

Policy KW2: Land Adjoining the Cart & Horses PH

Overview of Comments:

Support - 3

Neither support or object - 9

Object – 8

The changes to the supporting text and the Local Plan policies have not only been informed by the responses to the Regulation 18 consultation but they have also taken on board any additional feedback that has come out of discussions/meetings with statutory consultees and members in order to improve the clarity and understanding of the contents of the Local Plan.

Comments which neither support nor object to Policy KW2: Land adjoining the Cart and Horses PH		
Respondent number	Comment	Officer comment
BHLF-KSAR-N86F-K Natural England Link here	This allocation is also in close proximity to the River Itchen SSSI & SAC, we advise this allocation is linked to policies NE6 and NE17. To ensure that impacts to the River Itchen from pollution via surface water are avoided, the policy should include a requirement for assessment of impacts from surface water-run off, and incorporation of naturalised SuDS features as appropriate.	Comments noted. It is important to read the Plan as a whole and cross-referencing to other policies should be avoided. Recommended response: No change
BHLF-KSAR-N8Z7-8 South Downs National Park Authority	Policy KW2 should be amended to reference Policy NE8 (South Downs National Park) and set out that the proposed development site will be within the setting of the SDNP. As such, development will need to be sensitively located and designed to avoid or minimise adverse impacts on the SDNP.	Comments noted. It is important to read the Plan as a whole and cross-referencing to other policies should be avoided. Criterion viii of Policy KW2 already refers to protecting important views of the National Park. However, it is accepted that there should be reference

		<p>to avoiding harm to the setting of the National Park.</p> <p>Recommended response: Amend Policy KW2 criterion viii. as follows: Ensure that development is designed so as to protect important views of the conservation areas, listed buildings and South Downs National Park <i>and minimise harm to their setting.</i></p>
<p>BHLF-KSAR-N86T-1 Hampshire County Council (Transport)</p>	<p>Request that the KW2 policy wording be revised to allow for developer contributions to be collected towards improvement works at the Cart and Horses junction as an alternative to direct provision.</p>	<p>The Cart and Horses junction will be affected by proposals to upgrade M3 junction 9. Also Hampshire County Council has consulted on alternative options for improving the junction, involving either a double roundabout arrangement or traffic lights. There is, therefore, some current uncertainty about the form and timing of the junction improvement.</p> <p>Development must be accessed from this junction, so needs to await the resolution of these uncertainties. It would also need to contribute towards the costs of changes to the junction and Hampshire County Council requests that financial contributions could be allowed for, rather than just physical improvements.</p> <p>This makes sense given the uncertainties, although Policy KW2 already requires development to <i>'provide</i></p>

		<p><i>for</i> the rearrangement of the junction. This is intended to allow for either physical improvements or a financial contribution, so it is not necessary to amend this wording. However, criterion ii of the policy on phasing should be amended to refer to the need to resolve access arrangements prior to the site being permitted.</p> <p>Recommended response: Amend Policy KW2 criterion ii. as follows: As older person's accommodation is a housing priority, there is no restriction on the phasing of development, <u>subject to the need to ensure development does not take place in advance of the rearrangement of the Basingstoke Road, London Road and B3047 junction.</u></p>
ANON-KSAR-N8VD-H	<p>National planning policy guidance states that the need to provide housing for older people is critical and in October 2022 Professor Les Mayhew indicated that the government needs to initiate older people's housing of up to 50,000 new units a year, one sixth of the government's annual housing target. The allocation of land adjacent to the Cart and Horses is the only site-specific allocation for older person's housing in the Plan and is supported.</p> <p>The location close to local facilities and public transport services and the physical characteristics of the site offer an opportunity to deliver high-quality, purpose-built accommodation for older people. Agreement has been reached in principle with Hampshire County Council over</p>	<p>Support welcomed and the comments regarding the need for older persons housing and site access are noted.</p> <p>Further discussions have been held with the respondent (who is the site promoter) and additional joint working has been undertaken on development options and constraints. These confirm that a viable development can be achieved within the constraints present, by focussing development towards the eastern part of the site so as to limit impact on the trees</p>

