

**Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan DPD 2011 – 2029**

**Sustainability Appraisal for Modifications**  
*Incorporating Strategic Environmental Assessment*

March 2015

## **Commenting on this Document**

This Sustainability Appraisal report has been published alongside the Revised Local Plan DPD Modifications Schedule (TVBC14), with both subject to public consultation from 24<sup>th</sup> April to 4.30pm on 5<sup>th</sup> June 2015. Only representations made within this period will be taken into account.

This document is available for inspection at the Former Magistrates Court in Romsey and the Council's office in Andover during normal office hours. It is also available on the Council's website at

<http://www.testvalley.gov.uk/resident/planningandbuildingcontrol/planningpolicy/local-development-framework/revised-local-plan-examination/> .

If you would like to comment on this document please send your views to the address below or the email address.

Your correspondence will be available for public inspection and for copying in accordance with the provisions of the Access to Information Act.

Should you have any questions please contact the Planning Policy team.

Planning Policy  
Test Valley Borough Council  
Beech Hurst  
Weyhill Road  
Andover  
SP10 3AJ  
T: 01264 368000  
E: [LDF@testvalley.gov.uk](mailto:LDF@testvalley.gov.uk)

## Contents

<b>Non-Technical Summary</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>1. Introduction and Background</b> .....	<b>8</b>
Introduction.....	8
Report Context .....	8
Sustainability Appraisal Process .....	9
Consultation .....	10
<b>2. Appraisal Methodology</b> .....	<b>16</b>
Introduction.....	16
Assessment of Minor Modifications .....	17
<b>3. Review of Modifications</b> .....	<b>18</b>
Main Modifications .....	18
Minor Modifications.....	18
<b>4. Predicting and Evaluating Cumulative Effects of the Plan</b> .....	<b>19</b>
Effects on the Environment .....	19
Effects on the Local Community .....	29
Effects on the Local Economy .....	32
Effects on Education and Lifelong Learning .....	33
Effects on Community Safety .....	33
Effects on Health and Wellbeing.....	33
Effects on Leisure and Culture .....	34
Effects on Transport .....	35
Summary of the Main Significant Effects of the Revised Local Plan.....	35
Mitigation Measures .....	36
Monitoring Significant Effects of the Plan .....	37
<b>5. Conclusion</b> .....	<b>45</b>
<b>Appendix 1: Sustainability Appraisal Framework</b> .....	<b>46</b>
<b>Appendix 2: Main Modifications and Consideration of Alternatives</b> .....	<b>57</b>
<b>Appendix 3: Main Modifications and Likely Significant Effects</b> .....	<b>73</b>
<b>Appendix 4: Minor Modifications Assessment</b> .....	<b>90</b>

## Non-Technical Summary

### Introduction

- i. This Sustainability Appraisal Report forms part of the documentation produced to explain how sustainability matters have been considered and taken into account in the preparation of the Council's Revised Local Plan Development Plan Document (DPD) and to ensure it contributes to sustainable development.
- ii. Sustainability Appraisals are intended to support the selection of options in the preparation of plans, not to make the decision. This document is a summary of the Sustainability Appraisal Report.
- iii. The Council has a duty to consider the sustainability of its plans through the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended). It also has to prepare an environmental report of its plans as a result of requirements contained in the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004<sup>1</sup>. The requirements of both pieces of legislation have been met by the Sustainability Appraisal Reports prepared by the Council.
- iv. This Sustainability Appraisal Report should be read in conjunction with the Revised Local Plan DPD, the Sustainability Appraisal Report dated November 2013 and the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report<sup>2</sup>. Summaries of the Scoping Report and the November 2013 Sustainability Appraisal have been prepared and are available via the Council's website<sup>3</sup>.

### What is being assessed?

- v. The Council is preparing a Local Development Framework (LDF) to set out a long term strategy to manage development over the period from 2011 to 2029. The Local Development Framework includes a number of documents. The plan that is being assessed through this Sustainability Appraisal process is the Test Valley Borough Revised Local Plan DPD, which will provide the majority of planning policies used to determine planning applications within Test Valley.
- vi. A Sustainability Appraisal Report was prepared in November 2013 in relation to the Revised Local Plan. This considered various options for developing the plan and their potential effects. The Council took account of this when producing the Revised Local Plan.
- vii. This Sustainability Appraisal Report focuses on modifications to the Revised Local Plan that have been proposed by the Council – these have been set out in document

---

<sup>1</sup> This legislation is also referred to as the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Regulations.

<sup>2</sup> Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report, Test Valley Borough Council, 2011.

<sup>3</sup> At <http://www.testvalley.gov.uk/resident/planningandbuildingcontrol/planningpolicy/local-development-framework/sustainability-appraisal/>.

reference TVBC14. These modifications fall into two categories, main and minor modifications. Main modifications are more substantial amendments that could affect the way the plan is applied. Minor modifications tend to be less significant, for example including typographical errors. There is a need to undertake a sustainability appraisal of main modifications, however the minor modifications have also been considered through this process.

- viii. This assessment does not seek to duplicate work undertaken through the November 2013 Sustainability Appraisal but considers the implications of the proposed modifications on the work previously completed.

### Methodology

- ix. The sustainability appraisal process is undertaken alongside the preparation of the Revised Local Plan. There are a number of stages to the sustainability appraisal process based on the legal requirements, these are:
- Stage A: Setting the context and objectives, establishing the baseline and deciding the scope
  - Stage B: Developing and refining alternative options and assessing effects
  - Stage C: Preparing the Sustainability Appraisal Report
  - Stage D: Consulting on the draft plan and the Sustainability Appraisal Report
  - Stage E: Monitoring the significant effects of implementing the plan
- x. Most of the stages of the process have been considered through the Scoping Report and the November 2013 Sustainability Appraisal. However, this report has focused on reviewing parts of stage B, C and D in relation to the proposed modifications.
- xi. In particular, this appraisal has considered whether there are reasonable alternative options to the modifications that have been proposed by the Council and what the likely significant effects of the modifications are.
- xii. Following on from this, there has been consideration of what the likely effects of the Revised Local Plan are as a whole, when accounting for the modifications put forward. This has been undertaken through a review of the likely effects identified in the November 2013 Sustainability Appraisal.

### Reviewing the Modifications

- xiii. The assessment of the modifications has been divided based on whether they are categorised as 'main' or 'minor'.
- xiv. For the main modifications, there was initially a review of whether there are reasonable alternatives that should be considered - this is presented in Appendix 2. As part of considering of whether there were reasonable alternatives, regard was had to why the modifications were put forward and whether other options would be consistent with national guidance. For example, if the Council had been asked to consider ways to address a specific point, it was deemed unreasonable to put

forward an option of not making a change. None of the modifications were identified as having reasonable alternatives that should be subject to further assessment in this context.

- xv. The second stage of assessment of main modification was to consider if they resulted in any significant effects. Initially this focused on each modification, as well as the modification in the context of the policy it related to. This assessment can be found in Appendix 3. None of the main modifications were identified as having a likely significant effect through this assessment.
- xvi. A separate assessment was undertaken of the minor modifications. This considered both whether there were reasonable alternatives and whether the modifications resulted in a likely significant effect. This is presented in Appendix 4. None of the minor modifications were identified as having a likely significant effect, particularly given the nature of the changes (e.g. a number comprise of typographical corrections or clarifications).

#### Reviewing the Likely Significant Effects of the Revised Local Plan

- xvii. A key part of the sustainability appraisal process is identifying the significant effects of the plan under consideration (i.e. the Revised Local Plan) – this includes short, medium and long term effects; permanent and temporary effects; indirect effects, those which may result in combination with other factors (known as cumulative effects) and those where the effect is increased in combination with other factors (known as synergistic effects). It is also necessary to consider ways to prevent or reduce any significant negative effects through mitigation measures.
- xviii. As noted above, there was consideration of the likely significant effects of the Revised Local Plan through the November 2013 Sustainability Appraisal. This has been reviewed through this report. A summary of the likely effects that has been identified are set out below.
- xix. As a result of the proposed development within the Borough, the population is anticipated to rise. Based on the proposed Borough wide housing figure (588 dwellings per year), the population of Test Valley would increase by approximately 23,000 people between 2011 and 2029<sup>4</sup>. This equates to about a 20% increase when compared to the 2011 Census population figure. This is considered to represent a significant effect. The population increase could be larger given the housing figure is a minimum.
- xx. The amount of affordable housing within the Borough will increase over the plan period. However, there remains uncertainty about the implications on general affordability of housing – there are a range of factors affecting this, of which housing supply is only one.

---

<sup>4</sup> Drawing on Test Valley Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA), Justin Gardner Consulting, 2013.

- xxi. It is also difficult to predict the specific effects on employment and the local economy. As a result of the proposals within the Revised Local Plan, in conjunction with other strategies, it is anticipated that availability of additional land would aid in the rejuvenation of Walworth Business Park, which has the potential to support economic growth in Andover. There is also likely to be an increase in the amount of floorspace within the Borough available for commercial uses.
- xxii. Additional retail provision in Andover may improve the role of the town centre in comparison to its existing status. Without enhancing the retail offer of the town centre there is a risk of further decline relative to nearby towns, such as Basingstoke.
- xxiii. A growth in the population of the Borough is likely to be accompanied by an increase in traffic levels within Test Valley (and beyond the Borough). Additional development is anticipated to support improvement of pedestrian and cycle networks, particularly in the more urban areas of the Borough.
- xxiv. Demand for water, energy and other resources is likely to grow in conjunction with an increase in the population of the Borough. It is anticipated that the per person use of water should reduce when accounting for the policies within the Revised Local Plan in conjunction with other plans and projects.
- xxv. In meeting the housing and employment needs of the Borough, the proposals will result in the development of greenfield (undeveloped) land; this may include the loss of higher quality agricultural land. The landscape of the Borough is likely to be affected, with some parts becoming more urban in appearance. There may also be effects on settlement character and the historic environment. It is difficult to be precise about the nature and significance of these effects as it will in part depend on the proposals that come forward through planning applications. Also, there is not a direct relationship between the scale of proposals and the level of impact on these features.
- xxvi. The impact of development is anticipated to result in a greater risk of indirect effects having an adverse impact on the Borough, rather than direct effects. In most cases, mitigation measures can be provided to reduce these effects.
- xxvii. It is challenging to determine the effects of development when accounting for other causes of change and the potential for effects in combination with other plans and projects. In some cases, the combination of effects can become significant, potentially being worse than the sum of all the individual proposals. A changing climate is likely to affect the Borough over the course of the plan period (2011-2029) and beyond; the impacts of this in conjunction with the Revised Local Plan could increase the significance of effects, for example resulting in more pressure on the water environment.

