

Site Assessment Process



Basingstoke and Deane Local Plan Update

Report Setting out Proposed Methodology

Draft for Consultation – September 2020

1. Introduction

- 1.1 This document sets out the proposed methodology to be used to identify, assess and agree development sites for allocation within the Local Plan Update (LPU). It has been produced in order to clearly explain the process for the purposes of consultation on the SA Scoping Report and Issues and Options consultation. This is in order to gain the views of local communities, stakeholders and technical consultees to ensure that the methodology which is taken forward is robust and provides a suitable framework for site assessment.

2. Background

National Policy

- 2.1 The NPPF does not specifically address the site allocation process in the plan making section. However, in the housing delivery section it states that:

“To support the Government’s objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes, it is important that a sufficient amount and variety of land can come forward where it is needed, that the needs of groups with specific housing requirements are addressed and that land with permission is developed without unnecessary delay.” (paragraph 59).

These considerations will clearly need to underpin the process, particularly in terms of ensuring the identification of a sufficient amount and variety of sites which can be delivered effectively.

- 2.2 The housing section also states that:

“Strategic policy-making authorities should have a clear understanding of the land available in their area through the preparation of a strategic housing land availability assessment. From this, planning policies should identify a sufficient supply and mix of sites, taking into account their availability, suitability and likely economic viability.”

The council publishes an updated Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA) annually and this forms the basis for the site assessment process. This is explained in more detail below.

- 2.3 Paragraph 68 of the NPPF emphasises that small and medium sized sites can make an important contribution to meeting the housing requirement of an area, and are often built-out relatively quickly. Consequently, the NPPF stresses that Local Plans (and brownfield land registers) should accommodate at least 10% of the housing requirement on sites no larger than one hectare; unless it can be shown, through the preparation of relevant plan policies, that there are strong reasons why this 10% target cannot be achieved. The NPPF also states that the LPA should work with developers to

encourage the sub-division of large sites where this could help to speed up the delivery of homes.

2.4 The NPPF also emphasises the importance of large-scale sites:

“The supply of large numbers of new homes can often be best achieved through planning for larger scale development, such as new settlements or significant extensions to existing villages and towns, provided they are well located and designed, and supported by the necessary infrastructure and facilities. Working with the support of their communities, and with other authorities if appropriate, strategic policy-making authorities should identify suitable locations for such development where this can help to meet identified needs in a sustainable way.” (paragraph 72)

In line with the guidance, the council will consider reasonable options through the site assessment process, working with landowners, agents and developers in order to establish the most appropriate way for sites to come forward, including whether they need to come forward as large sites or in a more iterative manner.

2.5 Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) sets out that it is beneficial for the process of allocating housing and employment land to be integrated in order to ensure that sites are allocated for the most appropriate use. That approach will be reflected in the assessment process, as housing and employment sites will be considered together, though with bespoke criteria pertaining to each land use. The draft assessment criteria also include consideration as to whether there may be a more appropriate use for any given site.

Sustainability Appraisal

2.6 The NPPF stresses that Local Plans should be informed throughout their preparation by sustainability appraisal that meets the relevant legal requirements (paragraph 32). This should demonstrate how a Plan has addressed relevant economic, social and environmental objectives. The SA process is integral to the site assessment/selection decision making, as set out in more detail below.

Consultation

2.7 The PPG stresses the importance of effective engagement and consultation with local communities, businesses and other interested parties. This document assists with that process by providing clear information on the proposed site assessment process, enabling stakeholders and interested parties to understand the methodology and shape the process.

2.8 Turning to the various stages more specifically, the SA Scoping Report will be consulted upon alongside the Issues and Options Consultation. This will include the site assessment criteria. The criteria can be amended in light of representations received through consultation, as suitable.

- 2.9 The full suite of assessments will be made available in due course, to inform future consultations on the LPU. The site assessment process and resultant allocations will also be scrutinised via the Examination in Public following the submission of the LPU.

Neighbourhood Planning

- 2.10 The council actively supports neighbourhood planning and Neighbourhood Plans (NPs) have been made for Overton, Oakley and Deane, Bramley, Sherborne St John, St Mary Bourne, Old Basing, Sherfield on Loddon, Whitchurch, Kingsclere and Wootton St Lawrence. These NPs now form part of the Development Plan for their areas and are used in the determination of relevant planning applications. A number of new NPs are also being progressed by local communities.
- 2.11 The Overton, Oakley and Deane, Sherborne St John, Whitchurch and Kingsclere NPs all allocate housing sites and neighbourhood planning is highly likely to continue to play a role in the process of identifying, assessing and allocating sites. The details of this will be established through the LPU process via discussions with the relevant parish councils and in light of relevant public consultations.

Call for sites

- 2.12 The first step in the process of identifying potentially suitable site allocations was the call for site consultation which took place in summer 2019. This was publicised widely via a range of methods including direct communication with everyone on the planning policy database, a press release, social media and via the council's website. Direct notifications were sent to parish councils, landowners, developers, businesses, relevant local interest groups and stakeholders.
- 2.13 The call for sites encompassed the whole borough and sought to identify all sites potentially available for a wide range of uses, namely:
- Residential development including sites for self-build/custom build, special needs housing such as older persons and care accommodation, affordable housing and mobile/park homes
 - Employment development including sites for industrial and storage and distribution
 - Gypsy, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople pitches/plots
 - Other uses such as retail, community uses, open space or health

As per the guidance set out in the PPG, it was required that sites put forward should be capable of accommodating at least five residential units or, for employment sites, at least 0.25 hectares or able to accommodate at least 500 square metres of floorspace.

- 2.14 242 sites were promoted through the consultation. The details of these sites were published through the SHELAA in December 2019. Further sites have been promoted subsequently and these will be considered alongside the sites outlined in the SHLEAA.
- 2.15 A large range of sites have therefore been promoted, varying in type, scale and location. Consequently, it has been considered necessary to filter the number of sites that are assessed in detail through the plan making process in a manner which still allows for proper consideration of reasonable alternatives. This filtering process is explained below.

Stage 1: Filtering of Sites

- 3.1 It would be both impractical and unnecessary to undertake a detailed assessment of every promoted development site, as a sizeable proportion will not be suitable for allocation in the LPU. This could be as a result of locational factors (e.g. if they are in locations where new greenfield sites are not appropriate) or in light of certain key technical or policy constraints (e.g. environmental designations). Therefore, a filtering process is required in order to enable the promoted sites to be distilled down to a sensible pool of sites for detailed assessment.
- 3.2 Extensive research has been done on potential filtering mechanisms. In light of this, an approach has been adopted which strikes a balance between ensuring that all reasonable alternative have been considered, while keeping the number of sites needing assessment to a suitable level, and consistent with the overall approach to the production of the LPU. This involves two elements, as set out below, namely using the SHELAA and by focusing on the most sustainable locations.

1A - Strategic Housing & Economic Land Availability Assessment

- 3.3 As referred to above, national planning policy requires the preparation of a Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA), which collates information provided as part of site promotion and presents that information in a manner which addresses the national level policy requirements and the guidance within the PPG.
- 3.4 The SHELAA forms the first filter of potential development sites. It identifies sites with fundamental constraints that would make their development definitively unsuitable. It is proposed that such sites are filtered from the process at this stage and are therefore not subject to any further consideration for potential allocation. This is in line with the SHELAA guidance which states that the assessment should contain more detail for those sites which are considered to be realistic opportunities for development, while others can be discounted where there are clearly evidenced and justified reasons.
- 3.5 The basis for excluding sites from the SHELAA are:

- Small sites which could only accommodate less than five dwellings, as the PPG specifies that sites should be able to accommodate at least 5 units;
- Sites in flood zone 3a and 3b, in order to accord with the sequential approach as set out in section 14 of the NPPF;
- Sites within an SSSI and other important environmental or biodiversity designations e.g. SPA, SAC or Ramsar sites, or with irreplaceable habitats such as ancient woodland or veteran trees, in order to reflect paragraphs 175 and 176 in the NPPF;
- Sites in use as open space including designated Local Green Spaces and playing fields; sports uses or recreational buildings, as per paragraphs 97 and 99 within the NPPF;
- Those that are not expected to be available until after the end of the plan period (for the LPU), as such sites are not likely to be appropriate for allocation.

The list of sites identified as not being suitable for inclusion within the SHELAA are set out in Appendix 2 of that document¹. Sites promoted after the publication of the SHELAA in December 2019 will be included in the 2020 SHELAA and will be subject to the same filtering process.

Stage 1B – Prioritising the most sustainable locations

- 3.6 At this stage, the most effective second stage of filter is considered to be to focus on the most sustainable locations in the borough. This reflects the inherent need to ensure that the LPU supports sustainable development. It also ensures that a set of reasonable alternatives can be established, as all sites in sustainable locations are potentially worthy of consideration. This approach will be reviewed and refined as the spatial strategy of the Plan is developed but provides a suitable starting point from which future decisions can be made.
- 3.7 This approach will also support the process of developing the spatial strategy for the LPU by identifying locations with the more suitable development sites, which can then inform where new development could be directed. This will need to be balanced with other factors such as the outcomes of relevant technical studies and public consultation.
- 3.8 The current adopted Local Plan and the developing evidence base to support the LPU suggests the following settlement tiers, reflecting the relative sustainability of locations. This is due to be consulted upon as part of the council's issues and options consultation.

¹ <https://www.basingstoke.gov.uk/content/page/59237/Appendix%20%20-%20Sites%20identified%20not%20subject%20to%20further%20assessment.pdf>

| Category | Settlement |
|-----------------------------|--|
| 1. Principal Service Centre | Basingstoke Town |
| 2. Service Centre | Overton, Tadley, Whitchurch |
| 3. Local Centre | Bramley, Kingsclere, Oakley and Old Basing |
| 4. Larger villages | North Waltham, Sherborne St John, Sherfield on Loddon, Woolton Hill |
| 5. Smaller Villages | Ashford Hill, Bishops Green, Burghclere, Cliddesden, Dummer, Ecchinswell, Headley, Highclere, Preston Candover, Silchester, St Mary Bourne, Upton Grey |

- 3.9 At present it is intended to focus on the top 3 tiers in the list above for site assessment purposes. This allows a balance to be struck between focusing on the most sustainable settlements, and also providing a sufficient range of alternatives in order to meet the identified housing need. This also reflects where allocations were made in the current Local Plan. This site assessment process may evolve as the production of the LPU progresses, if, for example, the tiers above are amended or if a sufficient number of suitable sites are not identified in the more sustainable locations.
- 3.10 A caveat to the above is that sites in Tadley are not currently considered to be reasonable alternatives and hence are not proposed to be assessed at present. This is a reflection of the constraints upon development within this settlement which flow from its proximity to the Aldermaston Atomic Weapons Establishment and the associated emergency planning procedures. However, the suitability of Tadley as a future location of growth will be fully explored through the LPU and any updated position will be reflected in the site assessment process.