	<p>how to access the site and deliver highway improvements which will enable the known accident blackspot at the junction of London Road with the A33 to be eliminated. These represent a significant opportunity to deliver public benefits and form an integral element of the proposed development. Anchor Properties therefore supports paragraph 14.77 which recognises that the location and characteristics of the site make it suited to older person's housing.</p> <p>Concerned that the scale of development has been derived from a mathematical exercise, rather than detailed consideration of important factors, including constraints, the potential to deliver older persons housing and a high quality place, or the development's viability. The scale of development identified in policy KW2 has potentially underestimated the site's potential and this needs to be evaluated and confirmed following discussions about constraints, design opportunities and viability. Anchor Properties will be undertaking a high level viability appraisal of the proposed development and the results will be discussed with the council as soon as they are available.</p>	<p>on land to the west and around the perimeter of the site.</p> <p>The proposed care facility has also been removed as such provision is now likely to be made on and allocated by policy KW1 at Church Lane. As a result, the estimated capacity has been revised upwards to 75 dwellings or dwelling equivalents, although this is likely to be a modest estimate.</p> <p>Policy KW2 should be amended accordingly but the policy and its explanatory text already adequately ensure the protection of important trees and require the development of a woodland management document. Amendments should be made to paragraph 14.77 to give more flexibility over the type of older person's housing provided.</p> <p>Recommended response: Amend policy KW2 as follows: 'Land adjoining the Cart & Horses PH, Basingstoke Road, as shown on the Policies Map, is allocated for the development of older person's housing of about 757 dwelling equivalents....'</p> <p>Amend paragraph 14.77 as follows:</p>
--	--	--

		<p>'The location and characteristics of the site make it suited to the development of older person's housing. For care units a proportion is used to determine the 'dwelling equivalents' provided (1.8 care units = 1 dwelling). It is expected that the site could accommodate a mix of <u>older person's accommodation and associated facilities</u> care accommodation (communal) and assisted living units (independent) which would equate overall to about 7570 dwellings....'</p>
<p>BHLF-KSAR-N86Z-7</p>	<p>The GP surgeries that serve these potential sites are currently over-subscribed by 10,900 and the additional dwellings from the local plan will add a further 581 patients. The NHS will be seeking financial contributions to increase the primary care space by a further 46 sq m.</p> <p>The Winchester surgeries and PCN have been clear that it does not feel able to absorb any further increases in population without significant further investment in primary care infrastructure. Due to the additional healthcare activities that will derive from the Local Plan there should be references in policy KW2 to the requirement for impacts to be mitigated.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Officers have held a number of meetings with the ICB to understand further this representation and others on proposed site allocations in the regulation 18 draft Local Plan. Further information has been sought from the ICB to provide more detail on the nature and scope of any deficit in GP surgery facilities and how it may be resolved. This includes confirmation of which surgeries serve proposed allocations and which may require improvement. At this point it is considered prudent for the Plan and associated Infrastructure Delivery Plan to note this position and set out a mechanism to deal with any necessary infrastructure requirements arising from this request. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan will include the most recent</p>

		<p>information received from the ICB regarding the capacity of infrastructure and identified need for any improvements.</p> <p>Recommended response: No change.</p>
BHLF-KSAR-N86H-N	<p>The site allocation is listed in the Hampshire Gardens Trust inventory of Hampshire gardens and parks and is subject to 'blanket' tree preservation orders. It also forms part of the settlement gap between Kings Worthy and Abbots Worthy. The former country house was removed from the site, which has returned to open grass and woodland, so it is inappropriate to imply that it is a brownfield site.</p> <p>The Plan only provides one site allocation for housing for older people (Policy KW2), which is on a greenfield site and within a Local Gap, conflicting with the objectives to prioritise brownfield land. The Plan falls short of its requirements to provide for the increasing ageing population of the district, it is estimated that a total of 2,182 older persons units will be required. The Council should reconsider alternative sites to meet this estimated need whilst reviewing the policy to ensure the range of specialist tenures needed are reflected in the Plan, in accordance the NPPF (land at Crawley Court, Crawley promoted).</p>	<p>Comments regarding the constraints of the site and need for older persons housing are noted. The constraints of the site are recognised in the wording of Policy KW2 and its explanatory text, but the site nevertheless is well related to Kings Worthy and provides a suitable location for older persons' housing.</p> <p>The respondent does not specifically object to Policy KW2 but suggests a need for more sites to be allocated for older persons' housing, specifically land at Crawley Court, Crawley. This is dealt with elsewhere as an 'omission' site, but no change is necessary to Policy KW2 as a result of this comment.</p> <p>Recommended response: No change.</p>
ANON-KSAR-N8YF-P	<p>Not a bad site for development, though biodiversity to the north east side of the site is at least as valuable as some of the decaying and dangerous trees. The poor safety of the Cart and Horses junction is rightly mentioned and major improvement should be a pre-requisite for development. The field and paths through the woodlands are widely used and there are applications for Rights of Way through the area, which should be taken into consideration within any</p>	<p>Comments noted. The wording of Policy KW2 and its explanatory text require a masterplan for the site that would deal with the matters raised. These are also already mentioned in Policy KW2 or are requirements of the Plan's topic-based policies, such as on access, permeability and open space.</p>