## Summary of Proposed Mitigation Measures

- xxviii. A range of mitigation measures have been recommended to be included within the Revised Local Plan. In some cases this involves avoiding vulnerable or sensitive locations, such as ecologically important areas. This applies to both the consideration of planning applications and bringing forward the proposed strategic sites. It will be important for the Revised Local Plan to be read as a whole, to ensure policies that cover these matters are taken into account.
- xxix. Additional measures have been proposed to reduce the risk of adverse effects. For example, there is pressure on water resources in the Borough and additional development may add to this. Therefore, a policy is proposed to seek the more efficient use of water in new buildings. In addition, in order to try and reduce growth in traffic levels (and congestion) it has been recommended that steps should be taken to try and ensure that new development is connected to pedestrian, cycle and public transport routes. The provision or contribution towards affordable housing is also sought in conjunction with new residential development given the housing need and issues with affordability of housing within the Borough.
- xxx. When accounting for the potential mitigation measures, it is likely that there will be some remaining impacts as a result of the Revised Local Plan. The landscape and settlement character of parts of the Borough will change, particularly in Andover and Southern Test Valley but also in some of the more rural areas of the Borough. Traffic levels are also likely to increase, which may have an effect on air quality within the Borough. In addition there will be an adverse effect on soil resources, focusing on greenfield sites brought forward for development over the plan period.

## Monitoring the Plan

- xxxi. Monitoring plays an important role in assessing the actual effects of any plans, including the Revised Local Plan. This can feed into more accurate future predictions of effects and can also help identify where changes need to be made to promote more sustainable development within the Borough.
- xxxii. Within the November 2013 Sustainability Appraisal, a monitoring strategy was set out. This identified measures and indicators being reported annually (unless the information is not available this regularly) that will be presented in the Monitoring Reports that form part of the Local Development Framework. This monitoring strategy includes the consideration of the number of dwellings completed each year, affordable housing provided, population size, the areas of specific habitats and ecological designations within Test Valley, and the amount of employment floorspace that is completed.
- xxxiii. The monitoring strategy has been reviewed as part of this report and has been considered to remain appropriate. Therefore, no further indicators have been identified within this appraisal.

## 1. Introduction and Background

### *Introduction*

- 1.1 This Sustainability Appraisal (SA)/ Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Report<sup>5</sup> has been prepared by Test Valley Borough Council to assist in the production of the Revised Local Plan Development Plan Document (DPD), which will form part of the Test Valley Local Development Framework.
- 1.2 There is a statutory requirement to prepare sustainability appraisals to support Development Plan Documents. There is also a requirement to produce an environmental report in line with the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004. This report forms part of the process of fulfilling these requirements and should be read in conjunction with the Sustainability Appraisal Report for the Revised Local Plan dated November 2013<sup>6</sup>.

### *Report Context*

- 1.3 The Test Valley Revised Local Plan (Regulation 22 version) was submitted for Examination in Public in July 2014. Hearing sessions were undertaken as part of this process in December 2014 and January 2015. As a result of the Examination process to date, the Council is proposing modifications to the Revised Local Plan for consideration by the Planning Inspector who has been appointed to conduct the Examination. The focus of this report is to ensure the potential significant effects as a result of the proposed modifications to the Revised Local Plan have been taken into account.
- 1.4 Modifications to a DPD are categorised as being either 'minor' or 'main', depending on the nature of the amendment and how fundamental it is to changing the content of the plan. While the focus of this report is the main modifications (i.e. those that are more substantial in nature), minor modifications (published since the November 2013 Sustainability Appraisal Report) have also been considered.
- 1.5 This report should also be read alongside the Revised Local Plan and the proposed modifications, which are available in document reference TVBC14. This is published on the Council's website at:  
<http://www.testvalley.gov.uk/resident/planningandbuildingcontrol/planningpolicy/local-development-framework/revised-local-plan-examination/>

---

<sup>5</sup> For information, where this report refers to Sustainability Appraisal or the sustainability appraisal process, it should be taken that this includes the requirements of strategic environmental assessment.

<sup>6</sup> Available at: <http://www.testvalley.gov.uk/resident/planningandbuildingcontrol/planningpolicy/local-development-framework/sustainability-appraisal/>

*Sustainability Appraisal Process*

- 1.6 The Sustainability Appraisal report for the Regulation 19 stage (November 2013) provides more detail on the sustainability appraisal / strategic environmental assessment processes and the background to the Revised Local Plan. As such, this information is not repeated in this report. However, Table 1 illustrates the stages of the sustainability appraisal process and when they were undertaken.
- 1.7 Table 2 sets out where the environmental information required by the SEA Directive and Regulations has been provided in order to provide clarity on how and where the requirements have been met.
- 1.8 One of the challenges associated with this stage of the appraisal process is drawing out the potential significant changes as a result of the modifications, which in some cases are proposed to provide clarification in how proposals will be implemented. Therefore while they may be classified as major modifications, they do not necessarily result in new significant effects.

**Table 1: Commentary on the Production of the Sustainability Appraisal**

[Stage A of the process is within the Scoping Report]

SA Stage/task	Who was involved?	When was the work undertaken?
<b>Stage A: Setting the context and objectives, establishing the baseline and deciding on the scope</b>		
Task A1: Identifying other relevant plans, programmes and objectives	Planning Policy Team with assistance from other Council Services	January to February 2011
Task A2: Collecting baseline information	Planning Policy Team with assistance from other Council Services	January to February 2011
Task A3: Identifying sustainability problems / issues	Planning Policy Team with assistance from other Council Services.	January to February 2011
Task A4: Developing SA / SEA objectives (and the SA Framework)	Planning Policy Team	January to February 2011
Task A5: Consultation on the scope of the Sustainability Appraisal	Planning Policy Team; the three statutory environmental consultation bodies <sup>7</sup> plus the other organisations identified in Appendix 1 of the Scoping Report.	February to March 2011
<b>Stage B: Develop and refine alternatives, and assess effects</b>		
B1: Test the plan objectives against the sustainability objectives	Planning Policy Team (with input from other teams within the Council and other organisations for specific aspects).	May to October 2011 for Regulation 25 consultation work; with additional work undertaken from June
B2: Developing strategic alternatives		
B3: Predict the effects of the draft plan		
B4: Evaluate the effects of the draft		

<sup>7</sup> Natural England, Environment Agency and English Heritage are the statutory environmental consultees.

SA Stage/task	Who was involved?	When was the work undertaken?
plan		to December 2012 (for Reg 18 stage) and June to November 2013 (for Reg 19 stage).
B5: Consider ways of mitigating adverse effects		
B6: Proposing measures to monitor the effects of the plan		
<b>Stage C: Preparing the Sustainability Appraisal Report</b>		
C1: Preparing the Sustainability Appraisal Report	Planning Policy Team	May – October 2011 for Regulation 25 work; with additional work undertaken from June to December 2012 for the Regulation 18 work and from June to November 2013 for the Regulation 19 report.
<b>Stage D: Consult on the draft plan and the Sustainability Appraisal Report</b>		
D1: Consult on the draft plan and the Sustainability Appraisal Report	Planning Policy Team	January to March 2014 for Regulation 19 stage
D2: Assess significant changes	<i>The Examination of the Revised Local Plan DPD is currently underway. This report seeks to consider the potential significant effects accounting for modifications to the emerging plan proposed by the Council.</i>	
D3: Make decisions and provide information	<i>This stage will be completed following the receipt of the recommendations of the Inspector following the examination into the soundness of the plan.</i>	
<b>Stage E: Monitor the significant effects of implementation of the plan</b>		
E1: Develop the monitoring arrangements	<i>These stages will be completed once the plan has been formally adopted, but consideration of monitoring arrangements has been a continuing activity in the development of the Revised Local Plan and associated Sustainability Appraisal – for more information see Chapter 16 of the November 2013 report . One of the key issues associated with monitoring is identifying appropriate (and available) indicators / measures to monitor the potential significant effects identified and other potential effects on the environment. In some cases other proxies have had to be identified.</i>	

### Consultation

- 1.9 Public and stakeholder participation is an important element of the plan making and sustainability appraisal process. It helps to ensure that the Sustainability Appraisal Report will be robust and have due regard to the appropriate information that will support the Plan in its contribution to sustainable development. This includes consideration of whether all likely significant effects have been identified.

- 1.10 Consultation has been undertaken on previous SA reports alongside the production of the Revised Local Plan DPD. As noted within the 'Commenting on this Document' section, this Sustainability Appraisal Report has been published for consultation for a period of six weeks alongside the main modifications to the Revised Local Plan from 24<sup>th</sup> April to 5<sup>th</sup> June 2015. Comments on the information contained within this report, or its relationship with the modifications, will be considered by the Council and forwarded to the Inspector.

