizes and types, make provision for a proportion of self-build units and also, in conjunction with other sites, a permanent, pitch/plot provision to meet identified accommodation needs of Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople in the borough, such needs being identified in the council's Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (and any updates);
- c) Include the provision of social and physical infrastructure, including the provision of a community centre, local shopping facilities, sports facilities including playing pitches, and a three form entry primary school;
- d) Respond positively to the special characteristics and sensitivities of the landscape, ensuring that the density, heights and layout of buildings respond positively to the site and its setting and minimise any visual impact;
- e) Include a robust landscape strategy that creates a strong defensible boundary between the site and open countryside, respecting the Roman Road as a landscape feature and existing hedgerows and woodlands. The layout should incorporate the existing landscape structure within the proposal, reinforcing and extending the existing green infrastructure network within the site, ensuring that links are made with the green infrastructure network outside the site;
- f) Avoid or mitigate direct and indirect adverse impacts on key species and habitats, including nearby Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs) through adequate buffering, ensuring the retention of key woodland areas and by mitigating and/or compensating any adverse impacts to ensure a net gain in biodiversity. Opportunities will be taken to create and enhance habitat connectivity between existing key habitats;
- g) Conserve and enhance the architectural and historic significance of the Grade II listed Southwood Farmhouse and its setting, which lies close to the south western boundary of the site, subject to allowing a sufficient landscape buffer to preserve a sense of the rural setting and context of the listed building, and ensuring that adequate mitigation measures to protect its setting are put in place;
- h) Include measures to mitigate the impact of development on the local road network including improvements to the A30 corridor;
- i) Provide all-purpose vehicular accesses from the Winchester Road (A30), ensuring that the most appropriate location for this is identified, taking into account the requirement to provide vehicular access to site SS3.11 (Basingstoke Golf Course);
- j) Include measures to improve accessibility by non-car transport modes, the ability to service the site by public transport and ensuring the external and internal connection of the site with existing cycle and pedestrian routes and Public Rights of Way network, including the upgrading of the cycle link to Dummer, improving the links to the existing Winchester Road bus stops, and providing safe and convenient crossing points for the A30;
- k) Make provision for vehicular access requirements that may be needed to serve future development to the north-west of the site;
- l) Ensure adequate infrastructure is provided for sewerage (on and off site) and surface water drainage and produce a drainage strategy;
- m) Avoid development and points of access in the vicinity of the part of the site falling within flood zone 2;

n) Include appropriate open space/green infrastructure, including allotments, to meet local needs in line with the council's adopted standards, providing links to the existing green infrastructure network;

o) Ensure acceptable noise and air quality standards can be met within homes and amenity areas through suitable design and noise and air quality mitigation measures in light of the proximity of the site to the A30;

p) Incorporate and/or promote renewable energy technologies;

q) Ensure that, through joint masterplanning, it provides for a comprehensive development with the Kennel Farm (policy SS3.2) and Basingstoke Golf Course (policy SS3.11) allocations.

Development on site will deliver homes in the period 2017/18 to 2028/9, in accordance with the requirement to maintain a five year supply of deliverable housing sites.

SA Objective	SA Appraisal Criteria (to take into account/guide appraisal)	Impact (positive/ negative/ neutral) and discussion (if effects quantifiable give details e.g. Co2 savings exceed national standards by 10%) If impact negligible no need to fill in last 2 columns.	Commentary on assessment: likelihood/certainty, spatial scale (incl cross-boundary), timescale (short/medium/long term), Duration (temporary/permanent), Frequency (frequent/rare)	Possible changes to plan/mitigation (e.g. need to change option, other policies needed to ensure mitigation etc.)
1) To provide all residents with the opportunity to live in a sustainable, decent, affordable home.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will it increase housing supply? • Will it increase the range of housing to meet all needs? • Will it increase the affordability of housing? • Will it help to reduce the no. of homeless? • Will it reduce the no. of empty properties? • Will it produce dwellings of sustainable design and construction? • Will it ensure that appropriate infrastructure is in place to 	<p>++</p> <p>This policy supports the increase in housing supply by 750 dwellings and could supply a variety of types and sizes of dwelling to meet a range of housing needs.</p> <p>The policy directly ensures that there is a percentage of affordable housing provided on site.</p> <p>Developing the site will contribute towards reducing the numbers on the housing register.</p> <p>Development of the site also meets</p>	<p>Likelihood: certain Scale: local Timescale: short-long term Duration: temporary Significance: significant</p>	