	development. A major part should have public access and permeability to allow walking to and from Eversley Park and the primary school.	Recommended response: No change.
--	---	---

Comments which object to Policy KW2: Land adjoining the Cart and Horses PH		
Respondent number	Comment	Officer comment
BHLF-KSAR-N8BQ-A Historic England Link here	The relationship with the designated heritage assets and SDNP is more than a matter of views, also need to consider the contribution made by the assets' setting to their significance. Propose a wording change: viii. Ensure that development is designed so as to protect important views of the conservation areas, listed buildings and South Downs National Park <i>and minimise harm to their setting</i> .	Comment noted. It is accepted that criterion viii currently only seeks to protect important views and that the suggested wording would be an improvement. Recommended response: Amend Policy KW1 criterion viii. as follows: Ensure that development is designed so as to protect important views of the conservation areas, listed buildings and South Downs National Park <u><i>and minimise harm to their setting</i></u> .
BHLF-KSAR-N8BE-X Environment Agency Link here	Based on the information currently available, the site raises some environmental concerns that need to be addressed. Further work will be needed to show how these issues can be satisfactorily addressed. • SPZ • principal aquifer	Comments on the protection of groundwater are noted. A similar point is made by Southern Water (below), which suggests amended wording. It is recommended that revised wording be adopted.

	<p>Water Quality. The entire development area is within Source Protection Zone 1, there may be some constraints on activities, designs and construction works (i.e. fuel storage or drainage options) associated with this development.</p>	<p>Recommended response: Amend Policy KW2 criterion x. as follows: Provide a connection to the nearest point of adequate capacity in the sewerage and water supply network, in collaboration with the service provider. <u>Ensure that the groundwater Source Protection Zone is protected. The layout of development should ensure access to existing sewerage infrastructure for maintenance and upsizing purposes.</u></p>
<p>ANON-KSAR-NK2C-Y Southern Water Link here</p>	<p>This site is within Southern Water's statutory water and wastewater service area. There is a policy requirement for 'connection to the nearest point of adequate capacity in the sewerage network' but since OFWAT's new approach to water and wastewater connections charging we have adjusted our approach and the wording of this requirement is no longer effective. Moreover, our assessment of this site reveals that there is presently adequate capacity within the wastewater network for this development, therefore this policy criterion may be deleted.</p> <p>Our assessment also revealed that site lies within groundwater Source Protection Zone (SPZ) 1. Developers will need to consult with the Environment Agency to ensure the protection of the public water supply source and inform Southern Water of the outcome. Also, Southern Water's infrastructure crosses the site, which needs to be taken into account when designing the layout of development. An easement of 6 metres or more, depending on pipe size and depth, would be required, which may affect site layout or require diversion.</p>	<p>Comments on wastewater connections and the protection of groundwater are noted. A similar point is made by the Environment Agency (above) regarding groundwater protection. It is recommended that revised wording along the lines proposed by this respondent be adopted.</p> <p>Recommended response: Amend Policy KW2 criterion x. as follows: Provide a connection to the nearest point of adequate capacity in the sewerage and water supply network, in collaboration with the service provider. <u>Ensure that the groundwater Source Protection Zone is protected. The layout of development should ensure access to existing sewerage infrastructure for maintenance and upsizing purposes.</u></p>