**Table 2: The SEA Directive Requirements<sup>8</sup>**

SEA Requirement	Where covered in this Report
<p>Preparation of an environmental report in which the likely significant effects on the environment of implementing the plan or programme, and reasonable alternatives taking into account the objectives and geographical scope of the plan or programme, are identified, described and evaluated. The information to be given is (Art. 5 and Annex I):</p>	<p>The November 2013 SA Report and this report incorporate the Environmental Report required by the SEA Directive and Regulations. Table 10 of the November 2013 SA Report signposts where the environmental information has been included in relation to the SA objectives which have been used to appraise the Plan options.</p>
<p>a) An outline of the contents, main objectives of the plan or programme, and relationship with other relevant plans and programmes;</p>	<p>An outline of the content and objectives of the Revised Local Plan DPD is covered in Chapter 1 of the November 2013 SA Report. The relevant plans and programmes are covered in the SA Scoping Report and as updated within Appendix 1 of the November 2013 SA Report. More recently published plans and programmes have been taken into consideration in the preparation of this report.</p>
<p>b) The relevant aspects of the current state of the environment and the likely evolution thereof without implementation of the plan or programme;</p>	<p>This is covered in the SA Scoping Report and is summarised in Chapter 5 of the November 2013 SA Report.</p>
<p>c) The environmental characteristics of areas likely to be significantly affected;</p>	<p>This is covered in the SA Scoping Report and is considered in Chapters 8 to 15 of the November 2013 Report and Chapter 4 of this report.</p>
<p>d) Any existing environmental problems which are relevant to the plan or programme including, in particular, those relating to any areas of a particular environmental importance, such as areas designated pursuant to Directives 79/409/EEC and 92/43/EEC;</p>	<p>This is covered in the SA Scoping Report and is summarised in Chapters 4 and 5 of the November 2013 SA Report.</p>
<p>e) The environmental protection objectives, established at international, Community or national level, which are relevant to the plan or programme and the way those objectives and any environmental considerations have</p>	<p>This is covered in the SA Scoping Report and Appendix 1 of the November 2013 SA Report. It was also incorporated through the testing of options against sustainability</p>

<sup>8</sup> Using same template as Table 4 of the November 2013 Sustainability Appraisal which is based on Figure 1 of A Practical Guide to the Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive, ODPM, 2005.

SEA Requirement	Where covered in this Report
<p>been taken into account during its preparation;</p>	<p>objectives in the November 2013 SA Report (which were prepared taking account of the environmental protection objectives in other relevant plans and programmes and other environmental considerations).</p>
<p>f) The likely significant effects on the environment, including on issues such as biodiversity, population, human health, fauna, flora, soil, water, air, climatic factors, material assets, cultural heritage including architectural and archaeological heritage, landscape and the interrelationship between the above factors. (Footnote: These effects should include secondary, cumulative, synergistic, short, medium and long-term, permanent and temporary, positive and negative effects);</p>	<p>An assessment of the likely significant effects is undertaken as part of the consideration of alternative options within the SA Reports. There is consideration of the effects of the Plan as a whole in Chapter 15 of the November 2013 SA Report and Chapter 4 of this report.</p>
<p>g) The measures envisaged to prevent, reduce and as fully as possible offset any significant adverse effects on the environment of implementing the plan or programme;</p>	<p>Mitigation measures have been considered as part of the appraisal of alternative options as well as in conjunction with the discussion of the effects of the Plan. A summary of some of the mitigation measures is identified in Chapter 15 of the November 2013 SA Report and Chapter 4 of this report.</p>
<p>h) An outline of the reasons for selecting the alternatives dealt with, and a description of how the assessment was undertaken including any difficulties (such as technical deficiencies or lack of know-how) encountered in compiling the required information;</p>	<p>The consideration of alternative options has been presented in Chapters 8 to 15 of the November 2013 SA Report. A summary of the key difficulties experienced during the specific stages of the sustainability appraisal process was provided in Table 5 and Chapter 2 of the same report. These matters have also been considered in Chapters 1 and 3 of this report.</p>
<p>i) a description of measures envisaged concerning monitoring in accordance with Article 10;</p>	<p>Chapter 16 of the November 2013 SA Report identifies the monitoring measures that are proposed, there is also consideration of monitoring as part of the sustainability appraisal framework within the SA Scoping Report. The monitoring arrangements are referred to in Chapter 4 of this report.</p>

SEA Requirement	Where covered in this Report
<p>j) a non-technical summary of the information provided under the above headings;</p>	<p>A non-technical summary is provided for this report, with non-technical summaries also provided for the November 2013 SA Report and the Scoping Report (June 2011).</p>
<p>The report shall include the information that may reasonably be required taking into account current knowledge and methods of assessment, the contents and level of detail in the plan or programme, its stage in the decision-making process and the extent to which certain matters are more appropriately assessed at different levels in that process to avoid duplication of the assessment (Art. 5.2).</p>	<p>Information is included through the Scoping Report and the November 2013 SA Report (particularly Chapters 5 and 8 to 15) in relation to the information required. This includes drawing on evidence base studies on specific matters. The report has tried to ensure an appropriate level of detail of information is used, recognising that more detailed information is likely to be required to support the determination of planning applications (which may be supported by environmental statements).</p>
<p>Consultation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Authorities with environmental responsibility shall be consulted when deciding on the scope and level of detail of the information to be included in the environmental report (Art. 5.4).</li> </ul>	<p>Consultation on the SA Scoping Report included the statutory environmental bodies in England, namely English Heritage, Natural England and the Environment Agency (see Chapter 2 of the SA Scoping Report).</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Authorities with environmental responsibility and the public shall be given an early and effective opportunity within the appropriate time frames to express their opinion on the draft plan or programme and the accompanying environmental report before the adoption of the plan or programme (Art, 6.1, 6.2)</li> </ul>	<p>The statutory environmental bodies and the public have been consulted on Sustainability Appraisal Reports, including the November 2013 SA Report. This report is also subject to consultation.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Other EU Member States, where the implementation of the plan or programme is likely to have significant effects on the environment of that country (Art.7).</li> </ul>	<p>Not applicable in this case.</p>
<p>The environmental report and the results of the consultations are taken into account in decision-making (Art. 8).</p>	<p>The Environmental Report has been used to inform the production of the Plan, including the identification of appropriate mitigation measures. This document is subject to consultation alongside the modifications to the Revised Local Plan and the representations received will be taken into</p>

SEA Requirement	Where covered in this Report
	consideration and forwarded to the Inspector.
<p>Provision of information on the decision: When the plan or programme is adopted, the public and any other countries consulted shall be informed and the following made available to those so informed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The plan or programme as adopted</li> <li>- A statement summarising how environmental considerations have been integrated into the plan or programme and how the environmental report pursuant to Article 5, the opinions expressed pursuant to Article 6 and the results of consultations entered into pursuant to Article 7 have been taken into account in accordance with Article 8, and the reasons for choosing the plan or programme as adopted, in the light of the other reasonable alternatives dealt with; and</li> <li>- The measures decided concerning monitoring (Art 9 and 10).</li> </ul>	<p><i>To be undertaken following the conclusion of the Examination in Public.</i></p>
<p>Monitoring of the significant environmental effects of the plan's or programme's implementation (Art. 10).</p>	<p><i>To be undertaken following adoption of the Revised Local Plan DPD. Chapter 16 of the November 2013 SA Report provides details about the anticipated monitoring arrangements.</i></p>
<p>Quality assurance: environmental reports should be of sufficient standard to meet the requirements of the SEA Directive (Art.12)</p>	<p>This is provided through this table and Table 4 of the November 2013 SA Report. It is considered that this report, the November 2013 SA Report and the SA Scoping Report (2011), meets the requirements of the SEA Directive when read together.</p>

## 2. Appraisal Methodology

### *Introduction*

- 2.1 This section provides an overview of the methodology applied for the production of this report. Further details on the approach to undertaking the sustainability appraisal / strategic environmental assessment process is contained within the Sustainability Appraisal Report for the Regulation 19 stage of the Revised Local Plan, particularly chapters 2 and 7.
- 2.2 In undertaking the assessment of modifications, regard has been had to the relationship with other relevant plans and programmes. This includes the publication of the National Planning Practice Guidance and consultation on a Regulation 18 stage Gypsy and Traveller DPD.

### *Assessment of Main Modifications*

- 2.3 Through the appraisal process, there is a need to consider reasonable alternatives to the proposed modifications and also assess the likely significant effects of modifications.
- 2.4 The November 2013 Sustainability Appraisal focused on the approach of the policies rather than the specific policy wording (although the latter was considered in giving a further assessment of the likely significant effects of the plan). Therefore, where the modifications seek to clarify the application of the policy, this is unlikely to result in a significant change in terms of the likely effects and compatibility with the sustainability objectives (relative to the assessment in the November 2013 appraisal)<sup>9</sup>. As such, further assessment of alternatives has not been undertaken.
- 2.5 Where modifications are in response to a request from the Planning Inspector to make a change for soundness reasons, the scope for alternatives may be limited as they would not be considered to be reasonable in the context of conflict with national guidance.
- 2.6 In addition to considering alternatives, there has been an assessment of whether the modifications are likely to have a significant effect. As with the consideration of alternatives, where a modification is proposed to provide clarity but does not result in a substantive change to the likely implications of the policy / proposal no further assessment (beyond that within the November 2013 appraisal) may be necessary. Where a change has not previously been considered and is likely to have a significant effect, there is a need to undertake further assessment of this modification. In relation to the latter, the consideration of effects of the plan as a whole has taken account of the sustainability objectives and sustainability framework (see Appendix 1).

---

<sup>9</sup> In addition, the changes may not be sufficiently distinct to represent an alternative for assessment against the sustainability objectives.

### *Assessment of Minor Modifications*

- 2.7 As set out within Chapter 1 of this report, minor modifications (i.e. addressing typographical errors, providing clarification on matters that do not substantively change the plan) are not the focus of this appraisal process but need to be considered in the context of considering significant effects of the plan. An initial assessment has been undertaken to ensure that there are no significant conflicts between the minor modifications and the sustainability objectives. If this identified any issues, then further appraisal would be undertaken.
- 2.8 In addition, to ensure that the potential effects of all modifications are considered, a review has been undertaken of chapters 15 and 16 of the November 2013 Sustainability Appraisal on the cumulative effects of the Revised Local Plan and monitoring arrangements. This also provides an opportunity to provide updates based on other policy changes in context.