	<p>serve the additional dwellings?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will it produce sustainable communities? • Will it help new households access market housing? • Will it reduce the number in need on the housing register? • Will it enable social inclusion through meeting the needs of groups with specific housing needs? • Will it meet the housing needs of the ageing population? • Will it meet the housing needs of gypsies and travellers? • Will it integrate with the employment needs of the Borough? 	<p>the specific housing needs of gypsies and travellers.</p>		
<p>2) To reduce deprivation and inequalities in quality of life between residents and neighbourhoods</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will it encourage social cohesion? • Will it reduce overcrowding? • Will it reduce deprivation in the 7 most deprived areas of the Borough (within the wards of Buckskin, Norden, Popley East and South Ham)? • Will it discourage anti-social behaviour? • Will it reduce crime? 	<p>0 This policy may help to reduce overcrowding, but is unlikely to reduce deprivation</p>		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will it provide better opportunities to improve skills/achievements/employment, particularly within the most deprived wards of the Borough? 			
3) To reduce and minimise emissions of greenhouse gases and manage the impact of climate change	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will it reduce and/or minimise greenhouse gas emissions and help to meet international, national and regional emissions targets? • Does it incorporate and/or promote the use of renewable energy technologies? • Will it mitigate the effects of climate change? 	<p>+</p> <p>This policy promotes the use of renewable technologies on site. The policy requires measures to improve accessibility by non-car modes and improvements to pedestrian/cycle links which will help reduce emissions and mitigate the effects of climate change.</p>	<p>Likelihood: uncertain Scale: local Timescale: Medium/long term Duration: permanent Frequency: uncertain Significance: uncertain but unlikely to be significant</p>	Also addressed by other policies
4) To protect, and enhance local biodiversity, flora and fauna	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will it protect and enhance sites and habitats, both designated and undesignated, of nature conservation value? • Will it ensure the protection of protected species? • Will it contribute towards protecting and enhancing national and county Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) species and their habitats? 	<p>+/-</p> <p>The policy requires direct and indirect adverse impacts on key species and habitats to be avoided or mitigated. Policy also requires mitigation and compensation to ensure a net gain in biodiversity. All adverse impacts may not be avoided.</p>		A suitable buffer zone is required between the development and the designated SIN
5) To protect and enhance the distinctiveness and quality of the local landscape, soils, geological and geomorphologic interests	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will it protect areas of highest landscape value? • Will it protect and enhance the Borough's landscape character and diversity? • Will it avoid damage to geological and geomorphologic 	<p>+</p> <p>The policy requires that any development responds positively to the landscape.</p> <p>The policy supports a well-designed layout and appropriate</p>	<p>Likelihood: uncertain Scale: local - national Timescale: short term – long term Duration: permanent Significance: significant</p>	The layout must reinforce and extend the existing green infrastructure network within the site, ensuring that links are made with the green infrastructure network outside the site.