	<p>Accordingly, we propose the following amendments to Policy KW2:</p> <p>x. Provide a connection to the nearest point of adequate capacity in the sewerage and water supply network, in collaboration with the service provider. Layout of the development must be planned to ensure future access to existing sewerage infrastructure for maintenance and upsizing purposes. Ensure that the groundwater Source Protection Zone is protected.</p>	
ANON-KSAR-N8GD-2	<p>Development must require access to and a significant improvement of the Cart & Horses Junction, including permeability for pedestrians, cyclists and motability scooters. The permeability should join the link between Hinton Fields and Hinton Drive at the point when that link joins with Hinton Drive. It should be possible to walk, cycle or use a motability scooter through the site in a reasonably direct but safe way, to link to routes specified as linking the Cart & Horses junction through to M3 Junction 9.</p> <p>The fact that the site is suitable for older persons development, should not limit the permeability by creating a private gated development.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The wording of Policy KW2 and its explanatory text require rearrangement of the Cart & Horses junction, a pedestrian link to Hinton Field and other off-site improvements as necessary (criteria iii – v). It is important to read the Local Plan as whole and sustainable and active travel is dealt with in a separate topic. This is a very specific issue that can be dealt with as part of the design process. As part of the design process, an applicant will be required to prepare and submit a Design and Access Statement that will need to consider and take into account all users' needs irrespective of gender, age or disability.</p> <p>Recommended response: No change.</p>
ANON-KSAR-N83W-1	<p>The constraints and impacts associated with development of this greenfield site have not been accurately presented or assessed on an objective basis in the Development Strategy and Site Selection Report (DSSSR), nor the</p>	<p>Comments noted. The constraints highlighted have been acknowledged in the explanatory text to policy KW2, the Development Strategy and Site Selection</p>

	<p>Integrated Impact Assessment. The selection and allocation under Policy KW2 is unsound and not adequately supported by evidence.</p> <p>The site is covered by blanket TPOs, with a wooded area of mature trees, and mature trees on the boundaries. Views into the site are limited in the summer months but there are filtered views to the undeveloped field which forms the north western portion of the site, and wider views particularly in the winter. This open and undeveloped land is a key part of the settlement gap between Kings Worthy and Abbots Worthy and development would remove the physical and visual separation of the settlements. The site adjoins the Kings Worthy and Abbots Worthy Conservation Areas and development has the potential to adversely impact them.</p> <p>The woodland in the east and south east of the site does provide enclosure but also provides physical separation from the wider settlement of Kings Worthy. Development on the open parts of the site would be separate from the existing built-up part of Kings Worthy, creating an isolated development out of character with the settlement pattern and limited potential to integrate with it. Other sites promoted through the SHELAA have the potential to better integrate with the settlement pattern and avoid impacting on the settlement gap.</p> <p>The landscape impacts of the development and access improvements have not been adequately considered as the site comprises the setting of the National Park. There would be significant changes to boundary vegetation, together with the impact of the new junction arrangement and street</p>	<p>Report and the Integrated Impact Assessment. The policy itself includes requirements that seek to minimise the impact on trees and the settlement gap and avoid harm to the South Downs National Park. Additional wording is proposed for policy KW2 criterion viii to minimise harm to the conservation areas, listed buildings and the National Park.</p> <p>It is not accepted that development would be separate from the existing built-up area or create isolated development. Indeed the ability to integrate the site, physically and visually, with Kings Worthy provides one of its key benefits over other sites promoted around the village.</p> <p>The Cart and Horses junction will be affected by proposals to upgrade M3 junction 9 and Hampshire County Council has consulted on alternative options for improving the junction. There is, therefore, some current uncertainty about the form and timing of the junction improvement which prevents the policy from being very prescriptive. However, Hampshire County Council has requested flexibility to accept developer contributions, which the policy provides, and it is proposed amend criterion ii of the policy relating to phasing to ensure</p>
--	---	--