### **3. Review of Modifications**

#### *Main Modifications*

- 3.1 As set out in Chapter 2, main modifications have been reviewed both in terms of the consideration of reasonable alternatives and likely significant effects. The former is presented in Appendix 2 and the latter in Appendix 3 to this report.
- 3.2 As documented in Appendix 2, the nature of the modifications and the reason they have been put forward has not given rise to a need to appraise alternatives. Therefore, there is no further information presented in this report regarding alternative options.
- 3.3 Similarly, as set out in Appendix 3, none of the main modification were considered to have a likely significant effect when considered alone and in the context of the aspect of the plan to which they relate.
- 3.4 The potential for significant effects when considered in combination with the plan as a whole has been considered in in the following chapter of this report.

#### *Minor Modifications*

- 3.5 The initial assessment (Appendix 4) of the proposed minor modifications indicated that no further assessment of their effects was required when considered alone or in the context of the aspect of the plan to which they relate.
- 3.6 The potential for significant effects when considered in combination with the plan as a whole has been considered in in the following chapter of this report.

## **4. Predicting and Evaluating Cumulative Effects of the Plan**

- 4.1 This section of the appraisal seeks to predict and evaluate the effects of the emerging Revised Local Plan and identify mitigation measures. It provides an account of the likely effects of the plan as a whole, when taking account of other relevant plans, policies and programmes.
- 4.2 As is set out within the SEA Directive, the consideration of effects needs to account for secondary (or indirect), cumulative, synergistic, short, medium and long term, permanent and temporary, positive and negative effects. Chapter 15 of the November 2013 SA report provides a description of cumulative and synergistic effects. There is not always a clear distinction between these different types of effects.
- 4.3 Given the strategic nature of the Plan, and the dependence on the proposals that come forward, it is difficult to be precise about the likely effects and the potential interactions with other plans, policies and programmes. In addition, with the scale of growth often being presented as minimum figures (e.g. for the scale of residential development through policy COM1), the nature and degree of effects may be different from that set out below. Many of the effects identified as a result of the Plan are similar to those identified in the November 2013 SA Report.
- 4.4 The consideration of effects has been based on the topics used in the Scoping Report. These cover all the SEA Directive topics and all the sustainability objectives. Where appropriate, potential mitigation measures have also been considered in relation to each topic.

### *Effects on the Environment*

- 4.5 The environment covers a wide variety of issues; as such this section has been divided into more specific areas. However, there is overlap between a number of the topics which has made the separation of the prediction and evaluation of likely effects challenging.

### *Water*

- 4.6 As has been highlighted within the Scoping Report, the water environment of the Borough plays an important role, including as a source of drinking water and supporting habitats and species within the locality.
- 4.7 In the medium to long term it is anticipated that the demand for and consumption of water will increase as a result of the population of the area rising. However, this needs to be considered in conjunction with changing demand for water from existing users<sup>10</sup>, implications of additional development outside the Borough (served by the

---

<sup>10</sup> Water Resource Management Plans have indicated that over time there has not been a direct relationship between water demand and number of dwellings being supplied.

same supplies) and the potential implications of a changing climate, which could also act as a driver for increased water demand and reduced availability of supplies. This could have indirect adverse effects on the biodiversity of the Borough and surrounding areas (which act as a water source for the Borough) if insufficient water is available to support the environment.

- 4.8 Abstraction of water is controlled by the Environment Agency, who will need to account for the impact of increased abstraction on the environment, particularly given the requirements of the Water Framework Directive (which may result in further changes to licenses in the future). The Revised Local Plan is proposing to introduce measures to promote water efficiency within new buildings – this could not be applied retrospectively to those sites that already have planning permissions. Although in some cases, high levels of water efficiency have been sought and agreed as part of planning permissions.
- 4.9 Southern Water (water company covering the majority of the Borough) is also rolling out a universal metering programme for domestic properties which is expected to reduce average water consumption for existing customers over time. This has already been undertaken for most of the Borough served by Southern Water.
- 4.10 There is some uncertainty about the wider cumulative effects on the water environment in the future. For example, in order to reduce water consumption on the River Itchen (due to adverse effects on the River Itchen SAC), it is proposed to increase abstraction from the lower River Test. The increase would remain within the existing consent but would exceed current abstraction rates. There is some uncertainty as to the likely effect should the reduced abstraction rate from the River Itchen come into force before the infrastructure is in place to distribute additional water supplied from the River Test. It is noted further work is currently being undertaken to review the sustainability of water abstraction on the River Test linked to this proposal, which remains in the latest Water Resource Management Plan.
- 4.11 The plan makes provision for new development which will increase consumption. Changes in consumption patterns might also affect water use. Mitigation measures within the Revised Local Plan (including seeking higher levels of water efficiency than currently required through Building Regulations) and through other mechanisms are likely to reduce the rate of increased consumption.
- 4.12 There is the potential for a cumulative (and possibly synergistic) effect on the water environment when accounting for development outside the Borough, which is served by the same water resources (particularly within the South Hampshire Water Resource Zone). Many of the neighbouring authorities to Test Valley have or propose to have policies that seek higher levels of water efficiency associated with new development.

- 4.13 The level of water use will also have implications on water quality within the Borough. Based on the latest assessments linked to the Water Framework Directive requirements the quality of water in the Borough is varied<sup>11</sup>.
- 4.14 The most likely implications on water quality as a result of the proposals within the Revised Local Plan link to the availability of waste water treatment capacity. There are known constraints to the treatment capacity available at Fullerton Waste Water Treatment Works (WWTW) which serves Andover and a number of the surrounding villages. This works does not serve development outside Test Valley Borough, therefore there is unlikely to be a cumulative effect on this works when accounting for development outside the Borough.
- 4.15 Taking account of the potential levels of development over the plan period, in the medium to longer term there is the potential for the current capacity at Fullerton WWTW to be exceeded. There will need to be close monitoring of completions and permissions for development within the catchment for this works, as well as joint working with the Environment Agency and Southern Water. Southern Water has highlighted that over the course of the plan period, it is anticipated that solutions can be found for Fullerton WWTW. The need for a collaborative approach is set out within the Revised Local Plan, along with the need for development to be planned and phased accounting for the available capacity.
- 4.16 The proposed measures to increase water efficiency for new development within the Borough may have implications on capacity for the treatment of waste water. Over the length of the plan period there is the potential that new technologies for the treatment of waste water may become viable for use, however this cannot be relied upon.
- 4.17 Development within the Borough (including allocations) will also be served by other waste water treatment works. There remains some uncertainty about the potential effects on the water environment (via the capacity of waste water treatment works) in relation to likely levels of windfall development within the Borough. Some water bodies may be subject to cumulative effects, particularly in the medium to long term, when accounting for development across a number of local authority areas. This may include the River Itchen via the Chickenhall WWTW, which serves development within the districts of Eastleigh, Winchester and Test Valley. As above, it will be important to continue to work with Southern Water and the Environment Agency on this matter.
- 4.18 A policy seeking to protect all water bodies, including groundwater protection zones, is included within the Revised Local Plan which is intended to consider direct and more diffuse impacts on water quality. A separate policy also seeks to reduce the risk of water pollution. There are a range of other sources of diffuse water pollution, including from rural areas and runoff from highways (referred to within the draft

---

<sup>11</sup> See documentation associated with the consultation on the draft update to the river basin management plan for South East River Basin District, Environment Agency, 2014.

river basin management plan consultation documents). Development within the Borough has the potential of a cumulative or synergistic effect on water quality.

- 4.19 There are a number of factors affecting water quality within the Borough (including legal drivers such as the Water Framework Directive). There is uncertainty over the specific implications on water quality, given the range of variables. It is noted that development within Test Valley could have an affect beyond the Borough boundary and vice versa (e.g. small parts of the Borough discharge to waste water treatment works that discharge to water systems outside the Borough, such as the River Itchen). More development may have an adverse impact, particularly if infrastructure capacity is exceeded. However this needs to be balanced with measures in place to try and overcome existing sources of water pollution (including diffuse sources) and prevent new development resulting in a worsening situation.
- 4.20 The modifications proposed to the Revised Local Plan would result in the provision of a policy criterion to ensure new development complies with national guidance on flood risk (contained within the NPPF and the National Planning Practice Guidance). A changing climate is anticipated to increase the areas at risk of flooding within the Borough in the longer term - this should be taken into account when considering proposals (as set out in national guidance). In some circumstances new development may be undertaken in areas of flood risk; in these situations if the flood risk cannot be avoided it would be important to identify appropriate mitigation measures to reduce vulnerability (both as a result of the risk of flooding and the magnitude of any events should they occur).
- 4.21 It is increasingly important to ensure that surface water is appropriately managed in conjunction with new development. Through a Ministerial Statement in December 2014 it has been indicated that the planning application process will provide the mechanism for securing the provision of sustainable drainage systems in conjunction with major applications. This will not cover smaller scale proposals which may mean there is a residual effect without actions by other organisations.

#### *Air Quality*

- 4.22 The impacts on air quality can arise as a result of short term, often temporary factors such as through construction processes, as well as longer term implications for example as a result of increased traffic levels over time. The short term construction related implications can to some extent be mitigated through the management of construction processes and may be localised to the vicinity of the area of works (and transport corridors used by construction vehicles – this could be beyond the Borough boundary).
- 4.23 It is anticipated that traffic generation is likely to increase over time as a result of additional development within and beyond the Borough. This has the potential for an adverse effect on air quality over time. Air quality is generally good in the Borough at present, with no Air Quality Management Areas (AQMA) identified. Areas of higher traffic congestion would potentially result in a greater risk of air pollution –

this would be likely to be a long term effect. There are areas outside the Borough which have less favourable air quality at present that may be subject to additional traffic levels (likely to be medium to longer term) from a range of geographical areas, including from within Test Valley.

- 4.24 A number of potential mitigation measures have been included within the Revised Local Plan to try and reduce the potential impact including locating proposed allocations in more accessible locations and seeking to encourage more sustainable modes of travel. It is anticipated that there could be a residual impact on air quality, which has the potential to have an adverse impact on human health and ecology. It is not possible to predict the significance of this impact, particularly as there may be other factors that also impact on air quality and movement in the Borough. For example, improvements in technology may result in lower emissions associated with road transport (although it is acknowledged that as the technologies age (i.e. as cars containing such technologies get older) their ability to reduce emissions tends to reduce).