	<p>interests?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will it maintain and enhance the quality of the Borough's soils? • Will it retain the Borough's best and most versatile agricultural land? 	<p>level/distribution of open space which could accommodate interface with surrounding countryside and enhance landscape character and visual amenity.</p>		
<p>6) To maintain and improve the quality of water resources in the Borough</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will it maintain or improve the water quality of controlled waters including rivers, streams, ditches, ponds, lakes and groundwater? 	<p>0</p>		<p>This is dealt with through another Local Plan policy</p>
<p>7) To reduce the risk of flooding and the resulting detriment to the local community, environment and economy</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will it reduce the vulnerability to all types of flooding? • Will it encourage a net reduction in the total number of dwellings built in areas of medium and high flood-risk? • Will it increase the use of Sustainable Urban Drainage systems within developments? • Will there be adequate provision of supporting water and sewerage infrastructure to support development? 	<p>+</p> <p>The policy requires that adequate infrastructure is provided for surface water and drainage which includes SUDs.</p>	<p>Likelihood: uncertain Scale: local Timescale: short term Duration: temporary Significance: significant</p>	<p>This is further supported by another Local Plan policy.</p>
<p>8) To improve sustainable accessibility to all services and facilities</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will it improve access to community facilities and services, particularly within rural areas? • Will it improve the self-containment of Basingstoke Town? 	<p>++</p> <p>This policy is considered to support the improvements of sustainable transport modes to improve accessibility.</p>	<p>Likelihood: certain Scale: Local Timescale: Medium/long term Duration: uncertain Frequency: unknown Significance: significant</p>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will it reduce congestion? • Will it reduce barriers to social inclusion? • Does it include provision for extending remote access? • Will it improve access to broadband? 			
9) To improve choice and access to sustainable transport options	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will it minimise the need to travel? • Will it provide alternative means of travel to the private car? • Will it reduce private vehicular use? • Will it encourage the use of public transport? 	<p>+ This policy is considered to support the improvements of sustainable transport modes to improve accessibility.</p>	<p>Likelihood: uncertain Scale: Local Timescale: Medium/long term Duration: uncertain Frequency: unknown Significance: uncertain</p>	All-purpose vehicular accesses from the A30 must be identified in the most appropriate location.
10) To improve educational attainment and increase opportunities for new skills and learning to support the economic competitiveness of the Borough, and personal development.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will it increase the levels of participation in education at all levels? • Will it increase the levels of attainment in education at all levels? • Will it improve the qualifications or skills of the population? • Will it improve the educational performance of the Borough at secondary school level? • Will it provide higher level education (graduate/highly skilled)? • Will it enable learning and 	<p>+ This policy is unlikely to have a particular impact upon education attainment in the borough.</p> <p>However, the policy does require the provision of a three form entry primary school which will create more school places for the growing population.</p>		

	<p>development to meet the skills requirements of employers within the Borough?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will it help to develop lifelong skills? • Will it reduce long-term unemployment? 			
11) To develop a diverse and competitive knowledge-based economy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will it promote employment opportunities for the whole community? • Will it promote a dynamic, diverse and knowledge-based economy? • Will it encourage business start-up and business growth? • Will it maintain or provide a sufficient supply of employment land to meet the needs of existing businesses and attract inward investment? 	0 The policy does not consider commercial premises or providing an element of employment land.		
12) To maintain high and stable levels of employment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will it promote employment opportunities for the whole community? • Will it promote a dynamic, diverse and knowledge-based economy? • Will it encourage business start-up and business growth? • Will it maintain or provide a sufficient supply of employment land to meet the needs of existing businesses and attract 	0 The policy does not consider commercial premises or providing an element of employment land.	<p>Likelihood: likely Scale: Borough wide Timescale: Medium/long term Duration: Frequency: uncertain Significance: not likely to be significant</p>	

	inward investment?			
13) To maintain and enhance sustainable economic growth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will it integrate with the housing needs of the Borough? • Does any economic growth accord with the principles of sustainable development? 	<p>+</p> <p>The policy will provide housing to support the needs of the local economy over the plan period.</p>		
14) To enhance the attractiveness of the Borough to visitors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will it retain or improve retail facilities in the Borough? • Will it improve the image of the Borough to attract inward investment and tourism? • Will it meet the needs of visitors to the Borough 	<p>0</p> <p>This policy does not incorporate anything that would attract visitors.</p>		
15) To protect and enhance distinctive and high quality features of the local built environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will it promote and maintain an attractive and diverse townscape, and protect areas of highest townscape quality? • Will it promote high quality design and enhance the built environment? • Does it value and protect the locally distinctive settlement character? • Will it safeguard sites and monuments of archaeological importance? • Will it preserve and enhance buildings of historic or architectural interest? • Will it avoid damage or degradation to designated areas (Conservation Areas, 	<p>+</p> <p>This policy states that the development will have a high quality design and layout which respects its location.</p>	<p>Likelihood: likely</p> <p>Scale: Local</p> <p>Timescale: Medium/long term</p> <p>Duration: uncertain</p> <p>Frequency: uncertain</p> <p>Significance: not likely to be significant</p>	<p>Sufficient landscape buffer is required for the Grade II listed Southwood Farmhouse and adequate mitigation is required to protect its setting.</p> <p>Also covered by Local Plan design policy</p>