Stage 2: Detailed Assessment of Sites - Baseline

- 4.1 The detailed assessment process involves the thorough consideration of the sites which are deemed to be reasonable alternatives for potential allocation in the LPU. This will also include analysis of relevant site combinations. For example, there are a number of sites on the eastern side of Basingstoke whereby the implications of particular groups of closely related sites being developed could be very different to the implications of developing just one of the sites in isolation, particularly in relation to issues such as infrastructure provision. Considering site combinations will also be helpful for understanding the cumulative impacts.

Methodology

- 4.2 The proposed approach involves the production of a detailed site assessment matrix for each of the sites which has reached stage 2. Sites will be assessed against a large number of technical criteria covering a wide range of issues relevant to the suitability of sites for development. The proposed matrix is set out in the appendices of the SA Scoping Report and is also set out in

Appendixes 1 - 3 of this document. The matrix builds upon the comprehensive and robust approach used for the last Local Plan process (Basingstoke and Deane Local Plan Review 2011 – 2029) which was found sound through the Local Plan Examination in Public. Criteria have been updated where necessary in order to reflect the latest technical and policy considerations.

- 4.3 There are three versions of the matrix, one for housing, along with an extended version for gypsy and traveller sites which incorporates additional site specific considerations which have been incorporated in order to reflect the guidance set out in Planning Policy for Traveller Sites. Finally there is also a version for employment sites, this is also derived from the SA objectives, but includes extra criteria concerning commercial considerations, and conversely does not include the criteria which are considered to only be relevant to residential sites.
- 4.4 The proposed process enables a thorough and transparent consideration of the full range of issues which are likely to determine whether a site, or a combination of sites, is suitable for allocation. It enables the relative merits of sites to be considered to enable a comparison of potential development options. It also ensures that the site specific policies in the LPU are informed by thorough analysis of all the relevant sustainability issues.
- 4.5 The site assessment criteria are informed by, and integrated with, the Sustainability Appraisal. More specifically, the SA scoping report has identified the key sustainability issues, which then form the basis for a series of sustainability objectives. The site assessment criteria reflect these objectives, and translate them into a set of considerations which are suitable for the assessment of individual sites. Consequently, the site assessment process ensures that the SA is integral to the process from the outset and that it supports the delivery of sustainable development.
- 4.6 The matrix for assessing each site uses a traffic light/RAG system whereby each category is broken down into a series of parameters aligned to the RAG system. This provides a visual understanding of the findings of the assessment of each category. Commentary has also been included for each category to highlight the key issues associated with individual sites, and to explain the conclusions reached. Each assessment culminates in a summary and an overall conclusion. There is no explicit weighting system for the different categories and a degree of planning judgement will be required in order to assess how to translate the result of each assessment into an overall conclusion regarding the site.
- 4.7 The parameters used for the RAG system are not precise numerical criteria, and many do require technical analysis. Consequently, the different categories will be assessed by relevant technical specialists both within and outside of the council, including officers from Hampshire County Council and appointed specialist consultants. This allows for a very detailed and rigorous assessment process, informed by a thorough, technical understanding of the relevant issues.

Outcomes

- 4.8 This part of the process is intended to act effectively as a baseline, where reasonable alternatives are considered and then distilled down to the sites which have the best potential for allocation. These sites will then move forward to the refinement stage (stage 3 below).
- 4.9 There are likely to be various technical issues and constraints identified for most sites. These will need to be considered in more detail, along with capacity issues, during stage 3 of the assessment process. This will be important in terms of trying to minimise/mitigate impacts and ensuring that the most appropriate sites are deliverable in an appropriate manner which accords with national policy. The process will enable key opportunities and constraints to be identified and provide a framework for considering the relative importance of constraints on overall developability and deliverability.

Stage 3: Refinement of options

- 5.1 Following on from the baseline stage, the most promising sites for allocation will be identified and discussions will take place with site promoters and key stakeholders in order to establish to what extent key constraints can be overcome and/or mitigated. Appropriate yields/capacity in terms of the number of units to be accommodated on sites will also be considered, informed by the constraints identified and national policy requirements.
- 5.2 This process will be informed by the provision of technical reports and masterplanning information from site promoters/developers. These will also be subject to consideration by relevant technical consultees as suitable.
- 5.3 As this process evolves, the scoring of the different sites (as per the matrices referred to above) may need to be updated and this will culminate in a revised set of assessments which will then be reflected in the recommendations concerning which sites are most appropriate for allocation (stage 4). If it is not possible to resolve the issues with some of the preferred sites at this stage then it may be necessary to consider the inclusion of additional sites from stage 2 to provide a suitable range of options for meeting the housing requirements and ensuring that there is a reasonable set of alternatives for the final selection of appropriate sites for allocation.

Stage 4: Selection of Proposed Allocations

- 6.1 Following on from the earlier stages, the council will select sites for allocation. The approach will need to ensure that the outcomes of the process and factors for consideration are clear and transparent for the benefit of the decision makers, site promoters and the public.

6.2 This process will need to be rooted in the analysis contained within the site assessment matrices, but will also need to be strategic in nature. It will need to be informed by the spatial strategy with regard to how many units/sites are appropriate for allocation in the different parts of the borough and also considerations such as maintaining a 5 year supply of deliverable housing sites.

Summary

The following flow chart summarises the site selection process:

Stage 1: Filtering sites. 1A - SHELAA, 1B - Focus on most sustainable locations (based on tiers within the settlement study).

Stage 2: detailed assessment of sites. Baseline phase, assess all reasonable alternatives (those not filtered out at stage 1). Identify suitable sites for more thorough consideration.

Stage 3: refinement of options. Negotiations regarding more promising sites in order to overcome constraints and agree potential yield. Update detailed assessments in light of new information.

Stage 4: Council decides on site allocations in light of report setting out the options in light of stage 3 and consideration of the LPU process generally.

Basingstoke and Deane Local Plan Update



Housing Site Assessment

Introduction

To ensure that the Local Plan delivers the most appropriate site allocations for the borough, it is necessary to evaluate the suitability of potential development sites in a comprehensive and consistent manner. This document sets out the details of the site assessments which have been undertaken.

The site assessment criteria reflects the requirements of the NPPF, and translates these into sites assessment considerations.

A large part of the criteria are also driven by the Sustainability Appraisal. This involves distilling the SA objectives into a set of more site specific objectives/criteria. This ensures that the site assessment and SA process has been fully integrated. The outcomes of the Sustainability Appraisal process itself will also be given due consideration when the site allocation decisions are made.

The process has also been informed by the detailed evidence base developed to inform the Local Plan Update. Such an approach is in line with the National Planning Policy Framework which states that Local Plans should be based upon a robust, up-to-date and adequate evidence base (paragraph 31).

Sites will also be considered sequentially in terms of flood risk, outside of this Site Assessment process, although the findings of the assessment will feed into that sequential testing.

The site assessment process is informed by relevant evidence base studies, which include the:

- Transport Assessment
- Biodiversity Assessment
- Landscape Character Study and Sensitivity Assessment
- Strategic Flood Risk Assessment
- Water Cycle Study
- Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA)

Additional important sources of evidence and information include the:

- Green Infrastructure Strategy
- Green Space Standards
- Accessibility analysis using GIS
- School organisation plan (HCC)
- Agricultural land classification maps (Natural England)
- Minerals mapping (HCC)
- Hampshire Historic Environment Record.

The relevant sources of information/evidence used for each criterion are listed in the individual site

matrices. Officers from different units of the borough council have fed into the assessment process, in addition to outside consultees including Hampshire County Council, Environment Agency, Natural England and relevant utility companies and statutory providers.

A colour coding/traffic light system has been used in order to provide a visual understanding of the findings of the assessment of each category. Commentary has also been included for each category to highlight the key issues associated with individual sites, and to explain the conclusions reached. Each assessment culminates in a summary and conclusion. Sites have not been ranked but the assessment provides an overall indication of those sites that have the most potential to accommodate future development.

Key to colour coding/traffic light system:

| |
|-------------------|
| Strongly positive |
| Positive |
| Neutral |
| Negative |
| Strongly negative |

Site:

Proposal:

| Method for assessment /indicators | Detailed Criteria | Source of Evidence | Potential Impact | Comments |
|--|---|--|------------------|----------|
| SA Objective 1: Enable the provision of affordable, adaptable, and high quality homes for all. | | | | |
| <p>The development of the site is deliverable, economically viable, and accords with financial contributions, infrastructure provision and policy requirements</p> | <p>The category is important for ensuring the successful provision of new homes, and underpinning the site’s potential to meet the requirements for affordable housing and other specialist forms of housing.</p> <p>Based on criteria set out in the NPPF and associated guidance which relates to whether there is a reasonable prospect that housing will be developed on the site at a particular point in time (higher scores will be accorded to sites which can deliver more quickly); market cost or delivery factors have been identified which may delay the achievability of the site; or delivery is not likely to be achievable.</p> <p>The assessment of the above will also be informed by whether there is a development partner/prospective developer in place to progress the delivery of the site, as this is likely to improve the deliverability position.</p> <p>Making this assessment also involves consideration of the sites availability, as this will influence the success and speed of delivery. Sites which are available within the shortest timescale will support a more positive assessment of the site.</p> | <p>Work associated with the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, information from RPs and the site promoter</p> | | |

| SA Objective 2: Ensure the creation of healthy, inclusive and safe communities, both in relation to the provision of new neighbourhoods, and the enhancement of existing places, including by supporting regeneration. | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|--|
| There would be capacity within local health/social care facilities to serve the site or new facilities could be provided | Whether there is: plenty of adequate capacity within existing local health/social care facilities to serve the site; sufficient capacity at present; there is insufficient capacity at present but there is scope to accommodate the site through expansion of existing facilities or by on-site provision of new facilities; or services are too remote from the site or there is insufficient capacity and neither opportunity for expansion nor provision of facilities to meet the needs of residents of the site; there is significant pressure on existing services and these may not be able to handle the additional demand associated with the proposal. | Information provided from Hampshire Hospitals, the relevant medical practices, Clinical Commissioning Group, the council's Community Regeneration Team. | | |
| The development can provide appropriate open space/green infrastructure or existing open space provision is sufficient to meet with increased needs | Whether the site offers opportunities to improve local open space/green infrastructure provision; there is sufficient and appropriate open space/green infrastructure already available to meet with increased needs; there is insufficient open space/green infrastructure but needs can be met through on-site provision; or there is insufficient open space/green infrastructure to meet increased needs and on-site provision is not achievable due to site constraints/cost | Leisure and Recreational Needs Assessment (2020), Green Infrastructure Strategy (2018 - 2029), and Infrastructure delivery information | | |
| The site falls within, or may impact upon, a deprived area or area identified for regeneration | The site falls within an identified area for regeneration or within a lower super output area which is within the 20% most deprived nationally and the development can positively contribute towards the objective to a significant extent; the site falls within an identified area for regeneration or within a lower super output area which is within the 20% most deprived nationally and the development can positively contribute | | | |