#### *Soil and Geology*

- 4.25 The Revised Local Plan will result in the development of greenfield sites which will have a permanent impact on soil resources (which are considered as non-renewable), this is anticipated to include best and most versatile agricultural land. This impact is unlikely to be reversible.
- 4.26 There is less certainty about the implications of non-allocated development that may come forward over the plan period. The effects on agricultural land are unlikely to be significant in the context of the Borough alone, but would be more significant when considered in conjunction with development outside the Borough, including on best and most versatile agricultural land and when accounting for other factors including the implications of a changing climate.
- 4.27 Further development may also result in the compression of soils, which can be permanent. This may also have implications on the water environment in terms of infiltration of water and the risk of surface water flooding. There may be some opportunities to reduce the extent of this impact through the management of construction activities (this is not controlled by a proposed policy or any proposed modifications).
- 4.28 The principle of development being acceptable within settlement boundaries may provide an opportunity to address areas of land that have the potential to be contaminated (note the Scoping Report set out that none of the sites that have the potential to be contaminated have been designated as contaminated land). This may have ecological and other environmental benefits. It is not possible to predict or evaluate the magnitude and significance of this effect as it will depend on the nature and location of applications received over the plan period.

- 4.29 The identification of strategic sites has taken account of the location of mineral consultation areas, which identify potential mineral sources within the Borough. A number of the strategic sites put forward include mineral consultation areas – this would need to be considered in more detailed planning of sites. It would be expected that any viable minerals should be extracted prior to development. Where resources are not viable for extraction, there may be a permanent loss of minerals – it is anticipated that this would be of a relatively low significance. The Minerals and Waste Plan also forms part of the Development Plan and would be taken into consideration in the determination of applications.

*Landscape and Settlement Character*

- 4.30 The proposed allocations and non-allocated development coming forward through planning applications will have an effect on the landscape of the Borough throughout the plan period (and beyond this). The changes are likely to be most significant around the larger settlements where the greatest level of development is proposed. This may also apply around the rural areas – this is more difficult to predict as it is more likely to depend on applications that come forward over the plan period (e.g. as rural affordable housing exception schemes and community led development) and proposals emerging through any Neighbourhood Development Plans that come forward. As the housing figures within the Revised Local Plan are presented as a minimum, there is the potential for a greater level of change than if this was envisaged as the upper level of development.
- 4.31 The identification of strategic sites for development has taken account of the potential impact on the landscape and settlement character as a means of trying to reduce the likelihood of adverse effects, with the scope for mitigation being provided through landscaping features as part of the sites.
- 4.32 The identification of local gaps is likely to retain the distinction between settlements around Andover and Southern Test Valley. Strategic sites are proposed in the area between the edge of Nursling and Rownhams and Southampton. Additional landscaping has been proposed in association with these sites to lessen this effect.
- 4.33 Mitigation can be provided to reduce the impact of development on the landscape, for example through the detailed design and layout of schemes, as well as through planting schemes. Policies within the Revised Local Plan seek to ensure that appropriate landscaping helps to integrate development in with the local landscape character.
- 4.34 It is challenging to determine the nature and likelihood of effects on settlement character within the Borough. The degree of change is likely to be variable across the Borough. The Revised Local Plan includes policy requirements to ensure new development is appropriate given the existing settlement character.
- 4.35 Proposed allocations are likely to predominantly effect the character of the settlements they fall within or adjacent to. These effects are likely to occur in the

medium to long term impacts and are likely to be permanent. Taking this into account it will be important to give careful consideration to the design and layout of proposals as they come forward. Some of the larger residential allocations are likely to come forward as new neighbourhoods; therefore there may be an opportunity to establish their own identity and local character whilst also drawing on the settlement wide character. Development that comes forward that does not relate to allocations can also have a significant effect on settlement character and the same requirements within the Revised Local Plan would apply. Modifications proposed should reduce the risk of poor quality design coming forward.

- 4.36 Guidance is available for many of the settlements within the Borough to help ensure that new development is not out of character – this includes through Village and Town Design Statements, the Landscape Character Assessment and townscape assessments. A policy is also included to seek to protect residential areas of special character – this policy is likely to help retain these distinct areas of lower density, often including similar architectural styles and more mature planting. It has also been recognised that there may be a need to review the Landscape Character Assessment to ensure it remains up to date.
- 4.37 Given the policies in place through the Revised Local Plan, in conjunction with other plans, policies and programmes, it is predicted that the Revised Local Plan will not have a significant adverse effect on the North Wessex Downs AONB and the New Forest National Park in terms of landscape and character considerations.
- 4.38 Development within the Borough has the potential to have temporary effects on both landscape and settlement character as a result of construction activities. No mitigation is proposed as the impact is likely to be temporary in nature, despite the potential for the duration and significance of the effects varying.
- 4.39 It is acknowledged that over the plan period there are likely to be changes to the landscape and settlement character that occur outside the control of planning. It is challenging to set out whether these cumulative changes would necessarily be positive or negative, as opposed to just part of the evolution of the landscape of the Borough.

#### *Historic Environment*

- 4.40 A policy sets out that development should conserve and enhance historic assets and their setting, with further modifications having been proposed to strengthen this policy. However, the specific impact is likely to depend on the nature of development that comes forward over the plan period.
- 4.41 The identification of strategic sites included the consideration of heritage assets, particularly listed buildings, conservation areas, archaeology and registered Historic Parks and Gardens. One of the allocations (at George Yard / Black Swan Yard in Andover) is within a Conservation Area, while another site is within an area identified on the Hampshire Register of Historic Parks and Gardens. Effects in

relation to these sites are likely to arise in the medium to long term. Some of the other allocations are close to heritage assets or may have archaeological potential – it will be vital that the sites are taken forward giving consideration to these designations and their setting to avoid the risk of adverse effects.

- 4.42 Effects on the historic environment tend to be quite localised in relation to specific features of interest but tend to be permanent in nature (either through direct or indirect effects). The proposals at North Stoneham for residential development, in conjunction with the proposal by Eastleigh Borough Council for residential development south of Chestnut Avenue are likely to have a permanent, cumulative effect on the locally important historic landscape associated with the former North Stoneham House, which extends beyond the Borough boundary.
- 4.43 There are a number of heritage assets within the Borough which are considered to be ‘at risk’ – development over the course of the plan period has the potential to help restore these assets however this would depend on opportunities coming forward. None are specifically planned as a result of the Revised Local Plan.
- 4.44 Listing descriptions (for listed buildings) and Conservation Area Character Appraisals (where available) are just some of the sources that can help to ensure that any development is planned in a sensitive way to the features of interest.
- 4.45 Romsey acts as a market town, with a key part of its identity relating to the historic core. While there are specific proposals for major residential and employment developments around the town which will have an impact on the character of the settlement as a whole, they are not considered to have a significant adverse impact on the historic core of Romsey over the course of the plan period.

#### *Biodiversity*

- 4.46 Based on the location of the proposed strategic sites and the proposed requirements for the site coming forward, it is considered unlikely that the Revised Local Plan will result in a significant adverse direct effect on sites of biodiversity value or importance. The potentially greater risk comes from indirect, cumulative and synergistic effects – these include recreational pressure on designations, and changes to water and air quality – some of which are outside Test Valley. More detailed discussion on the likely significant effects (and proposed mitigation) on Natura 2000 sites and Ramsar sites is provided within the Habitats Regulations Assessment reports.
- 4.47 Over the course of the plan period, temporary effects of construction activities (e.g. noise disturbance and air quality impacts) could have implications on local biodiversity. The permanence and magnitude of the impacts of these factors is likely to depend on the sensitivity of the ecological feature of interest. In most cases, these impacts can be mitigated and this would be largely addressed through Environmental Impact Assessments and the determination of planning applications.

- 4.48 As development occurs across the Borough (and in neighbouring areas), particularly as a result of larger scale developments, habitats and species may be effected by additional recreational pressure (as a result of increased population), particularly in the medium to longer term. This could include internationally important to locally important sites. Without mitigation this could have a long term adverse impact on features of ecological interest. To some extent, the impact on these receptors can be mitigated through the management of the sites, including in terms of accessibility and directing people to the less sensitive areas of habitats. In addition, the provision of accessible and usable public open space (and accessible green infrastructure provisions) can play a role in minimising the impact on ecologically important habitats and species.
- 4.49 The Revised Local Plan includes provision for a forest park within Southern Test Valley in addition to the public open space requirements. This will provide additional recreational space and form part of the local green infrastructure network. The woodland areas making up the forest park are of ecological value in their own right (e.g. designated as SINCs and including ancient woodland) therefore it will be important that biodiversity value of the site is considered in bringing it forward to avoid an adverse ecological impact. The same applies in relation to the Luzborough Plantation and Beggarspath Wood which are linked to residential development in Southern Test Valley.
- 4.50 Opportunities may arise over the course of the plan period to enhance local biodiversity, for example through habitat restoration. Links to the local Biodiversity Action Plans (BAPs) may enable consideration of how new developments may support actions contained within the BAPs.
- 4.51 There are a range of other factors that could influence biodiversity over the plan period in combination with development and other changes within the Borough. For example, a changing climate is expected to result in both direct and indirect effects on biodiversity – it will be important to account for these long term trends and their potential implications (which may result in synergistic changes), for example by seeking to protect and enhance habitat stepping stones.

#### *Resource Consumption*

- 4.52 Additional development within the Borough is likely to result in increased consumption of resources, ranging from materials to construct new buildings to the additional energy usage associated with the resultant development. This is likely to be a permanent effect. The spatial distribution of effects as a result of this is likely to depend on the source of the resources in consideration.
- 4.53 In terms of energy consumption, rising Building Regulation requirements to meet the Governments targets<sup>12</sup> are likely to temper the increase in energy consumption but

---

<sup>12</sup> For all new dwellings to be zero carbon by 2016, with new commercial buildings being constructed to zero carbon standards by 2019.

this in itself is unlikely to result in a reduction in energy use across the Borough in the long term. Other initiatives and government policies may also impact on energy consumption within the Borough, such as the Green Deal.