	<p>Historic Parks and Gardens)?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will it protect the Borough's historic and cultural heritage? 			
<p>16) To improve the efficiency of resource use, including re-using previously developed land, existing buildings and materials, and encouraging the maximum use of sustainable design and construction technologies</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will it use water more efficiently? • Will it reduce water consumption? • Will it result in a reduction in the amount of waste requiring treatment and disposal? • Will it improve energy efficiency? • Will it enable development to re-use brownfield land? • Will it entail the conversion of existing buildings? • Will it seek to support sustainable design and construction techniques? • Will it reduce the quantity of land contamination or land affected by contamination? • Will it reduce the Borough's carbon footprint? • Will it provide energy from renewable sources? • Will it reduce the amount of waste? • Will it increase recycling rates? • Will it minimise use of 	<p>0 This policy does not directly address these matters.</p>		<p>This is dealt with through other Local Plan policies.</p>

	<p>construction materials e.g. aggregates?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will it minimise land use? 			
<p>(17) To create and sustain vibrant settlements and communities</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will it direct new development towards those settlements best able to accommodate it? • Will it promote the viability and vitality of the Borough's town, district, local and village centres? • Will it avoid excessive intensification in built-up areas? • Will it avoid loss of open space? • Will it avoid the disruption of locally distinctive settlement form? • Will it support the provision and retention of key facilities and services ensuring that local needs are met locally wherever possible? • Will it, reflecting the objectives of the SCI, improve the engagement of local communities in the local planning system? • Will it help create a sense of place and add to the distinctiveness of the Borough's settlements? 	<p>+ This Policy is considered to aid sustainable development and communities by requiring the need for local shopping facilities within the development.</p>		
<p>(18) To promote and improve access to</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will it maintain or improve public access to open space 	<p>+ The policy requires the inclusion of</p>	<p>Likelihood: uncertain Scale: local</p>	

<p>open space and countryside</p>	<p>and the countryside?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will it improve the quality of the Borough's open space? • Will it contribute towards meeting the sport and recreational needs of all in the community? • Will it encourage participation in leisure and cultural events? 	<p>new open space within the development.</p>	<p>Timescale: medium-long term Duration: permanent Significance: significant</p>	
<p>19) To improve community safety by reducing crime, the fear of crime, and antisocial behaviour</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will it reduce opportunities for crime (e.g through design and layout)? • Will it reduce antisocial behaviour? • Will it reduce the fear of crime? 	<p>0</p> <p>The policy has no impact on crime and anti-social behaviour.</p>		
<p>20) To improve health and well-being through the development of healthy communities</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will it improve access to health and social care? • Will it promote healthy lifestyles? • Will it provide/improve healthcare facilities to meet the needs of older people? • Will it help to develop healthy and 'liveable' neighbourhoods • Will it improve air quality? • Will it decrease noise pollution near residential areas? 	<p>+</p> <p>This policy addresses issues relating to health implications around noise pollution and requires suitable mitigation.</p>	<p>Likelihood: uncertain Scale: local Timescale: short-long term Duration: permanent Significance: insignificant – can be overcome.</p>	
<p>Conclusion: This policy is broadly compatible with the social SA objectives, enabling housing provision. The policy impacts on the environmental SA objectives are generally negligible as the policies address mitigation measures to alleviate any adverse impact on the environment. The housing provided by these sites will help to support the local economy and therefore are generally positive or negligible on the economic SA objectives.</p>				