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| | towards the objective to a limited extent or it is located outside of such an area but may have indirect benefits for the deprived/regeneration area: The site is unlikely to impact upon deprived areas or areas identified for regeneration; The site/development could have a limited negative impact on deprivation/regeneration objectives, including indirect impacts from sites outside such areas; The site/development could have a significant negative impact on deprivation/regeneration objectives. | | | |
| Objective 3: Reduce the need to travel, improve choice and access to sustainable transport options including walking and cycling as well as ensuring a safe and efficient transport system. | | | | |
| The site is accessible by a range of existing sustainable transport modes, or can realistically be made accessible, to key facilities and services including education, employment, medical centres and, town centres and community facilities | Whether the site is close to or easily accessible to key services; some services are inaccessible or would need additional access provision, but this can be addressed by additional infrastructure; only some services are accessible and it is unlikely that additional infrastructure can be provided to mitigate this; or the site is remote in relation to most or all key services by existing networks and they can only be accessed by private car, and it is not likely to be possible to provide or extend existing sustainable transport infrastructure. This will be informed by more detailed criteria based on varying distance thresholds appropriate to the service/facility, and will consider whether there are opportunities to promote walking, cycling and public transport, and provide a genuine choice of transport modes. | GIS accessibility modelling tool (insert official name); Public Transport mapping; Cycle Strategy; Transport Assessment 2020; Basingstoke Transport Strategy 2019 | | <p>Pedestrian & Cycle Infrastructure:</p> <p>Bus:</p> <p>Rail:</p> <p>Accessibility:</p> <p>Primary school Secondary School College GP Surgery Hospital Shop (food) Train station Bus stops Strategic Employment Areas</p> |
| There would be opportunities for the development of the site to provide viable | The development of the site would offer clear opportunities to improve transport options, and these are likely to be deliverable; the site may offer the opportunity to improve transport | Basingstoke Transport Strategy 2019 | | |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| <p>new/improved transport infrastructure, that offers a genuine choice of transport modes including walking, cycling and public transport use that would successfully integrate into the existing movement networks</p> | <p>options, but this is not clearly defined and/or there is uncertainty about the deliverability potential; the potential to deliver any improved transport infrastructure is limited, and/or there are concerns that such infrastructure may well be undeliverable; there is no potential to deliver improved transport options and/or the deliverability of any potential options is very likely to be undeliverable. The assessment of the considerations above will be informed by consideration of the sustainability credentials of the enhanced transport opportunities in question.</p> | | | |
| <p>There would be suitable highway access for all users</p> | <p>The site has an existing suitable access for all users; a new or improved access can realistically be provided without causing significant detrimental impacts or impacting markedly on viability; providing new or improving an existing access for all users is potentially achievable, but may result in detrimental impacts or impinge on viability, but it is likely that this can be adequately mitigate; providing a new, or improving an existing access, may result in significant detrimental impacts or impinge the viability of the site, and it is unlikely that this can be adequately mitigated and/or may undermine the delivery of the site.</p> | <p>Basingstoke Transport Strategy 2019</p> | | |
| <p>The existing highways infrastructure can accommodate additional traffic flows or appropriate additional infrastructure or</p> | <p>Whether it is likely that the local highway network can accommodate the additional traffic flows generated from the site without causing severe impact on road network; mitigation measures could realistically be used to accommodate traffic generated from the site; or significant investment would be needed to accommodate flows on the wider network to mitigate congestion,</p> | <p>Basingstoke Transport Strategy 2019</p> | | |

| | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|
| mitigation measures could be provided | and it is unclear whether this can be mitigated against; or the additionally generated traffic would have a severe impact, which it would not be able to be mitigated against. | | | |
| SA Objective 4: Reduce pollution (including minimising emissions of greenhouse gases to achieve zero net carbon), and support mitigation and adaptation measures required for the impact of climate change. | | | | |
| The development of the site is unlikely to lead to exceedance of national air quality objectives, or be likely to expose people to levels of air pollution which exceed national air quality objective levels | The development of the site provides an opportunity to improve air quality; there will be no change in air quality levels; there is potential for change, and this may require further consideration; there is the potential for a detrimental impact on air quality, but mitigation measures have been proposed; there is a risk of exceedance of national air quality levels. | | | |
| Development of the site would be compatible with nearby land uses | The development of the site for the proposed use will be compatible with nearby land uses, and will not impose onerous restrictions on the existing land use; the development of the site is likely to be compatible with nearby land uses provided appropriate mitigation measure are incorporated into the new development; there may be a conflict with a neighbouring land use and it is not clear to what extent this can be successfully mitigated; the development of the site is likely to create a significant conflict with nearby land uses and it is unlikely that adequate mitigation measures can be incorporated into the new development. | Analysis of neighbourly uses/properties; and assessment by Environmental Health officers | | |
| The site benefits from suitable ground conditions | No evidence of previous contamination; owing to previous use, there could be some contamination, but this is not likely to be prohibitive to development; | Historic land use maps; Site investigation | | |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| | previous use indicates potential for significant contamination, which could impact upon the development of the site. | reports, landfill site evidence | | |
| The site would not be adversely affected by noise pollution. | The site would be free of any adverse noise impact; the site would be impacted by noise, but it is likely that this can be satisfactorily mitigated; the site would be impacted by significant amounts of noise, but it is likely that this can be mitigated; the site would be impacted by significant amounts of noise, and it is not likely that this can be satisfactorily mitigated. | Proximity to relevant land uses (road, rail, commercial etc.); assessment by Environmental Health officers | | |
| SA Objective 5: Minimise and improve the efficiency of resource use. | | | | |
| The site would have the potential to incorporate and/or promote the use of sustainable design features and climate change adaption/mitigation measures | The site has considerable potential to utilise a wide range of sustainable design features and climate change adaption/mitigation measures; the site has the potential to deliver a limited range of sustainable design features and climate change adaption/mitigation measures; there are likely to be significant limitations on the potential to utilise sustainable design features climate change adaption/mitigation measures. | Basingstoke Urban Design Framework | | |
| Re-use of previously developed land | The development of the site would make use of previously developed land (PDL) which currently has a detrimental impact upon the local environment and/ local communities; development of the site would involve development of previously developed land which currently does not have a detrimental impact on the local environment; Development of the site would involve a combination of previously developed and non-previously developed; Development would involve previously developed land, but it is situated in an isolated location; involves development of greenfield site or is PDL but would | N/A | | |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| | involve the loss of an important existing use. Where the site involves a mixture of PDL and greenfield, the assessment will take account of the proportion of the site which is currently previously developed. | | | |
| Development of the site is likely to be the most appropriate use of the site and achieves efficient use of land (when considered against any reasonably likely alternative uses or known land use needs) | The proposed use is likely to be a more appropriate or efficient use of land than is currently the case and there is no use which would be more appropriate than is now proposed; there is another appropriate alternative use (which may include any current use), but it is likely that this can be provided elsewhere or the loss of the existing use would not have a significant detrimental social or economic impact; there is likely to be a more appropriate alternative use (which may include any current use which would be lost), the loss of which, or failure to make provision for, could have detrimental social or economic impacts, and it is likely to be difficult to provide that use elsewhere. | SHELAA, land use needs identified in current or emerging development plan documents. | | |
| Development of the site would avoid the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land | Criteria based on Agricultural Land Classification in terms of whether a site is wholly or predominantly within Grades 1, 2 or 3a (excellent quality/very good/ good); Grade 3b (moderate quality); Grade 4 (poor quality); or Grade 5 (very poor quality). Poorer quality land should be preferred to those of a higher quality. | Strategic scale provisional Agricultural Land Classification, (Natural England) | | |
| Development of the site would avoid the sterilisation of mineral resources | Whether there would be no significant mineral constraint; there would be a mineral constraint associated with the development, but it is likely that this can be adequately mitigated/addressed as part of the development of the site; there is likely to be a significant mineral constraint and this may prevent or | Hampshire County Council Minerals and Waste Local Plan | | |

| | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|
| | significantly constrain the development of the site for the use under consideration. | | | |
| SA Objective 6: Conserve, and where possible, improve biodiversity, including its connectivity. | | | | |
| Development of the site would be compatible with biodiversity policies, NPPF, and relevant legal requirements | The criteria are set out in full in the Biodiversity Assessment, but can be summarised as follows: relatively few constraints; some constraints, but it is anticipated that these can be satisfactorily addressed; development likely to be possible, but significant parts of the site are constrained (e.g. by the presence of a SINC or priority habitat); development may be feasible, but the site is sensitive and further assessment may be required, and off-site compensation may be needed to achieve no net loss in biodiversity; development of the site is likely to be incompatible with biodiversity policies. | Biodiversity Assessment 2020, Green Infrastructure Strategy, and information from statutory consultees | | |
| SA Objective 7: Maintain and improve water quality, and ensure the sustainable management of water resources. | | | | |
| Development of the site would not have a negative impact on water quality | The development is likely to lead to an improvement in water quality; no deterioration; some deterioration, but no change in band status (River Loddon) or any nitrate impacts can be adequately mitigated; deterioration, and it is not clear whether the impacts can be adequately mitigated; deterioration that would result in a change in band status, or where the nitrate impact could not be mitigated. | Water Cycle Study (2020) and information from statutory consultees | | |
| | Criteria to protect the Solent and Southampton Water Special Protection Area (SPA), and Solent Maritime Special Area of Conservation (SAC) based on the location of the site – if a site falls within the River Test and Itchen catchments any development will need to be nitrate neutral in order to avoid harm to the protected sites. | River Test and Itchen Catchment areas (Environment Agency) – this will be clarified through the Water Cycle Study. | | |