- 4.54 There are no specific policies within the Revised Local Plan in relation to renewable energy and low carbon technologies (either as allocations or more general policies). National guidance provides a presumption in favour of renewable technologies, with text within the Revised Local Plan (as modified) recognising that the principle of renewable and low carbon technologies is supported subject to other relevant policy considerations being satisfied. There has been an increase in the installation of renewable energy systems, particularly solar photovoltaics (including 'solar farms'). This may also occur in relation to heat generating technologies as a result of the Renewable Heat Incentive and more generally in relation to renewable and low carbon technologies as a result of national policy. Should these installations come forward, there may be indirect effects on the environment, for example on the landscape.
- 4.55 There are no specific policies within the Revised Local Plan seeking to require the use of sustainably sourced materials. There may be some advantages through supporting the principle of the re-use of buildings in the countryside in terms of reducing the demand for new resources – the magnitude of this effect is uncertain.
- 4.56 The Revised Local Plan does not directly deal with waste generation and recycling. Additional development, resulting in an increased population of the Borough, is likely to result in an increase in waste generation, a proportion of which will be reused, recycled or composted. There are other plans, policies and programmes in operations within the Borough which seek to reduced waste production and increase the proportion of waste that is reused, recycled or composted.
- 4.57 The Minerals and Waste Plan (developed by Hampshire County Council) will seek to ensure that sufficient waste processing facilities and mineral resources are available. This forms part of the Development Plan.

#### *Greenhouse Gases and Climate Change*

- 4.58 Additional energy use (referred to above) and travel within the Borough are likely to result in increased greenhouse gas emissions. This will need to be balanced with measures that are being implemented to seek to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in order to comply with the targets established within the Climate Change Act. It is not possible to predict or evaluate the specific impact on this with any precision. Any changes within the Borough would also need to be considered in conjunction with additional development elsewhere as well as national and global trends to inform the identification of the effects of changes in emissions.
- 4.59 In order to try and reduce the significance of any increases in emissions as a result of new development (whilst also potentially having an indirect effect linked to existing development) a number of mitigation measures have been taken forward. The

settlement hierarchy approach is based on access to facilities and services, with an aim to try and focus new development in the most sustainable locations. Policies are also in place to seek to retain existing facilities and services; these measures have a role in seeking to reduce the need to travel. Policies also seek to promote more sustainable modes of travel. It is also recognised that wider initiatives may also have an impact on the Borough, for example any proposals to de-carbonise the grid.

- 4.60 Rising greenhouse gas emissions are linked to increasing the risks of a changing climate – within Chapter 5 of the Scoping Report some of the forecast scenarios in relation to temperature and precipitation changes are outlined. Changes within the Borough are anticipated to contribute to global changes which are forecast to result in rising temperatures, changing rainfall patterns and an increased risk of more extreme weather conditions. These changes are likely to result in secondary effects on ecology, human health and the water environment for example.
- 4.61 More localised changes within and beyond the Borough may also have effects when considered in combination, such as increased coverage of non-natural surfacing as a result of development, which may contribute to the urban heat island effect, potentially resulting in higher temperatures in the local area. The magnitude of this effect will depend of the scale of the existing settlements and the increase in coverage of non-natural surfaces. The inclusion of green areas, including public open space, could be a way to reduce the magnitude of this effect.
- 4.62 In addition, sea level rise needs to be considered in the context of the retention of coastal defences (for example around Southampton City) and the areas that may be allowed to change as sea levels rise (including the Lower Test). This will have knock on effects on habitat types and the species occupying this area<sup>13</sup>.
- 4.63 The mitigation measures referred to will not prevent the changes in climate. However, when taking account of similar measures introduced beyond the Borough, in conjunction with national and international measures, the magnitude and extent of impacts may be lessened.

### *Effects on the Local Community*

#### *Demographics*

- 4.64 A key effect on the local community will be an increase in the population of the Borough. The Scoping Report (Chapter 6) set out details on the existing population.
- 4.65 The population forecasts based on the proposed Borough wide housing figure of 588 dwellings per annum has been identified to result in a population increase of approximately 23,000 between 2011 and 2029<sup>14</sup>. This equates to approximately a 20% increase when compared to the 2011 Census population figure. As noted above,

---

<sup>13</sup> This matter is considered in more detail through the North Solent Shoreline Management Plan and associated technical studies, available at <http://www.northsolentsmp.co.uk/>.

<sup>14</sup> Drawing on Test Valley Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) 2013, Justin Gardner Consulting.

as this is a minimum figure, the actual change in the population of the Borough could be greater than this.

- 4.66 There are a range of factors that will influence the growth in population of the Borough, including the potential for additional development across the Borough (within settlements particularly) and other demographic changes (e.g. a greater move towards smaller household sizes, potential changes in migration rates, etc).
- 4.67 It is anticipated that the change in population within the Borough is likely to reflect the settlement sizes, with Andover and some of the larger settlements in Southern Test Valley experiencing the highest levels of growth. There is much greater uncertainty about changes in population for the smaller and more rural settlements, particularly when accounting for trends towards smaller household sizes. This could result in the reduction in population of certain settlements.
- 4.68 The age profile of the Borough may also change over the course of the plan period. Based on the 2011 Census, the proportion of 20 to 34 year olds is lower in the Borough than for England, while a higher proportion of the population are 50 to 74 years old<sup>15</sup>. It is anticipated that over the plan period, there will be a move toward an ageing population within the Borough.
- 4.69 Changes in the population of the Borough are likely to have indirect effects, which are picked up under separate headings within this section. This is likely to include increased use of resources.

### *Housing*

- 4.70 The 2011 Census set out that there were approximately 49,140 dwellings within the Borough. The proposed housing requirement for at least an additional 10,584 dwellings within the Borough between 2011 and 2029 would increase this total to approximately 59,730 dwellings. This figure is set out to be a minimum; therefore the increase in housing stock (and changes in population) could be greater than this.
- 4.71 It is anticipated that over the plan period the average household size within the Borough will fall, reflecting a national trend. There is some uncertainty as to the specific implications, particularly when accounting for the potential suppression of household formation linked to the economic downturn.
- 4.72 The number of affordable homes available within the Borough is expected to increase in the medium to long term, which is anticipated to have a positive effect. The rate at which affordable homes are provided is likely to be linked (not necessarily directly) to the delivery of market housing. The proposed policy within the Revised Local Plan seeks up to 40% affordable housing, with a stepped approach based on the number of dwellings proposed. If 35% of the proposed housing figure came forward as affordable housing this would equate to approximately 3,700

---

<sup>15</sup> 2011 Census, ONS, 2012.

affordable dwellings. A greater amount of affordable housing may come forward should the delivery of housing exceed the minimum figure outlined in the Revised Local Plan.

- 4.73 The location of the affordable housing is likely to be focused on the larger settlements, particularly in conjunction with the residential strategic sites. There is also likely to be some provision of affordable housing in the more rural settlements of the Borough brought forward as exception schemes – this will depend on whether a localised need is identified.
- 4.74 The proposed level of housing is not likely to provide for all of those in housing need, based on the figures identified in the Strategic Housing Market Assessments. It will make a contribution towards meeting this need. It is unlikely that outstanding need would be cancelled out by additional development in neighbouring authorities, although neighbouring authorities housing figures will also be contributing to the supply of affordable housing within the housing market areas over the plan period. The level of housing need is something that will need to be kept under review, in terms of the level of housing need across the housing market areas, as indicated by the local authority waiting lists.
- 4.75 Aside from the provision of affordable housing, the effect on the actual affordability of housing over the plan period remains uncertain. There are a number of factors that influence the price of housing. While the supply may have an effect, other factors are likely to be more important, particularly at present. General property price forecasts vary in their projections, however in the short to medium term it is anticipated that property prices are likely to increase.
- 4.76 While policies within the Revised Local Plan set out the importance of providing a mix of housing accounting for the needs of the community, there remains uncertainty as to the degree that this will be achieved. This includes in relation to the specific needs of certain household groups.

#### *Poverty and Social Exclusion*

- 4.77 As noted in the Scoping Report, Test Valley is not a deprived area as a whole but does include pockets of deprivation, including parts of Andover. There are no specific proposals within the Revised Local Plan that seek to address the areas of deprivation. In relation to areas of deprivation towards the east of Andover, development that is underway at East Anton (Augusta Park) and the proposals for additional employment land at Walworth Business Park (to support a wider regeneration strategy) may have a positive impact in the medium to long term; however the significance of this is uncertain.
- 4.78 A range of other strategies and programmes are in place to try and reduce pockets of deprivation within the Borough which potentially are more likely to have a significant effect on this matter.

### *Effects on the Local Economy*

- 4.79 The recent recession and the beginnings of the recovery from this are having an effect on the economy of the Borough. There is uncertainty about the timescales over which there will be changes to the national trends, which impacts on the certainty of changes to the local economy. There has been some consideration of this matter through the evidence base studies that have informed the preparation of the plan.
- 4.80 Unemployment levels in the Borough are generally relatively low in comparison to the south east region and the figure for Great Britain. It is predicted that this will be retained over the plan period when taking account of the proposed residential and employment proposals and the potential for non-allocated development to come forward, however there is a low level of confidence in this, particularly when accounting for external factors. There are likely to be short to medium term variations in the levels of employment, accounting for a range of factors including the timing of sites coming forward.
- 4.81 Recent trends have shown that on balance, more people commute out rather than commute in to Test Valley for work, with high flows across administrative boundaries – this reflects the high level of economic inter-dependencies with neighbouring areas (such as Southampton and Winchester)<sup>16</sup>. These trends may well continue.
- 4.82 In order to support the local economy of the Borough there is a need for immigration of labour as a result of the trend towards an ageing population. Without this, the economy of the Borough could decline. The housing figure established for the Revised Local Plan goes beyond the demographic requirement for the area, which may assist in supporting the supply of labour. However, this will be influenced by a range of factors making the specific effects more challenging to predict.
- 4.83 One of the sustainability issues identified in the Scoping Report was the need to rejuvenate Walworth Business Park in Andover. The proposal for additional employment land to the east of Walworth should support a wider strategy for the regeneration of this site (including the partnership with Kier). Without the regeneration of Walworth Business Park, there is a risk of a decline of the Andover economy in the medium to long term with the town potentially being seen as a less desirable location for businesses to locate. The specific impacts of the Revised Local Plan are difficult to identify individually as they are likely to have a positive impact in combination with other programmes and projects.
- 4.84 The provision of additional retail floorspace in Andover is predicted to enhance the role of the town in comparison to its existing status. Without improving the retail offer of the town there is the risk of further decline relative to nearby towns, such as Basingstoke. This would also potentially result in an increase in traffic generation and possibly an adverse impact on leisure and cultural facilities in Andover centre. It will

---

<sup>16</sup> Test Valley Local Housing Requirements, Nathaniel Litchfield and Partners, 2011.

be important that the impact on the historic environment is taken into account in bringing this strategic site forward.