	<p>lighting, and the proposed development itself, which would have a greater landscape and visual impact than acknowledged.</p> <p>The DSSSR is out of date and inaccurate with the accident record at the A33 / B3047 junction having worsened, including a fatality in Autumn 2022. The need for a complete re-design and upgrade of the junction is widely acknowledged, yet has not been accepted by the Highway Authority to date. The wording of Policy KW2 iii is vague and imprecise and could potentially be met by a financial contribution. It should be a requirement that prior to construction/occupation of any dwellings the re-arrangement of the junctions must be delivered. The scale of improvements required, and the costs of delivering them are not clearly articulated and there is no evidence that they can be met without affecting viability.</p> <p>It is clear from this that the Council anticipates that significant areas would remain undeveloped, yet the policy wording is vague and imprecise as to what those areas would be. There could be substantially different impacts from different forms and scales of development within the terms of Policy KW2. The protection that is identified as necessary in the DSSSR must be explicitly secured in Policy KW2. There should be further explanation of the form of development and the development principles with a plan to identify the areas for development.</p> <p>No detailed explanation is provided for why the location and characteristics of the site make it suited to older person's housing. The robustness of the justification for this site (as</p>	<p>that development cannot be in advance of the junction improvement.</p> <p>Criterion i of policy KW2 requires a masterplan to establish the disposition of housing, retained trees, open space, junction arrangements, etc. These are matters which are too detailed for the Local Plan to stipulate, especially given uncertainties round the junction improvements, albeit that they are recognised as important and require masterplanning.</p> <p>The site has been promoted for older persons housing and is well suited to such a use given the need to plan development around areas of retained trees, as well as being well related to various village facilities and services. The site allocation is specifically for older persons' housing, so another form of development would not meet the requirements of the policy.</p> <p>Existing provision is focussed at Eversley Park and there was potential to expand this when Hinton Fields were developed, but this was not felt to be needed at the time. Sports pitch provision could not reasonably be sought from an older persons' scheme and the site is not large</p>
--	--	---

	<p>opposed to any other) for older persons housing should be clearly set out, to avoid the risk that a scheme is promoted a development without older persons housing within it.</p> <p>The Plan has failed to consider the wider needs of Kings Worthy in terms of the deficiency of sports pitches which results in local teams playing on pitches in other settlements. Neither of the allocated sites in Kings Worthy are able to deliver sports pitches and the Council has failed to consider whether other SHELAA could provide the required housing as well as sports pitch provision. No consideration appears to have been given to how the deficiency will be addressed through the Local Plan.</p>	<p>enough to achieve it. The ability of an alternative site to achieve sports pitches should not be the driver for site allocation, and other sites would in any event be separated from Eversley Park.</p> <p>Recommended response: Amend Policy KW2 criterion ii. as follows: As older person's accommodation is a housing priority, there is no restriction on the phasing of development, <u>subject to the need to ensure development does not take place in advance of the rearrangement of the Basingstoke Road, London Road and B3047 junction.</u></p> <p>Amend Policy KW2 criterion viii. as follows: Ensure that development is designed so as to protect important views of the conservation areas, listed buildings and South Downs National Park <u>and minimise harm to their setting.</u></p>
BHLF-KSAR-N8BS-C	<p>This land is no longer in 'active' agricultural use and biodiversity and habitats have developed with varied species of flora and fauna (including Peregrine Falcons). Development would result in a significant adverse impact and a net loss of biodiversity and have a severe impact within the wider ecological network. The site is unlikely to achieve 10% biodiversity net gain without offsetting as it will have a high baseline score.</p> <p>The site would have a major adverse impact on the</p>	<p>Comments noted. Other policies of the Plan deal with biodiversity and it is important to read the Plan as a whole, rather than cross-referencing to other policies.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the site is in the currently-defined settlement gap but it is well contained and development would only have a limited effect on the</p>

	<p>settlement gap between Kings Worthy and Abbots Worthy. The previous Local Plan inspector's report confirms that the gap is crucial given that both settlements are distinct.</p> <p>The proposed use for a form of specialist housing will not meet market housing needs as identified in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment. If the site is going to deliver Care then the allocation should be for a C2 use.</p>	<p>appearance of the gap. The policy itself includes requirements that seek to ensure that the impact on the settlement gap (as well as trees and the SDNP) is minimised. Criterion i of policy KW2 also requires a masterplan to establish the disposition of housing, retained trees, open space, junction arrangements, etc.</p> <p>The site has been promoted for older persons housing, for which the Strategic Housing Market Assessment shows a need. The policy does not refer to Use Classes in order to provide some flexibility, but is clear that older person's housing is required.</p> <p>Recommended response: No change.</p>
ANON-KSAR-N8SU-Y	This will remove an area of green space and over develop the village.	<p>Comments noted. The Local Plan seeks to prioritise brownfield land, but the housing requirements mean that some greenfield sites also need to be allocated. The site performs well on the selection criteria and is of a modest scale in comparison to the size of the village.</p> <p>Recommended response: No change.</p>
ANON-KSAR-NKEM-V	Over development. Sort out road junction, etc.	<p>Comments noted. The site performs well on the selection criteria and is of a modest scale in comparison to the size of the village. Changes are proposed to policy KW2 criterion ii to ensure that</p>