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| Development of the site would minimise the risk of polluting a water source. | Criteria based on whether a site is within a Source Protection Zone and if so whether its zone 1, or 2 and 3. | Environment Agency information contained on GIS and any additional information from statutory consultees | | |
| There would be adequate water supply to serve the site. | The development of the site could facilitate enhancements to the water supply infrastructure; there is already adequate infrastructure/supply available to meet the increased demand; there is inadequate infrastructure available, but this can be adequately mitigated/addressed; there is inadequate infrastructure/supply available and it is unlikely that this issue can be addressed. | Water Cycle Study (2020); Water Company Water Resource Management Plans and information from statutory consultees | | |
| There would be adequate wastewater infrastructure to serve the site | Whether the development of the site will support enhancements to wastewater infrastructure facilities; there is adequate wastewater infrastructure in place to address the increased demand; there is adequate wastewater infrastructure planned in order to address the increased demand; there is inadequate capacity within the network and further investigations required to be undertaken by the water company; major wastewater infrastructure is needed to address the increased demand and it may not be practical or viable for this to be provided. | Water Cycle Study (2020) and consultation with Water companies | | |

| SA Objective 8: Reduce the risk of flooding and the resulting detriment to the local community, environment and economy. | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|--|
| Development of the site would minimise the risk of flooding | The site is within flood zone 1 and there are no known flood constraints; The site is within flood zone 1, but is upstream of a critical drainage area; The site is within flood zone 1, but is within a critical drainage area or is known to suffer with surface water or groundwater flooding issues; A part of the site is within flood zone 2 or 3, but this is not likely prevent the development of the rest of the site; A significant part of the site is within flood zone 2 or 3, and this is likely to make it difficult to develop the site. | EA Flood Zones, Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (2020), EA susceptibility flood maps and Surface Water Management Plans work, and information from statutory consultees | | |
| SA Objective 9: Protect, and where possible enhance, the character and quality of the local landscape and geodiversity. | | | | |
| Development of the site would protect or enhance the borough's landscape character and beauty | Based on sensitivity and landscape value to conclude on the capacity of a site to accommodate new development. Criteria are: major/high; medium/high; medium; medium/low; or low/negligible landscape. This will be informed by the more detailed criteria outlined in the Landscape Sensitivity Study relating to landscape and visual sensitivity, combined with an assessment of landscape value. This category also includes consideration of the impact on the landscape setting of settlements, and potential trees loss/impacts. Particular regard will need to be had to any impacts on the North Wessex Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. | Landscape Capacity Study 2020; Green Infrastructure Strategy; AONB Management Plan and information from statutory consultees | | |
| SA Objective 10: Protect, and where possible enhance, heritage assets. | | | | |
| Development of the site would preserve or enhance the significance of designated or non-designated heritage assets, | Whether the development would have a positive impact on the borough's historic environment; no impact; some negative impact but these can be wholly mitigated; negative impact which can only be partially mitigated; or negative impact which cannot be mitigated | The National Heritage List for England (NHLE); The Historic Environment Record (HER) for Hampshire; Conservation | | |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| <p>including any contribution made by their setting</p> | <p>against, resulting in development being unacceptable.</p> <p>The above assessment includes consideration of the importance of the asset(s). As per HE guidance, the process requires consideration of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Identify which heritage assets are affected. - Understand what contribution the site makes in its current form. - Identify what impact the allocation might have. <p>Consider potential to maximise enhancements and minimise harm.</p> <p>The assessment also includes consideration of the impact of development on the character and appearance of conservation areas.</p> | <p>Area Appraisals and Management Plans; Heritage SPD; The Local List; The national and local 'Heritage at Risk' registers; Information from statutory consultees; Any statements of significance or site specific studies; Historic England Advice Note 3</p> | | |
| <p>Development of the site would conserve areas of archaeological interest (through avoidance or preservation)</p> | <p>Whether the development would have no impact on areas of archaeological interest; low/acceptable impact; some impact but these can be wholly mitigated against; negative impact which can only partially be mitigated against; or negative impact which cannot be mitigated against. When considering the above it is also necessary to consider to what extent archaeological remains could be successfully integrated into the new development.</p> <p>The above assessment includes consideration of the importance of the asset(s). As per HE guidance, the process requires consideration of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Identify which heritage assets are affected. | <p>Hampshire Historic Environment Record and information from statutory consultees</p> | | |

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Understand what contribution the site makes in its current form. - Identify what impact the allocation might have. <p>Consider potential to maximise enhancements and minimise harm.</p> <p>This assessment includes identifying Scheduled Monuments and considering any impact upon their significance, including their setting.</p> | | | |
| Objective 11: Conserve and enhance the character of the borough's settlements through high quality design that maintains and strengthens local distinctiveness. | | | | |
| The site relates well to the existing settlement in terms of form, scale, character | Whether the development relates well to the existing settlement in terms of form, scale and character; the site may not relate well to the existing settlement but there is potential to mitigate this impact through siting, layout, scale, character and landscape design; or the site does not relate well to the existing settlement in terms of form, scale and character and this is likely to be difficult to fully mitigate. | Character Study for Basingstoke (2020); Countryside Design Summary (included within Landscape, Biodiversity and Trees SPD 2018). Landscape Character Appraisal (2020) and Landscape Capacity Study (2020) | | |
| Or in the case of a new settlement, does it have the potential to create a place with a cohesive, well defined character which produces a high quality living environment for residents and relates well to its surroundings. | <p>(This category is to be used in the case of applications for new settlements, such as proposed garden villages, as an alternative to the category above)</p> <p>The characteristics of the site are considered to be highly conducive to the development of a successful new settlement in design terms; the site is considered to be moderately conducive to the development of a successful new settlement in design terms; the strengths and weaknesses of the site are considered to be fairly evenly balanced in terms of the potential to</p> | Basingstoke Urban Design Framework (2020) | | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|--|
| | <p>create a successful new development in design terms; there are some concerns about the potential for the site to deliver a successful new settlement in design terms; there are significant concerns about the potential for the site to deliver a successful new settlement in design terms.</p> <p>This is likely to be determined by the factors which generally influence the character and development of settlements, such as the topography, attractiveness of the landscape, natural features on and around the site, quality of the surrounding environment, its size and the opportunities which are available to provide features which would benefit the lives of local residents and the development of a healthy and thriving community.</p> | | | |
| Development of the site would not lead to the coalescence of existing settlements | Based on whether development would not lead to coalescence of existing settlements; has the potential to lead to the coalescence of settlements but there is potential to address this through siting and layout; or development will lead the coalescence of existing settlements. | Landscape Capacity Study (2020) and any updates. Landscape Character Study 2020. Relevant sections of neighbourhood plans and their evidence bases | | |
| SA Objective 12: Ensure sustainable economic growth, supporting the diverse economy of the borough and enabling opportunities for new sectors, in order to maintain high levels of employment. | | | | |
| Will the proposed use of the site support sustainable economic growth and provide employment opportunities. | The proposed use of the site will have considerable potential to support sustainable economic growth and/or provide significant job opportunities; the proposed use of the site will have some positive impact on supporting sustainable economic growth and/or provide some job opportunities; the proposed use of the site will have a | Economic Needs Assessment 2020/2021 | | |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| | neutral impact on supporting sustainable economic growth and/or only provide limited or short term job opportunities (i.e. construction); the proposed use of the site could be harmful to sustainable economic growth and/or result in job losses; the proposed use of the site could have a significant detrimental impact on sustainable economic growth and/or result in considerable job losses. | | | |
| SA Objective 13: Facilitate improved access to education facilities in order to improve educational attainment and increase opportunities for new skills and learning. | | | | |
| There would be capacity within local primary and secondary schools to accommodate additional pupils created by the site's development or new facilities could be provided | The site would have the potential to provide or support significant new education provision for the benefit of the new/existing community; there is adequate capacity within local primary and secondary schools to accommodate additional pupils created by the site's development; there is insufficient capacity at present but there is scope to accommodate additional pupils through expansion of existing schools within the catchment area; there is insufficient capacity at present in local primary or secondary schools, and while accommodating the new pupils may be achievable this is likely to be difficult; or there are no schools within a reasonable distance which will be able to accommodate the additional pupils and on-site provision is not achievable due to site constraints or costs. | Schools Organisation Plan (2019-2023) and information from HCC Children's Service Facilities | | |
| SA Objective 14: Ensure access to services and facilities in order to sustain the vibrancy of communities and enhance the attractiveness of town centres to visitors. | | | | |
| There would be the opportunity to accommodate new local services and facilities to serve | The development of the site would facilitate the provision of additional/enhanced facilities which would benefit the local community; there is adequate capacity in local services and facilities to accommodate | Infrastructure delivery information and service providers | | |

| | | | | |
|---------------------------|---|--|--|--|
| the additional population | the additional population; there is insufficient capacity at present but there is scope to serve the additional population through the expansion of existing services and facilities or to provide new services and facilities; or services are currently too remote from the site/ there is insufficient capacity and there are no opportunities for expansion or provision of new facilities. | | | |
| SITE CONCLUSIONS: | | | | |

Basingstoke and Deane Local Plan Update



Housing Site Assessment (gypsy and traveller pitches)

Introduction

To ensure that the Local Plan delivers the most appropriate site allocations for the borough, it is necessary to evaluate the suitability of potential development sites in a comprehensive and consistent manner. This document sets out the details of the site assessments which have been undertaken.

The site assessment criteria reflects the requirements of the NPPF, and translates these into sites assessment considerations.

A large part of the criteria are also driven by the Sustainability Appraisal. This involves distilling the SA objectives into a set of more site specific objectives/criteria. This ensures that the site assessment and SA process has been fully integrated. The outcomes of the Sustainability Appraisal process itself will also be given due consideration when the site allocation decisions are made.

The process has also been informed by the detailed evidence base developed to inform the Local Plan Update. Such an approach is in line with the National Planning Policy Framework which states that Local Plans should be based upon a robust, up-to-date and adequate evidence base (paragraph 31).

Sites will also be considered sequentially in terms of flood risk, outside of this Site Assessment process, although the findings of the assessment will feed into that sequential testing.

The site assessment process is informed by relevant evidence base studies, which include the:

- Transport Assessment
- Biodiversity Assessment
- Landscape Character Study and Sensitivity Assessment
- Strategic Flood Risk Assessment
- Water Cycle Study
- Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA)

Additional important sources of evidence and information include the:

- Green Infrastructure Strategy
- Green Space Standards
- Accessibility analysis using GIS
- School organisation plan (HCC)
- Agricultural land classification maps (Natural England)
- Minerals mapping (HCC)
- Hampshire Historic Environment Record.

The relevant sources of information/evidence used for each

criterion are listed in the individual site matrices. Officers from different units of the borough council have fed into the assessment process, in addition to outside consultees including Hampshire County Council, Environment Agency, Natural England and relevant utility companies and statutory providers.