- 4.85 The implications of not making allocations for retail provision within Romsey town centre are less clear. There is a risk that if the centre does not provide a sufficient retail offer, visitors may be attracted to other centres in the vicinity. However, the draws of Romsey are different to those in Andover, for example with the centre being used as a meeting place, etc which may reduce such risks. This may be something that would need to be kept under review alongside the implications of additional residents in Romsey (potentially contributing to increased spending in the centre and influencing traffic patterns in and around the town centre).
- 4.86 Changes in the local economy within Test Valley are likely to affect the surrounding area, particularly within the Local Enterprise Partnership areas which cover the Borough (Solent and Enterprise M3). Additional economic development within Southern Test Valley forms part of a wider strategy to support growth in the South Hampshire economy in the medium to long term.

#### *Effects on Education and Lifelong Learning*

- 4.87 The Revised Local Plan does not include any specific proposals in relation to education and lifelong learning. However, broader policies on ensuring that sufficient infrastructure is provided with new development and seeking to improve access to skills training and apprenticeships may have a positive impact when considered in conjunction with other projects outside planning. There are a range of other plans and programmes in place seeking to promote educational performance and access to skills development. On this basis, it is predicted that the educational attainment of the Borough will be at least retained over the plan period. There is not sufficient certainty to predict an improvement in the educational attainment of the Borough.

#### *Effects on Community Safety*

- 4.88 Levels of crime within the Borough have previously been identified as being lower than county and national figures (see November 2013 SA Report). There are no specific proposals within the Revised Local Plan linked to crime prevention; however a specific policy is set out to ensure all development is designed to provide a safe environment and to reduce opportunities for crime. Despite this, there is not sufficient certainty over the overall effect on levels of crime and the fear of crime to give a clear estimation of the effects of the Plan on this matter. There are a range of organisations working in partnership within the Borough on this matter – this is more likely to have a significant effect.

#### *Effects on Health and Wellbeing*

- 4.89 There remains some uncertainty over the long term effects on human health over the plan period when accounting for other relevant plans, policies and programmes.

A policy is in place that seeks to ensure that sufficient infrastructure (including for health) is provided in association with new development.

- 4.90 Additional leisure and recreation provisions are predicted to have an indirect positive effect on health. In comparison to the Borough Local Plan 2006, the public open space standards have been increased to enable the provision of allotments. In addition, the provision of pedestrian and cycle links in association with new development (which should have benefits for existing residents) have the potential to have a positive effect on human health.
- 4.91 Conversely, any reductions in air quality (most likely to be associated with additional road traffic) may have an adverse effect on human health over the plan period. It is not possible to quantify the overall impact on human health over the plan period and any beneficial impact would be dependent on the use of the provisions made. The same also applies in relation to other forms of pollution, for example associated with noise levels experienced by existing and future residents.
- 4.92 The prospect of additional development and changes to the locality can also have an effect on wellbeing, with the timescales over which this arises varying based on the individuals affected, the location and the nature of the proposals.

#### *Effects on Leisure and Culture*

- 4.93 The Revised Local Plan contains policies seeking the provision of additional public open space in conjunction with new development, including proposed residential allocations. This includes a higher standard than for the Borough Local Plan 2006 through the inclusion of allotments. There are also proposals for additional formal recreation provisions in Romsey, to address a current deficit, and a forest park with enhanced public access to large areas of woodland in Southern Test Valley. The combination of these provisions is likely to enhance the access to public open space and green infrastructure within the Borough. These provisions are associated with the larger settlements in the Borough and are less likely to have a significant effect in the more rural areas of Test Valley. The forest park proposal may enhance access to recreational provisions for those in neighbouring authorities, particularly Southampton City and Eastleigh Borough.
- 4.94 The provision of additional facilities may have impacts on the participation in sports and active recreation; however no clear predictions can be made on this matter as there are a range of other factors involved.
- 4.95 There are no specific proposals within the Revised Local Plan linked to cultural provisions. Additional retail provisions in Andover may have an indirect effect on use of cultural facilities in the town centre in the medium to long term. The forecast additional population within the Borough may support leisure and cultural facilities beyond the Borough (e.g. in surrounding towns and cities).

### *Effects on Transport*

- 4.96 As highlighted within the Scoping Report, car ownership within the Borough and use of cars by residents to travel to work are relatively high; this is likely to be in part related to the rural nature and relative affluence of the Borough. Although there are variations within Test Valley. Car use is anticipated to remain high over the plan period. There is also the potential of additional traffic congestion, particularly at peak times on the main transport routes through and beyond the Borough. This has the potential to result in additional risk of air pollution, as referred to above.
- 4.97 Additional development within the Borough may support the viability of bus services, primarily around the larger settlements – however this will depend on the uptake of such services. This is less likely to apply in the rural areas of the Borough which are already experiencing cuts to public transport services.
- 4.98 Additional pedestrian and cycle routes are likely to be provided in conjunction with new development, which also have the potential to support existing residents and people outside the Borough. These could be used for commuting and recreational purposes. Additional mitigation measures may well come forward through the Hampshire Transport Plan (and associated local area strategies), Town Access Plan SPDs and Test Valley Access Plan SPD.

### *Summary of the Main Significant Effects of the Revised Local Plan*

- 4.99 The magnitude of the effects identified above may vary, including when accounting for the scale of development exceeding minimum requirements within the plan, allowing for development beyond the Borough and other causes of change (beyond development proposals). It is considered that the Revised Local Plan, when considered in combination with other plans and programmes, will not have significant transboundary effects<sup>17</sup>.
- 4.100 Over the course of the plan period, the Borough's population is anticipated to increase significantly, with some areas experiencing higher proportions of growth than others. This also needs to be considered in the context of additional growth in population beyond the Borough boundary. The levels of housing and commercial floorspace proposed should have positive effects on the local economy, including supporting economic growth over the plan period (subject to economic cycles and external factors).
- 4.101 This level of growth is likely to have a localised effect on some of the settlements within the Borough, where the physical environment will be subject to change over the plan period (including through land take). These changes may also have knock on effects, for example on habitat networks, particularly when considered in combination with development beyond the Borough and the potential effects of a changing climate.

---

<sup>17</sup> In this case taken to be effects to other countries.

4.102 Additional growth in the number of people within the Borough (residents and work forces) in combination with growth in the surrounding areas is likely to result in a significant increase in the demand for resources, including energy, water and other materials. The increased pressure on the water environment is particularly significant in the locality (although a mitigation measure is proposed for this as referred to below). There is also the potential of significant effects on biodiversity without mitigation (also see the Habitat Regulations Assessment report for more information).

#### *Mitigation Measures*

4.103 Mitigation measures have been incorporated in the Plan and have been identified through the assessment of options for the Plan (primarily within the November 2013 SA Report). A key form of mitigation includes avoiding vulnerable or sensitive locations. For example, the selection of strategic sites has taken account of biodiversity, heritage assets, landscape and settlement character and accessibility. Table 3 summarises mitigation measures that have been incorporated in the Revised Local Plan.

4.104 As noted above, it has been recognised that there is the potential for a greater impact as a result of the Revised Local Plan if the minimum housing figure is exceeded, however the mitigation measures identified in Table 3 would continue to apply in these circumstances.

4.105 The Revised Local Plan includes a number of policies that relate to specific matters all of which will need to be taken into account when determining applications. Therefore the plan will need to be considered as a whole.

4.106 As noted above, the development of greenfield land will result in an adverse impact on soil resources. One of the functions soil supports is the infiltration of rainwater and surface water, at the same time it can provide water filtration. As a result, it would be recommended that sustainable drainage systems are considered to support the management of surface water and rainfall. When implemented, changes to the National Planning Practice Guidance will establish how the planning application process will ensure the provision of sustainable drainage systems in conjunction with major planning proposals to help manage surface water and rainfall, which will need to accord with national standards<sup>18</sup>. Reference to this forthcoming guidance is proposed within the Revised Local Plan through a modification.

4.107 More detailed consideration of biodiversity value within sites should be taken into account as sites come forward. Ideally there should be no net loss of biodiversity and where possible a gain. As noted above, the possible cumulative effects on habitat

---

<sup>18</sup> House of Commons Written Statement reference HCWS161 regarding Sustainable drainage systems, dated 18<sup>th</sup> December 2014.

networks and corridors will also need to be taken into account for all applications, in line with the requirements of the proposed biodiversity policy.

- 4.108 It will be essential for sufficient infrastructure to be provided to support new development. In particular, it may be necessary to phase development to align with infrastructure availability, such as waste water treatment capacity in and around Andover.
- 4.109 It has been recommended that public open space provisions should be made in conjunction with new residential development, with the extra provision within Romsey for outdoor sports facilities given an existing deficit. A Forest Park is also proposed in Southern Test Valley to support the enhancement of the green infrastructure network across south Hampshire.
- 4.110 Affordable housing should be provided in line with the standards laid out within the Plan to help provide for those in housing need within the Borough. A policy has been proposed that aims to ensure that sufficient infrastructure is provided in association with development, whether or not it is allocated within the Revised Local Plan. An additional policy has been included seeking to promote water efficiency in new buildings.
- 4.111 In many cases, while policies are included to flag up issues that need to be taken into account, individual mitigation packages will need to be developed as part of planning applications and may be included within Environmental Statements (where required through Environmental Impact Assessment legislation).
- 4.112 It is acknowledged that there will remain some residual impacts on the environment, which will not be mitigated. This includes the permanent loss of some agricultural land and the development of greenfield sites.