		development does not take place in advance of junction improvements. Recommended response: Amend Policy KW2 criterion ii. as follows: As older person's accommodation is a housing priority, there is no restriction on the phasing of development, <u>subject to the need to ensure development does not take place in advance of the rearrangement of the Basingstoke Road, London Road and B3047 junction.</u>
--	--	--

	Recommendations	Officer response
Comments from SA	None.	NA
Comments from HRA	None.	NA

Policy KW2: Land adjoining the Cart & Horses PH

Land adjoining the Cart & Horses PH, Basingstoke Road, as shown on the Policies Map, is allocated for the development of older person's housing of about **75** dwelling equivalents (~~site capacity under review and may increase~~). Planning permission will be granted provided that detailed proposals accord with the Development Plan and meet the following specific development requirements:

Nature & Phasing of Development

- i. A masterplan establishing principles for the disposition of housing, retained trees, open space, access and junction arrangements should be submitted. Any applications for all or part of the site should demonstrate how the proposal will accord with these principles and achieve the form of development intended by this allocation as a whole;

- ii. As older person's accommodation is a housing priority, there is no restriction on the phasing of development, **subject to the need to ensure development does not take place in advance of the rearrangement of the Basingstoke Road, London Road and B3047 junction.**

Access

- iii. Provide for the rearrangement of the Basingstoke Road, London Road and B3047 junction so as to ensure safe vehicular access from Basingstoke Road, while protecting the important belt of trees on that edge of the site, and improve pedestrian and cycle access;
- iv. Provide a pedestrian link to the Hinton Field public open space;
- v. Contribute to any other off-site junction improvements necessary.

Environmental

- vi. Undertake an arboricultural survey, retain important trees within the site particularly fronting Basingstoke Road and in the northern and western parts of the site, and establish a management plan for areas of woodland to be retained;
- vii. Use retained trees to determine the layout of development and provide on-site open space (Informal Open Space) so as to create an attractive and accessible environment and retain the openness of the settlement gap;
- viii. Ensure that development is designed so as to protect important views of the conservation areas, listed buildings and South Downs National Park **and minimise harm to their setting.**

Other Infrastructure

- ix. Open space to serve the development in accordance with policy NE3.
- x. ~~Provide a connection to the nearest point of adequate capacity in the sewerage and water supply network, in collaboration with the service provider.~~ **Ensure that the groundwater Source Protection Zone is protected. The layout of development should ensure access to existing sewerage infrastructure for maintenance and upsizing purposes.**
- xi. Identify and contribute to infrastructure needed to make the development acceptable in planning terms.

Explanatory Text

Amend paragraph 14.77 as follows:

'The location and characteristics of the site make it suited to the development of older person's housing. ~~For care units a proportion is used to determine the 'dwelling equivalents' provided (1.8 care units = 1 dwelling).~~ It is expected that the site could accommodate a mix of older person's accommodation and associated facilities ~~care accommodation (communal) and assisted living units (independent)~~ which would equate overall to about 7570 dwellings....'

KW02: Land adj Cart and Horses PH

Proposed use: Residential use



IIA Objective	Score
IIA1: climate change mitigation	Minor negative (-)
IIA2: travel and air quality	Minor negative (-)
IIA4: health and wellbeing	Negligible (0)
IIA7: services and facilities	Minor negative (-)
IIA8: economy	Negligible uncertain (0?)
IIA9: biodiversity and geodiversity	Significant negative (--)
IIA10: landscape	Minor negative uncertain (-?)
IIA11: historic environment	Negligible uncertain (0?)
IIA12: natural resources	Significant negative (--)
IIA13: water resources	Significant negative (--)
IIA14: flood risk	Negligible (0)