The assessment of gypsy and travellers sites should be essentially the same as for housing sites. However, it is considered that there are some additional factors which need to be incorporated into the consideration of gypsy and traveller sites in order to reflect the guidance set out in Planning Policy for Travellers Sites 2015, particularly paragraphs 10 (d), 13, 14. The factors inferred from PPTS comprise criteria which seek to address the following; the need to reduce unauthorised encampments; promote peaceful and integrated co-existence with the settled community; provide a settled base; ensure that sites don't dominate the nearest settled community.

In addition, based on experience, a category has also been included which assesses the extent to which sites can be expanded. This reflects the tendency for highlight integrated family groups within the traveller community, meaning that multiple generations often live on the

same site, which often creates a need for existing sites to be expanded.

A colour coding/traffic light system has been used in order to provide a visual understanding of the findings of the assessment of each category. Commentary has also been included for each category to highlight the key issues associated with individual sites, and to explain the conclusions reached. Each assessment culminates in a summary and conclusion. Sites have not been ranked but the assessment provides an overall indication of those sites that have the most potential to accommodate future development.

Key to colour coding/traffic light system:

| |
|-------------------|
| Strongly positive |
| Positive |
| Neutral |
| Negative |
| Strongly negative |

Site:

Proposal:

| Method for assessment /indicators | Detailed Criteria | Source of Evidence | Potential Impact | Comments |
|--|---|--|------------------|----------|
| SA Objective 1: Enable the provision of affordable, adaptable, and high quality homes for all. | | | | |
| <p>The development of the site is deliverable, economically viable, and accords with financial contributions, infrastructure provision and policy requirements</p> | <p>The category is important for ensuring the successful provision of new homes, and underpinning the site’s potential to meet the requirements for affordable housing and other specialist forms of housing.</p> <p>Based on criteria set out in the NPPF and associated guidance which relates to whether there is a reasonable prospect that housing will be developed on the site at a particular point in time (higher scores will be accorded to sites which can deliver more quickly); market cost or delivery factors have been identified which may delay the achievability of the site; or delivery is not likely to be achievable.</p> <p>The assessment of the above will also be informed by whether there is a development partner/prospective developer in place to progress the delivery of the site, as this is likely to improve the deliverability position.</p> <p>Making this assessment also involves consideration of the sites availability, as this will influence the success and speed of delivery. Sites which are available within the shortest timescale will support a more positive assessment of the site.</p> | <p>Work associated with the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, information from RPs and the site promoter</p> | | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|--|
| The site provides a settled base | The site would provide a permanent settled base and is available immediately; the site would provide a permanent settled base, but would not be available immediately; the site may not be permanent, but there is no evidence of an intention to pursue alternative uses; the site would provide a temporary base, but this is likely to be for a significant time period; the site would only provide a temporary base and alternative uses may be pursued in the near future. | Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment 2020; Planning Policy for Traveller Sites 2015. | | |
| There is scope for the site to be expanded in order to meet the needs of future generations | There is scope for the site to be expanded in a manner which would be unlikely to have detrimental impacts; there is scope to expand the site with only moderate detrimental impacts which are capable of being mitigated; the site is capable of being expanded, with moderate detrimental impacts, which may be difficult to mitigate; there is no space to expand the site, or any expansion would be likely to involve significant detrimental impacts which would be difficult to mitigate. | Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment 2020; Planning Policy for Traveller Sites 2015. | | |
| SA Objective 2: Ensure the creation of healthy, inclusive and safe communities, both in relation to the provision of new neighbourhoods, and the enhancement of existing places, including by supporting regeneration. | | | | |
| There would be capacity within local health/social care facilities to serve the site or new facilities could be provided | Whether there is: plenty of adequate capacity within existing local health/social care facilities to serve the site; sufficient capacity at present; there is insufficient capacity at present but there is scope to accommodate the site through expansion of existing facilities or by on-site provision of new facilities; or services are too remote from the site or there is insufficient capacity and neither opportunity for expansion nor provision of facilities to meet the needs of residents of the site; there is significant pressure on existing services and these may not be able to handle | Information provided from Hampshire Hospitals, the relevant medical practices, Clinical Commissioning Group, the council's Community Regeneration Team. | | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|
| | the additional demand associated with the proposal. | | | |
| The development can provide appropriate open space/green infrastructure or existing open space provision is sufficient to meet with increased needs | Whether the site offers opportunities to improve local open space/green infrastructure provision; there is sufficient and appropriate open space/green infrastructure already available to meet with increased needs; there is insufficient open space/green infrastructure but needs can be met through on-site provision; or there is insufficient open space/green infrastructure to meet increased needs and on-site provision is not achievable due to site constraints/cost | Leisure and Recreational Needs Assessment (2020), Green Infrastructure Strategy (2018 - 2029), and Infrastructure delivery information | | |
| The site will promote peaceful and integrated co-existence between the site and the local community | The development of the site is likely to be successful in promoting peaceful and integrated co-existence; the site may involve some factors which inhibit the achievement of peaceful and integrated co-existence, but it is likely that these can be satisfactorily mitigated; the site may involve some factors which inhibit the achievement of peaceful and integrated co-existence, and it is unlikely that these can be satisfactorily mitigated; there are significant factors which would inhibit the achievement of peaceful and integrated co-existence, but these can be partially mitigated; there are significant factors which would inhibit the achievement of peaceful and integrated co-existence, and it is unlikely that these can be mitigated. | Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment 2020; Planning Policy for Traveller Sites 2015. | | |
| The size of the site would be well related to the nearest settled community | The size of the site would not dominate the nearest settled community; the size of the site would not dominate the nearest settled community, but may do if expanded; the size of the site would be moderately disproportionate in size when compared with the nearest settled community; the size of the site would be | Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment 2020; Planning Policy for Traveller Sites 2015. | | |

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|--|
| | significantly disproportionate to the nearest settled community. | | | |
| Objective 3: Reduce the need to travel, improve choice and access to sustainable transport options including walking and cycling as well as ensuring a safe and efficient transport system. | | | | |
| The site is accessible by a range of existing sustainable transport modes, or can realistically be made accessible, to key facilities and services including education, employment, medical centres and, town centres and community facilities | Whether the site is close to or easily accessible to key services; some services are inaccessible or would need additional access provision, but this can be addressed by additional infrastructure; only some services are accessible and it is unlikely that additional infrastructure can be provided to mitigate this; or the site is remote in relation to most or all key services by existing networks and they can only be accessed by private car, and it is not likely to be possible to provide or extend existing sustainable transport infrastructure. This will be informed by more detailed criteria based on varying distance thresholds appropriate to the service/facility, and will consider whether there are opportunities to promote walking, cycling and public transport, and provide a genuine choice of transport modes. | GIS accessibility modelling tool (insert official name); Public Transport mapping; Cycle Strategy; Transport Assessment 2020; Basingstoke Transport Strategy 2019 | | <p>Pedestrian & Cycle Infrastructure:</p> <p>Bus:</p> <p>Rail:</p> <p>Accessibility:</p> <p>Primary school Secondary School College GP Surgery Hospital Shop (food) Train station Bus stops Strategic Employment Areas</p> |
| There would be opportunities for the development of the site to provide viable new/improved transport infrastructure, that offers a genuine choice of transport modes including walking, cycling and public transport use that would successfully | The development of the site would offer clear opportunities to improve transport options, and these are likely to be deliverable; the site may offer the opportunity to improve transport options, but this is not clearly defined and/or there is uncertainty about the deliverability potential; the potential to deliver any improved transport infrastructure is limited, and/or there are concerns that such infrastructure may well be undeliverable; there is no potential to deliver improved transport options and/or the deliverability of any potential options is very likely to be undeliverable. | Basingstoke Transport Strategy 2019 | | |

| | | | | |
|--|---|-------------------------------------|--|--|
| integrate into the existing movement networks | The assessment of the considerations above will be informed by consideration of the sustainability credentials of the enhanced transport opportunities in question. | | | |
| There would be suitable highway access for all users | The site has an existing suitable access for all users; a new or improved access can realistically be provided without causing significant detrimental impacts or impacting markedly on viability; providing new or improving an existing access for all users is potentially achievable, but may result in detrimental impacts or impinge on viability, but it is likely that this can be adequately mitigate; providing a new, or improving an existing access, may result in significant detrimental impacts or impinge the viability of the site, and it is unlikely that this can be adequately mitigated and/or may undermine the delivery of the site. | Basingstoke Transport Strategy 2019 | | |
| The existing highways infrastructure can accommodate additional traffic flows or appropriate additional infrastructure or mitigation measures could be provided | Whether it is likely that the local highway network can accommodate the additional traffic flows generated from the site without causing severe impact on road network; mitigation measures could realistically be used to accommodate traffic generated from the site; or significant investment would be needed to accommodate flows on the wider network to mitigate congestion, and it is unclear whether this can be mitigated against; or the additionally generated traffic would have a severe impact, which it would not be able to be mitigated against. | Basingstoke Transport Strategy 2019 | | |
| SA Objective 4: Reduce pollution (including minimising emissions of greenhouse gases to achieve zero net carbon), and support mitigation and adaptation measures required for the impact of climate change. | | | | |
| The development of the site is unlikely to lead | The development of the site provides an opportunity to improve air quality; there will be no change in air quality levels; there is potential for change, and this | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|
| to exceedance of national air quality objectives, or be likely to expose people to levels of air pollution which exceed national air quality objective levels | may require further consideration; there is the potential for a detrimental impact on air quality, but mitigation measures have been proposed; there is a risk of exceedance of national air quality levels. | | | |
| Development of the site would be compatible with nearby land uses | The development of the site for the proposed use will be compatible with nearby land uses, and will not impose onerous restrictions on the existing land use; the development of the site is likely to be compatible with nearby land uses provided appropriate mitigation measure are incorporated into the new development; there may be a conflict with a neighbouring land use and it is not clear to what extent this can be successfully mitigated; the development of the site is likely to create a significant conflict with nearby land uses and it is unlikely that adequate mitigation measures can be incorporated into the new development. | Analysis of neighbourly uses/properties; and assessment by Environmental Health officers | | |
| The site benefits from suitable ground conditions | No evidence of previous contamination; owing to previous use, there could be some contamination, but this is not likely to be prohibitive to development; previous use indicates potential for significant contamination, which could impact upon the development of the site. | Historic land use maps; Site investigation reports, landfill site evidence | | |
| The site would not be adversely affected by noise pollution. | The site would be free of any adverse noise impact; the site would be impacted by noise, but it is likely that this can be satisfactorily mitigated; the site would be impacted by significant amounts of noise, but it is likely that this can be mitigated; the site would be | Proximity to relevant land uses (road, rail, commercial etc.); assessment by Environmental Health officers | | |

| | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|
| | impacted by significant amounts of noise, and it is not likely that this can be satisfactorily mitigated. | | | |
| SA Objective 5: Minimise and improve the efficiency of resource use. | | | | |
| The site would have the potential to incorporate and/or promote the use of sustainable design features and climate change adaption/mitigation measures | The site has considerable potential to utilise a wide range of sustainable design features and climate change adaption/mitigation measures; the site has the potential to deliver a limited range of sustainable design features and climate change adaption/mitigation measures; there are likely to be significant limitations on the potential to utilise sustainable design features climate change adaption/mitigation measures. | Basingstoke Urban Design Framework | | |
| Re-use of previously developed land | The development of the site would make use of previously developed land (PDL) which currently has a detrimental impact upon the local environment and/ local communities; development of the site would involve development of previously developed land which currently does not have a detrimental impact on the local environment; involves development of greenfield site or is PDL but would involve the loss of an important existing use. Where the site involves a mixture of PDL and greenfield, the assessment will take account of the proportion of the site which is currently previously developed. | N/A | | |
| Development of the site is likely to be the most appropriate use of the site and achieves efficient use of land (when considered against any | The proposed use is likely to be a more appropriate or efficient use of land than is currently the case and there is no use which would be more appropriate than is now proposed; there is another appropriate alternative use (which may include any current use), but it is likely that this can be provided elsewhere or the loss of the existing use would not have a significant detrimental social or | SHELAA, land use needs identified in current or emerging development plan documents. | | |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| reasonably likely alternative uses or known land use needs) | economic impact; there is likely to be a more appropriate alternative use (which may include any current use which would be lost), the loss of which, or failure to make provision for, could have detrimental social or economic impacts, and it is likely to be difficult to provide that use elsewhere. | | | |
| Development of the site would avoid the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land | Criteria based on Agricultural Land Classification in terms of whether a site is wholly or predominantly within Grades 1, 2 or 3a (excellent quality/very good/ good); Grade 3b (moderate quality); Grade 4 (poor quality); or Grade 5 (very poor quality). Poorer quality land should be preferred to those of a higher quality. | Strategic scale provisional Agricultural Land Classification, (Natural England) | | |
| Development of the site would avoid the sterilisation of mineral resources | Whether there would be no significant mineral constraint; there would be a mineral constraint associated with the development, but it is likely that this can be adequately mitigated/addressed as part of the development of the site; there is likely to be a significant mineral constraint and this may prevent or significantly constrain the development of the site for the use under consideration. | Hampshire County Council Minerals and Waste Local Plan | | |
| SA Objective 6: Conserve, and where possible, improve biodiversity, including its connectivity. | | | | |
| Development of the site would be compatible with biodiversity policies, NPPF, and relevant legal requirements | The criteria are set out in full in the Biodiversity Assessment, but can be summarised as follows: relatively few constraints; some constraints, but it is anticipated that these can be satisfactorily addressed; development likely to be possible, but significant parts of the site are constrained (e.g. by the presence of a SINC or priority habitat); development may be feasible, but the site is sensitive and further assessment may be required, and off-site compensation may be needed to achieve no net loss in biodiversity; | Biodiversity Assessment 2020, Green Infrastructure Strategy, and information from statutory consultees | | |

| | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|
| | development of the site is likely to be incompatible with biodiversity policies. | | | |
| SA Objective 7: Maintain and improve water quality, and ensure the sustainable management of water resources. | | | | |
| Development of the site would not have a negative impact on water quality | The development is likely to lead to an improvement in water quality; no deterioration; some deterioration, but no change in band status (River Loddon) or any nitrate impacts can be adequately mitigated; deterioration, and it is not clear whether the impacts can be adequately mitigated; deterioration that would result in a change in band status, or where the nitrate impact could not be mitigated. | Water Cycle Study (2020) and information from statutory consultees | | |
| | Criteria to protect the Solent and Southampton Water Special Protection Area (SPA), and Solent Maritime Special Area of Conservation (SAC) based on the location of the site – if a site falls within the River Test and Itchen catchments any development will need to be nitrate neutral in order to avoid harm to the protected sites. | River Test and Itchen Catchment areas (Environment Agency) – this will be clarified through the Water Cycle Study. | | |
| Development of the site would minimise the risk of polluting a water source. | Criteria based on whether a site is within a Source Protection Zone and if so whether its zone 1, or 2 and 3. | Environment Agency information contained on GIS and any additional information from statutory consultees | | |
| There would be adequate water supply to serve the site. | The development of the site could facilitate enhancements to the water supply infrastructure; there is already adequate infrastructure/supply available to meet the increased demand; there is inadequate infrastructure available, but this can be adequately mitigated/addressed; there is inadequate infrastructure/supply available and it is unlikely that this issue can be addressed. | Water Cycle Study (2020); Water Company Water Resource Management Plans and information from statutory consultees | | |

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|--|
| There would be adequate wastewater infrastructure to serve the site | Whether the development of the site will support enhancements to wastewater infrastructure facilities; there is adequate wastewater infrastructure in place to address the increased demand; there is adequate wastewater infrastructure planned in order to address the increased demand; there is inadequate capacity within the network and further investigations required to be undertaken by the water company; major wastewater infrastructure is needed to address the increased demand and it may not be practical or viable for this to be provided. | Water Cycle Study (2020) and consultation with Water companies | | |
| SA Objective 8: Reduce the risk of flooding and the resulting detriment to the local community, environment and economy. | | | | |
| Development of the site would minimise the risk of flooding | The site is within flood zone 1 and there are no known flood constraints; The site is within flood zone 1, but is upstream of a critical drainage area; The site is within flood zone 1, but is within a critical drainage area or is known to suffer with surface water or groundwater flooding issues; A part of the site is within flood zone 2 or 3, but this is not likely prevent the development of the rest of the site; A significant part of the site is within flood zone 2 or 3, and this is likely to make it difficult to develop the site. | EA Flood Zones, Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (2020), EA susceptibility flood maps and Surface Water Management Plans work, and information from statutory consultees | | |
| SA Objective 9: Protect, and where possible enhance, the character and quality of the local landscape and geodiversity. | | | | |
| Development of the site would protect or enhance the borough's landscape character and beauty | Based on sensitivity and landscape value to conclude on the capacity of a site to accommodate new development. Criteria are: major/high; medium/high; medium; medium/low; or low/negligible landscape. This will be informed by the more detailed criteria outlined in the Landscape Sensitivity Study relating to landscape and visual sensitivity, combined with an assessment of landscape value. This category also includes consideration of the impact on | Landscape Capacity Study 2020; Green Infrastructure Strategy; AONB Management Plan and information from statutory consultees | | |

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| | the landscape setting of settlements, and potential trees loss/impacts. Particular regard will need to be had to any impacts on the North Wessex Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. | | | |
| SA Objective 10: Protect, and where possible enhance, heritage assets. | | | | |
| Development of the site would preserve or enhance the significance of designated or non-designated heritage assets, including any contribution made by their setting | <p>Whether the development would have a positive impact on the borough's historic environment; no impact; some negative impact but these can be wholly mitigated; negative impact which can only be partially mitigated; or negative impact which cannot be mitigated against, resulting in development being unacceptable.</p> <p>The above assessment includes consideration of the importance of the asset(s). As per HE guidance, the process requires consideration of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Identify which heritage assets are affected. - Understand what contribution the site makes in its current form. - Identify what impact the allocation might have. <p>Consider potential to maximise enhancements and minimise harm.</p> <p>The assessment also includes consideration of the impact of development on the character and appearance of conservation areas.</p> | <p>The National Heritage List for England (NHLE); The Historic Environment Record (HER) for Hampshire; Conservation Area Appraisals and Management Plans; Heritage SPD; The Local List; The national and local 'Heritage at Risk' registers; Information from statutory consultees; Any statements of significance or site specific studies; Historic England Advice Note 3</p> | | |
| Development of the site would conserve areas of archaeological interest (through avoidance or preservation) | <p>Whether the development would have no impact on areas of archaeological interest; low/acceptable impact; some impact but these can be wholly mitigated against; negative impact which can only partially be mitigated against; or negative impact which cannot be mitigated against. When</p> | <p>Hampshire Historic Environment Record and information from statutory consultees</p> | | |

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| | <p>considering the above it is also necessary to consider to what extent archaeological remains could be successfully integrated into the new development.</p> <p>The above assessment includes consideration of the importance of the asset(s). As per HE guidance, the process requires consideration of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Identify which heritage assets are affected. - Understand what contribution the site makes in its current form. - Identify what impact the allocation might have. <p>Consider potential to maximise enhancements and minimise harm.</p> <p>This assessment includes identifying Scheduled Monuments and considering any impact upon their significance, including their setting.</p> | | | |
| Objective 11: Conserve and enhance the character of the borough's settlements through high quality design that maintains and strengthens local distinctiveness. | | | | |
| The site relates well to the existing settlement in terms of form, scale, character | Whether the development relates well to the existing settlement in terms of form, scale and character; the site may not relate well to the existing settlement but there is potential to mitigate this impact through siting, layout, scale, character and landscape design; or the site does not relate well to the existing settlement in terms of form, scale and character and this is likely to be difficult to fully mitigate. | Character Study for Basingstoke (2020); Countryside Design Summary (included within Landscape, Biodiversity and Trees SPD 2018). Landscape Character Appraisal (2020) and Landscape Capacity Study (2020) | | |
| Development of the site would | Based on whether development would not lead to coalescence of existing | Landscape Capacity Study | | |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| not lead to the coalescence of existing settlements | settlements; has the potential to lead to the coalescence of settlements but there is potential to address this through siting and layout; or development will lead the coalescence of existing settlements. | (2020) and any updates. Landscape Character Study 2020. Relevant sections of neighbourhood plans and their evidence bases | | |
| SA Objective 12: Ensure sustainable economic growth, supporting the diverse economy of the borough and enabling opportunities for new sectors, in order to maintain high levels of employment. | | | | |
| Will the proposed use of the site support sustainable economic growth and provide employment opportunities. | The proposed use of the site will have considerable potential to support sustainable economic growth and/or provide significant job opportunities; the proposed use of the site will have some positive impact on supporting sustainable economic growth and/or provide some job opportunities; the proposed use of the site will have a neutral impact on supporting sustainable economic growth and/or only provide limited or short term job opportunities (i.e. construction); the proposed use of the site could be harmful to sustainable economic growth and/or result in job losses; the proposed use of the site could have a significant detrimental impact on sustainable economic growth and/or result in considerable job losses. | Economic Needs Assessment 2020/2021 | | |
| SA Objective 13: Facilitate improved access to education facilities in order to improve educational attainment and increase opportunities for new skills and learning. | | | | |
| There would be capacity within local primary and secondary schools to accommodate additional pupils created by the site's development or | The site would have the potential to provide or support significant new education provision for the benefit of the new/existing community; there is adequate capacity within local primary and secondary schools to accommodate additional pupils created by the site's development; there is insufficient capacity at present but there is scope to accommodate additional | Schools Organisation Plan (2019-2023) and information from HCC Children's Service Facilities | | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|
| <p>new facilities could be provided</p> | <p>pupils through expansion of existing schools within the catchment area; there is insufficient capacity at present in local primary or secondary schools, and while accommodating the new pupils may be achievable this is likely to be difficult; or there are no schools within a reasonable distance which will be able to accommodate the additional pupils and on-site provision is not achievable due to site constraints or costs.</p> | | | |
| <p>SA Objective 14: Ensure access to services and facilities in order to sustain the vibrancy of communities and enhance the attractiveness of town centres to visitors.</p> | | | | |
| <p>There would be the opportunity to accommodate new local services and facilities to serve the additional population</p> | <p>The development of the site would facilitate the provision of additional/enhanced facilities which would benefit the local community; there is adequate capacity in local services and facilities to accommodate the additional population; there is insufficient capacity at present but there is scope to serve the additional population through the expansion of existing services and facilities or to provide new services and facilities; or services are currently too remote from the site/ there is insufficient capacity and there are no opportunities for expansion or provision of new facilities.</p> | <p>Infrastructure delivery information and service providers</p> | | |
| <p>SITE CONCLUSIONS:</p> | | | | |

Basingstoke and Deane Local Plan Update



Employment Site Assessment

Introduction

To ensure that the Local Plan delivers the most appropriate site allocations for the borough, it is necessary to evaluate the suitability of potential future development sites in a comprehensive and consistent manner. This document sets out the details of the site assessments which have been undertaken.

The site assessment criteria reflects the requirements of the NPPF, and translates these into sites assessment considerations.

A large part of the criteria are also driven by the Sustainability Appraisal. This involves distilling the SA objectives into a set of more site specific objectives/criteria. This ensures that the site assessment and SA process has been fully integrated. The outcomes of the Sustainability Appraisal process itself will also be given due consideration when the site allocation decisions are made.

The process has also been informed by the detailed evidence base developed to inform the Local Plan Update. Such an approach is in line with the National Planning Policy Framework which states that Local Plans should be based upon a robust, up-to-date and adequate evidence base (paragraph 31).

Sites will also be considered sequentially in terms of flood risk, outside of this Site Assessment process, although the findings of the assessment will feed into that sequential testing.

The site assessment process is informed by relevant evidence base studies, which include the:

- Transport Assessment
- Biodiversity Assessment
- Landscape Capacity Study
- Strategic Flood Risk Assessment
- Water Cycle Study
- Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA)

Additional important sources of evidence and information include the:

- Green Infrastructure Strategy
- Green Space Standards
- Accessibility analysis using GIS
- School organisation plan (HCC)
- Agricultural land classification maps (Natural England)
- Minerals mapping (HCC),
- Hampshire Historic Environment Record.

The relevant sources of information/evidence used for each criterion are listed in the individual site

matrices. Officers from different units of the borough council have fed into the assessment process, in addition to outside consultees including Hampshire County Council, Environment Agency, Natural England and relevant utility companies and statutory providers.

A colour coding/traffic light system has been used in order to provide a visual understanding of the findings of the assessment of each category. Commentary has also been included for each category to highlight the key issues associated with individual sites, and to explain the conclusions reached. Each assessment culminates in a summary and conclusion. Sites have not been ranked but the assessment provides an overall indication of those sites that have the most potential to accommodate future development.

| |
|--|
| Key to colour coding/traffic light system: Strongly Negative |
| Negative |
| Neutral |
| Positive |
| Strongly Positive |

Site reference:

Proposal:

| Method for assessment /indicators | Detailed Criteria | Source of Evidence | Potential Impact | Comments |
|---|--|--------------------|------------------|----------|
| SA Objective 2: Ensure the creation of healthy, inclusive and safe communities, both in relation to the provision of new neighbourhoods, and the enhancement of existing places, including by supporting regeneration. | | | | |
| The site falls within, or may impact upon, a deprived area or area identified for regeneration | <p>The site falls within an identified area for regeneration or within a lower super output area which is within the 20% most deprived nationally and the development can positively contribute towards the objective to a significant extent; the site falls within an identified area for regeneration or within a lower super output area which is within the 20% most deprived nationally and the development can positively contribute towards the objective to a limited extent or it is located outside of such an area but may have indirect benefits for the deprived/regeneration area: The site is unlikely to impact upon deprived areas or areas identified for regeneration; The site/development could have a limited negative impact on deprivation/regeneration</p> | | | |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|
| | objectives, including indirect impacts from sites outside such areas; The site/development could have a significant negative impact on deprivation/regeneration objectives. | | | |
| SA Objective: 3. Reduce the need to travel, improve choice and access to sustainable transport options including walking and cycling as well as ensuring a safe and efficient transport system. | | | | |
| The site would be highly accessible; it would be moderately accessible; it would not be accessible, but could realistically be made accessible through the provision of additional infrastructure or services; the site would be moderately inaccessible; the site would be highly inaccessible. | GIS accessibility modelling tool (insert official name); Public Transport mapping; Cycle Strategy; Transport Assessment 2020; Basingstoke Transport Strategy 2019. | Cycle Strategy; Transport Assessment 2020; Basingstoke Transport Strategy (2019) | | Pedestrian & Cycle Infrastructure: Bus Rail Accessibility: |
| There would be opportunities for the development of the site to provide viable new/improved transport infrastructure, that offers a genuine choice of transport modes including | The development of the site would offer clear opportunities to improve transport options, and these are likely to be deliverable; the site may offer the opportunity to improve transport options, but this is not clearly defined and/or there is uncertainty about the deliverability potential; the potential to deliver any improved transport | Cycle Strategy; Transport Assessment 2020; Basingstoke Transport Strategy (2019) | | |

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|--|
| <p>walking, cycling and public transport use that would successfully integrate into the existing movement networks.</p> | <p>infrastructure is limited, and/or there are concerns that such infrastructure may well be undeliverable; there is no potential to deliver improved transport options and/or the deliverability of any potential options is very likely to be undeliverable. The assessment of the considerations above will be informed by consideration of the sustainability credentials of the enhanced transport opportunities in question.</p> | | | |
| <p>There would be suitable highway access for all users</p> | <p>The site has an existing suitable access for all users; a new or improved access can realistically be provided without causing significant detrimental impacts or impacting markedly on viability; providing new or improving an existing access for all users is potentially achievable, but may result in detrimental impacts or impinge on viability, but it is likely that this can be adequately mitigate; providing a new, or improving an existing access, may result in significant detrimental impacts or impinge the viability of the site, and it is unlikely that this can be adequately mitigated and/or may undermine the delivery of the site.</p> | <p>Cycle Strategy; Transport Assessment 2020; Basingstoke Transport Strategy (2019)</p> | | |
| <p>The existing highways infrastructure can accommodate</p> | <p>Whether it is likely that the local highway network can accommodate the additional traffic flows generated from the site without causing</p> | <p>Cycle Strategy; Transport Assessment 2020; Basingstoke</p> | | |

| | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|
| additional traffic flows or appropriate additional infrastructure or mitigation measures could be provided | severe impact on road network; mitigation measures could realistically be used to accommodate traffic generated from the site; or significant investment would be needed to accommodate flows on the wider network to mitigate congestion, and it is unclear whether this can be mitigated against; or the additionally generated traffic would have a severe impact, which it would not be able to be mitigated against. | Transport Strategy (2019) | | |
| SA Objective: 4. Reduce pollution (including minimising emissions of greenhouse gases to achieve zero net carbon), and support mitigation and adaptation measures required for the impact of climate change | | | | |
| The development of the site would not have a significant detrimental impact on existing air quality and emission values | The development of the site provides an opportunity to improve in air quality; there will be no change in air quality levels; there is potential for change, and this may require further consideration; there is the potential for a detrimental impact on air quality, but mitigation measures have been proposed; there is a risk of exceedance of national air quality levels. | | | |
| Development of the site would be compatible with nearby land uses | The development of the site for the proposed use will be compatible with nearby land uses; the development of the site is likely to be compatible with nearby land uses provided appropriate mitigation measure are incorporated into the new development; the development of the site is likely to create a significant conflict with nearby land uses | Analysis of neighbourly uses/properties; and assessment by Environmental Health officers | | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|
| | and it is unlikely that adequate mitigation measures can be incorporated into the new development. | | | |
| The development of the site would not inflict an unacceptable noise impact on neighbouring land uses | The development would not inflict any adverse noise impact or there are no sensitive land uses which would be affected; the site could create a level of noise which may have a detrimental impact, but this is unlikely to require mitigation; the development could generate significant amounts of noise, but it is likely that this can be mitigated; the development would generate significant amounts of noise it is not likely that this can be satisfactorily mitigated. | Proximity to relevant land uses (road, rail, commercial etc.); assessment by Environmental Health officers | | |
| The site benefits from suitable ground conditions | No evidence of previous contamination; owing to previous use, there could be some contamination, but this is not likely to be prohibitive to development; previous use indicates potential for significant contamination, which could impact upon the development of the site. | Historic land use maps; Site investigation reports, landfill site evidence | | |
| SA Objective: 5. Minimise and improve the efficiency of resource use | | | | |
| The site would have the potential to incorporate and/or promote the use of sustainable design features and climate change | The site has considerable potential to utilise a wide range of sustainable design features and climate change adaption/mitigation measures; the site has the potential to deliver a limited range of sustainable design features and climate change adaption/mitigation measures; there are likely to be | | | |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| adaption/mitigation measures | significant limitations on the potential to utilise sustainable design features climate change adaption/mitigation measures. | | | |
| Re-use of previously developed land | <p>The development of the site would make use of previously developed land (PDL) which currently has a detrimental impact upon the local environment and/ local communities; development of the site would involve development of previously developed land which currently does not have a detrimental impact on the local environment;</p> <p>Development of the site would involve a combination of previously developed and non-previously developed;</p> <p>Development would involve previously developed land, but it is situated in an isolated location; involves development of greenfield site or is PDL but would involve the loss of an important existing use.</p> <p>Where the site involves a mixture of PDL and greenfield, the assessment will take account of the proportion of the site which is currently previously developed.</p> | | | |
| Development of the site is likely to be the most appropriate use of the site and | The proposed use is likely to be a more appropriate or efficient use of land than is currently the case and there is no use which would be more | | | |

| | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|
| <p>achieves efficient use of land (when considered against any reasonably likely alternative uses or known land use needs)</p> | <p>appropriate than is now proposed; there is another appropriate alternative use (which may include any current use), but it is likely that this can be provided elsewhere or the loss of the existing use would not have a significant detrimental social or economic impact; there is likely to be a more appropriate alternative use (which may include any current use which would be lost), the loss of which, or failure to make provision for, could have detrimental social or economic impacts, and it is likely to be difficult to provide that use elsewhere.</p> | | | |
| <p>Development of the site would avoid the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land</p> | <p>Criteria based on Agricultural Land Classification in terms of whether a site is wholly or predominantly within Grades 1, 2 or 3a (excellent quality/very good/ good); Grade 3b (moderate quality); Grade 4 (poor quality); or Grade 5 (very poor quality). Poorer quality land should be preferred to those of a higher quality.</p> | <p>Strategic scale provisional Agricultural Land Classification, (Natural England)</p> | | |
| <p>Development of the site would avoid the sterilisation of mineral resources</p> | <p>Whether there would be no significant mineral constraint; there would be a mineral constraint associated with the development, but it is likely that this can be adequately mitigated/addressed as part of the development of the site; there is likely to be a significant mineral constraint and this may prevent or</p> | <p>Hampshire County Council Minerals and Waste Local Plan</p> | | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|
| | significantly constrain the development of the site for the use under consideration. | | | |
| SA Objective: 6. Conserve, and where possible, improve biodiversity, including its connectivity | | | | |
| Development of the site would be compatible with biodiversity policies, NPPF, and relevant legal requirements | The criteria are set out in full in the Biodiversity Assessment, but can be summarised as follows: relatively few constraints; some constraints, but it is anticipated that these can be satisfactorily addressed; development likely to be possible, but significant parts of the site are constrained (e.g. by the presence of a SINC or priority habitat); development may be feasible, but the site is sensitive and further assessment may be required, and off-site compensation may be needed to achieve no net loss in biodiversity; development of the site is likely to be incompatible with biodiversity policies. | Biodiversity Assessment 2020, Green Infrastructure Strategy, and information from statutory consultees | | |
| SA Objective: 7. Maintain and improve water quality, and ensure the sustainable management of water resources. | | | | |
| Development of the site would not have a negative impact on water quality | The development is likely to lead to an improvement in water quality; no deterioration; some deterioration, but no change in band status (River Loddon) or any nitrate impacts can be adequately mitigated; deterioration, and it is not clear whether the impacts can be adequately mitigated; deterioration that would result in a change in band status, or where the | Water Cycle Study (2020) and information from statutory consultees | | |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| | nitrate impact could not be mitigated. | | | |
| | Criteria to protect the Solent and Southampton Water Special Protection Area (SPA), and Solent Maritime Special Area of Conservation (SAC) based on the location of the site – if a site falls within the River Test and Itchen catchments any development will need to be nitrate neutral in order to avoid harm to the protected sites. | River Test and Itchen Catchment areas (Environment Agency) – this will be clarified through the Water Cycle Study. | | |
| Development of the site would minimise the risk of polluting a water source | Criteria based on whether a site is within a Source Protection Zone and if so whether its zone 1, or 2 and 3. | Environment Agency information contained on GIS and any additional information from statutory consultees | | |
| There would be adequate water supply to serve the site | The development of the site could facilitate enhancements to the water supply infrastructure; there is already adequate infrastructure/supply available to meet the increased demand; there is inadequate infrastructure available, but this can be adequately mitigated/addressed; there is inadequate infrastructure/supply available and it is unlikely that this issue can be addressed. | Water Cycle Study (2020); Water Company Water Resource Management Plans and information from statutory consultees | | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|--|
| There would be adequate sewerage infrastructure to serve the site | Whether the development of the site will support enhancements to sewerage infrastructure facilities; there is adequate sewerage infrastructure in place to address the increased demand; there is adequate sewerage infrastructure planned in order to address the increased demand; there is inadequate capacity within the network and further investigations required to be undertaken by the water company; major sewerage infrastructure is needed to address the increased demand and it may not be practical or viable for this to be provided. | Water Cycle Study (2020) and consultation with Water companies | | |
| SA Objective: 8. Reduce the risk of flooding and the resulting detriment to the local community, environment and economy | | | | |
| Development of the site would minimise the risk of flooding | The site is within flood zone 1 and there are no known flood constraints; The site is within flood zone 1, but is upstream of a critical drainage area; The site is within flood zone 1, but is within a critical drainage area or is known to suffer with surface water or groundwater flooding issues; A part of the site is within flood zone 2 or 3, but this is not likely prevent the development of the rest of the site; A significant part of the site is within flood zone 2 or 3, and this is likely to make it difficult to develop the site. | EA Flood Zones, Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (2020), EA susceptibility flood maps and Surface Water Management Plans work, and information from statutory consultees | | |
| SA Objective: 9. Protect, and where possible enhance, the character and quality of the local landscape and geodiversity | | | | |
| Development of the site would protect or | Based on sensitivity and landscape value to conclude on the capacity of a site to | Landscape Capacity Study 2020; Green | | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|--|
| <p>enhance the borough's landscape character and beauty</p> | <p>accommodate new development. Criteria are: major/high; medium/high; medium; medium/low; or low/negligible landscape. This will be informed by the more detailed criteria outlined in the Landscape Sensitivity Assessment relating to landscape and visual sensitivity, combined with an assessment of landscape value. This category also includes consideration of the impact on the landscape setting of settlements, and potential trees loss/impacts.</p> | <p>Infrastructure Strategy; AONB Management Plan and information from statutory consultees</p> | | |
| <p>SA Objective: 10. Protect, and where possible enhance, heritage assets</p> | | | | |
| <p>Development of the site would preserve or enhance the significance of designated or non-designated heritage assets, including any contribution made by their setting</p> | <p>Whether the development would have a positive impact on the borough's historic environment; no impact; some negative impact but these can be wholly mitigated; negative impact which can only be partially mitigated; or negative impact which cannot be mitigated against, resulting in development being unacceptable.</p> <p>The above assessment includes consideration of the importance of the asset(s). As per HE guidance, the process requires consideration of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Identify which heritage assets are affected. - Understand what contribution the site makes in its current form. | <p>The National Heritage List for England (NHLE); The Historic Environment Record (HER) for Hampshire; Conservation Area Appraisals and Management Plans; Heritage SPD; The Local List; The national and local 'Heritage at Risk' registers; Information from statutory consultees; Any statements of significance or site specific studies; Historic</p> | | |

| | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Identify what impact the allocation might have. - Consider potential to maximise enhancements and minimise harm. | England Advice Note 3 | | |
| Development of the site would conserve areas of archaeological interest (through avoidance or preservation) | Whether the development would have no impact on areas of archaeological interest; low/acceptable impact; some impact but these can be wholly mitigated against; negative impact which can only partially be mitigated against; or negative impact which cannot be mitigated against. When considering the above it is also necessary to consider to what extent archaeological remains could be successfully integrated into the new development. | Hampshire Historic Environment Record and information from statutory consultees | | |
| Objective 11: Conserve and enhance the character of the borough's settlements through high quality design that maintains and strengthens local distinctiveness. | | | | |
| The site relates well to the existing settlement in terms of form, scale, character | Whether the development relates well to the existing settlement in terms of form, scale and character; the site may not relate well to the existing settlement but there is potential to mitigate this impact through siting, layout, scale, character and landscape design; or the site does not relate well to the existing settlement in terms of form, scale and character and this is likely to be difficult to fully mitigate. | Character Study for Basingstoke (2020); Countryside Design Summary (included within Landscape, Biodiversity and Trees SPD 2018). Landscape Character Appraisal (2020) and Landscape Capacity Study (2020) | | |

| | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|
| Development of the site would not lead to the coalescence of existing settlements | Based on whether development would not lead to coalescence of existing settlements; has the potential to lead to the coalescence of settlements but there is potential to address this through siting and layout; or development will lead the coalescence of existing settlements. | Landscape Capacity Study (2020) and any updates. Landscape Character Study 2020. Relevant sections of neighbourhood plans and their evidence bases. | | |
| SA Objective 12. Ensure sustainable economic growth, supporting the diverse economy of the borough and enabling opportunities for new sectors, in order to maintain high levels of employment | | | | |
| Potential to meet local economic needs | The site would have significant potential to meet local economic needs; it would have moderate potential to meet local economic needs; it would have a neutral impact on local economic needs; it is likely to have a detrimental impact on the borough's economy; it is likely that it will have a significant detrimental impact on the borough's economy. The consideration of the above recognises the need to build on strengths, counter any weaknesses and address the challenges of the future. | Economic Needs Assessment; EM3 LEP Industrial Strategy; EM3 Commercial Property Market Study 2016; EM3 Strategic Economic Plan 2018 - 2030 | | |
| Potential to address wider economic needs | The site has significant potential to address wider economic needs; it would have a moderate potential to address wider economic needs; it would have a neutral impact on wider economic needs; it would be inconsistent with wider economic needs; it would be significantly inconsistent with wider economic needs. The | Economic Needs Assessment; EM3 LEP Industrial Strategy; EM3 Commercial Property Market Study 2016; EM3 Strategic Economic Plan 2018 - 2030 | | |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| | consideration of the above recognises the need to build on strengths, counter any weaknesses and address the challenges of the future. | | | |
| Whether the location is suitable for the type of employment development proposed. | The location is likely to be very suitable for the type of development proposed; it is moderately suitable for the type development proposed; it would be moderately unsuitable; it would be significantly unsuitable. The consideration of the above has regard to the specific locational requirements of different economic sectors. | Economic Needs Assessment; EM3 LEP Industrial Strategy; EM3 Commercial Property Market Study 2016; EM3 Strategic Economic Plan 2018 - 30 | | |
| The development of the site is deliverable, economically viable, and accords with financial contributions, infrastructure provision and policy requirements | This category is important for ensuring that the employment premises in question can be successfully delivered, and hence make the necessary contribution to the local economy. Based on criteria set out in the NPPF and associated guidance which relates to whether there is a reasonable prospect that housing will be developed on the site at a particular point in time (higher scores will be accorded to sites which can deliver more quickly); market cost or delivery factors have been identified which may delay the achievability of the site; or delivery is not likely to be achievable. The assessment of the above will also be informed by whether there is a development | | | |

| | | | | |
|--------------------------|---|--|--|--|
| | <p>partner/prospective developer in place to progress the delivery of the site, as this is likely to improve the deliverability position.</p> <p>Making this assessment also involves consideration of the sites availability, as this will influence the success and speed of delivery. Sites which are available within the shortest timescale will support a more positive assessment of the site.</p> | | | |
| <p>SITE CONCLUSIONS:</p> | | | | |