IIA objective 1: To minimise the District's contribution to climate change through a reduction of greenhouse gas emissions from all sources and facilitate the aim of carbon neutrality by 2031

Overall effect: Minor negative (-)

Score by criteria: 1a: Major negative (--); 1b: Major positive (++); 1c: Major negative (--); 1d: Major negative (--); 1e: Major positive (++); 1f: Major negative (--); 1g: Major positive (++); 1h: Minor positive (+); 1i: Minor negative (-)

Justification: The site is not within 1,200m of an NHS GP surgery. It is within 400m of a primary school. It is not within 2,000m of a secondary school. It is not within 1,200m of a town centre. It is within 200m of a district or local centre. It is not within 2,000m of a railway station. It is within 300m of a bus stop. It is within 300m of open space, open country or registered common land. Less than 25% of the site contains open space, open county or registered common land, which could be lost to development. The majority of it is within an area where average commuting distance is in 61-80% range for the plan area.

IIA objective 2: To reduce the need to travel by private vehicle in the District and improve air quality

Overall effect: Minor negative (-)

Justification: Appraisal criteria and results are the same as shown under SA objective 1: greenhouse gas emissions.

IIA objective 4: To improve public health and wellbeing and reduce health inequalities in the District

Overall effect: Negligible (0)

Score by criteria: 4a: Negligible (0); 4b: Minor negative (-); 4c: Negligible (0); 4d: Negligible (0); 4e: Major negative (--); 4f: Minor positive (+); 4g: Major positive (++)

Justification: The site is not within 500m of an AQMA. The majority of it is within an area where noise levels at night from roads and railways are above 50 dB or the noise levels as recorded for the 16-hour period between 0700 – 2300 are above 55 dB. The site does not lie within a noise contour associated with Southampton Airport. It is not within 400m of a wastewater treatment works or within 250m of a waste management facility. The site is not within 1,200m of an NHS GP surgery. It is within 300m of open space, open country or registered common land. Less than 25% of the site contains open space, open county or registered common land, which could be lost to development. It is within 200m of a public right of way or cycle path.

IIA objective 7: To ensure essential services and facilities and jobs in the District are accessible

Overall effect: Minor negative (-)

Justification: Appraisal criteria and results are the same as shown under SA objective 1: greenhouse gas emissions.

IIA objective 8: To support the sustainable growth of the District's economy

Overall effect: Negligible uncertain (0?)

Justification: The site is not in existing employment use.

IIA objective 9: To support the District's biodiversity and geodiversity

Overall effect: Significant negative (--)

Score by criteria: 9a: Minor negative (-); 9b: Minor negative (-); 9c: Major negative (--); 9d: Negligible (0); 9e: Negligible (0)

Justification: The site is within a SSSI Impact Risk Zone for 'residential' or 'all planning applications'. It is within 500m of a locally designated wildlife site or ancient woodland. It is within a priority habitat. It is not within 100m of a water course. The site does not intersect with a county or local geological site.

IIA objective 10: To conserve and enhance the character and distinctiveness of the District's landscapes.

Overall effect: Minor negative uncertain (-?)

Justification: The site has medium or higher overall landscape sensitivity

IIA objective 11: To conserve and enhance the District's historic environment including its setting.

Overall effect: Negligible uncertain (0?)

Justification: The site is rated 'green' for risk of effects on heritage assets.

IIA objective 12: To support the efficient use of the District's resources, including land and minerals

Overall effect: Significant negative (--)

Score by criteria: 12a: Major negative (--); 12b: Minor negative (-); 12c: Minor negative (-)

Justification: The majority of the site contains greenfield land. A significant proportion of the site ($\geq 25\%$) is on Grade 3 agricultural land or less than 25% of the site is on Grade 1 or 2 agricultural land. A significant proportion of the site ($\geq 25\%$) is within a Mineral Safeguarding Area.

IIA objective 13: To protect the quality and quantity of the District's water resource

Overall effect: Significant negative (--)

Justification: The site falls within a Source Protection Zone 1.

IIA objective 14: To manage and reduce flood risk from all sources

Overall effect: Negligible (0)

Score by criteria: 14a: Negligible (0); 14b: Negligible (0)

Justification: Less than 25% of the site is within flood zone 2 or 3. Less than 25% of the site has a 1 in 100 year or 1 in 30 year risk of surface water flooding.