#### *Monitoring Significant Effects of the Plan*

- 4.113 Chapter 16 of the November 2013 Sustainability Appraisal report set out the items that should be monitored in considering significant effects as a result the plan. The monitoring indicators / measures set out in Table 40 are considered to remain appropriate when accounting for the modifications put forward.
- 4.114 The indicators will be reported in monitoring reports produced on an annual basis; this will be through the Authority Monitoring Report. If some of the indicators are not available annually they will be updated as regularly as possible.

**Table 3: How Mitigation Measures Have Been Incorporated into the Revised Local Plan DPD**

What is mitigation for? What is the impact of the policies?	Mitigation measures	How have the proposed mitigation measures been taken into account?
<b>General Matters</b>		
Additional development resulting in increased number of trips with the potential for effects on air quality	<p>Promotion of access to sustainable modes of travel (including pedestrian and cycle links).</p> <p>Consideration given to identifying sites to meet housing need in accessible locations (including in terms of access to key destinations)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Policy on managing movement included which covers access to public transport, pedestrian and cycle links (policy T1)</li> <li>- References in policies for residential allocations to include provisions for pedestrian and cycle routes (policies COM3 to COM6a)</li> </ul>
Ensuring that an appropriate level of affordable housing is provided to support those in housing need	<p>Taken account of the need for affordable housing as part of the consideration of housing numbers for the plan period</p> <p>Seek the provision of or contribution towards affordable housing where there is a net gain in dwellings, incorporating a stepped approach to maximise provision (subject to viability)</p> <p>Provide a framework for considering rural affordable housing schemes</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Policy COM7 provides a framework for seeking affordable housing using a stepped approach in terms of the number of dwellings and the proportion affordable that should be sought</li> <li>- Policy COM8 sets the approach to rural affordable housing schemes</li> </ul>
Ensuring that additional development does not have an adverse effect as a result of insufficient infrastructure capacity (covering utilities, community facilities and services, etc)	<p>Ensure that an overarching policy is provided that sets out that sufficient infrastructure capacity will need to be available to support additional development</p> <p>Provide additional public open space to support new residential development</p> <p>Seek to retain existing facilities and services</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Policy COM15 sets out that appropriate investment in infrastructure needs to be secured</li> <li>- Policy LHW1 requires the provision of additional public open space and the retention of existing provisions</li> <li>- Policy COM14 seeks to retain community facilities and services (including local shops, pubs, cultural and community facilities)</li> <li>- Policies COM3 to COM6a identify the need for</li> </ul>

What is mitigation for? What is the impact of the policies?	Mitigation measures	How have the proposed mitigation measures been taken into account?
	<p>which support communities</p> <p>Highlight key infrastructure requirements associated with proposed residential development</p>	<p>additional education and community provisions in association with proposed residential allocations</p>
<p>Additional development is likely to increase demand for water resources, which are already under stress – mitigation should be provided to reduce this pressure</p>	<p>Seek a higher level of water efficiency from new development (residential and non-residential) using recognised standards (emerging higher standard through Building Regulations and BREEAM) to reduce the increase in consumption associated with new development</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Policy E7 includes a requirement to achieve certain credits for BREEAM (non-residential proposals) or comply with the emerging higher standard for water efficiency through the Building Regulations in relation to water for new development</li> </ul>
<p>Seek to avoid an increase in the risk of flooding (including through surface water flooding) as a result of additional development</p>	<p>Seek to avoid areas identified at risk of flooding, including through site selection</p> <p>Promote the use of sustainable drainage systems with new development to avoid a risk of increasing flood risk (either on site or off site)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The NPPF and associated guidance set out the approach to flood risk, a criterion is included in policy E7 that seeks to ensure that proposals comply with this guidance</li> <li>- Amendments are expected to be made to the National Planning Practice Guidance to ensure the provision of sustainable drainage systems in association with major development, therefore it is not necessary to duplicate this within the Revised Local Plan but reference has been made to this emerging position in the supporting text to policy E7</li> </ul>
<p>Additional development has the potential to affect landscape and settlement character, with the potential for a decline in the quality of the landscape (including designated</p>	<p>Take account of potential impact on settlement character and landscape character and quality as part of the identification of allocations</p> <p>Provide a framework for considering</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Policies E1 to E4 relate to settlement character and the landscape character to ensure new developments integrate into the surrounding area; they also seek to retain the distinction of settlements through the use of local gaps.</li> </ul>

What is mitigation for? What is the impact of the policies?	Mitigation measures	How have the proposed mitigation measures been taken into account?
areas)	applications for additional development to ensure schemes are sensitive to the landscape and settlement character	
Additional development has the potential to affect biodiversity	<p>Take account of potential impact on biodiversity as part of the identification of allocations</p> <p>Provide a framework for considering applications to ensure schemes are designed to conserve and enhance biodiversity</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Policy E5 establishes policy requirements seeking to conserve and enhance biodiversity, identifying key assets that should be taken into account</li> </ul>
Additional development has the potential to affect the historic environment	<p>Take account of potential impact on the historic environment as part of the identification of allocations</p> <p>Provide a framework for considering applications to ensure schemes are designed to be sensitive to the historic environment, including seeking to conserve and enhance heritage assets. Also recognise other activities undertaken by the Council to seek to conserve the historic environment.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Policy E9 establishes a framework for considering the approach to the historic environment in relation to applications</li> </ul>
<b>Area / Site Specific Mitigation</b> (this has not duplicated matters referred to above unless there is a site specific matter that has been highlighted as part of the appraisal)		
Ensuring that additional development in Andover and surrounding villages does not exceed the available capacity for Fullerton WWTW and potentially have an adverse effect on	It will be important to ensure that development is phased to take account of available capacity at this works, this will require the Council to work with the Environment Agency and Southern Water	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Policy E7 sets out that development will be approved if it does not result in the deterioration of water quality</li> <li>- The supporting text to E7 highlights the need to ensure delivery of development is phased to</li> </ul>

What is mitigation for? What is the impact of the policies?	Mitigation measures	How have the proposed mitigation measures been taken into account?
the water environment		account for constraints in capacity, highlighting Fullerton WWTW, and noting the need for joint working on this matter
Development at George Yard / Black Swan Yard, Andover (LE14) has the potential to adversely affect the historic environment ; the proposal would involve development on public car parks which may result in the loss of parking provision for the town	<p>Ensure that any development is planned in a way that is sensitive to the historic environment, taking account of heritage assets and their setting</p> <p>Ensure that there is appropriate provision for parking (which is likely to include the re-provision of existing parking)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Policy E9 sets out requirements in relation to heritage assets, with the supporting text to policy LE14 also noting the need to respect the Conservation Area and the relationship with other heritage assets</li> <li>- Policy T2 sets out the parking standards that would be required to support development (including this proposal)</li> </ul>
Development at Picket Piece, Andover (COM6) has the potential to involve development within a flood risk zone and the loss of assets of biodiversity value	<p>The identified areas of flood risk should be avoided in terms of vulnerable uses</p> <p>The features of biodiversity value should be conserved and where possible enhanced</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Supporting text to COM6 refer to the considerations in relation to flood risk, specifically referring to locating vulnerable development outside the areas at risk; also policy E7 includes a criterion in relation to flood risk</li> <li>- Policy E5 relates to the conservation and enhancement of biodiversity, including hedgerows and protected species</li> </ul>
Development as an extension to Picket Twenty, Andover (COM6a) has the potential to have adverse effects on biodiversity (including on Harewood Forest) and to affect the landscape quality and setting of Andover	<p>Ensure that areas of biodiversity value, including those adjacent to the site are conserved</p> <p>Ensure that the development is planned so as to be sensitive to the landscape quality and setting of Andover</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Policy COM6a seeks to extend a buffer to Harewood Forest that has been provided as part of the existing Picket Twenty development</li> <li>- Policy E5 relates to the conservation and enhancement of biodiversity</li> <li>- Supporting text to COM6a highlights the need for development to minimise visual impacts of the development, policies E1 and E2 would also</li> </ul>

What is mitigation for? What is the impact of the policies?	Mitigation measures	How have the proposed mitigation measures been taken into account?
<p>Development at Whitenap, Romsey (COM3) has the potential to result in adverse effects on biodiversity (including Beggarspath Wood and international designations) and buildings of local historic interest that fall within the site, there is a risk of a potential effect on the Broadlands Historic Park and Garden and the wider setting of Romsey</p>	<p>Ensure that areas of biodiversity value, including Beggarspath Wood, are conserved and where possible enhanced</p> <p>Make provision for appropriate mitigation for effects on international nature conservation designations (covered in more detail in Habitat Regulations Assessment)</p> <p>Seek to ensure development is planned in a way that is sensitive to the historic environment</p>	<p>be relevant</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Policy E5 relates to the conservation and enhancement of biodiversity, including SINCs</li> <li>- Policy COM3 includes a requirement to retain and enhance Beggarspath Wood and to provide mitigation measures</li> <li>- Policy E9 sets out requirements in relation to heritage assets – this covers non-designated assets and historic parks and gardens</li> </ul>
<p>Development at Hoe Lane, North Baddesley (COM4) has the potential to result in the loss of public open space (Mountbatten Park) and a community facility (Scout Hut), it also has the potential to contribute to an in-combination effect on international nature conservation designations</p>	<p>The public open space and community facility within the site boundary should be retained</p> <p>Make provision for appropriate mitigation for effects on international nature conservation designations (covered in more detail in Habitat Regulations Assessment)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The map (B) associated with this proposal does not indicate any residential development in the location of the public open space and community facility</li> <li>- As noted above, policy LHW1 requires the retention of existing public open space provisions and policy COM14 seeks to retain community facilities</li> <li>- Policy COM4 seeks to secure mitigation measures regarding international nature conservation sites</li> </ul>
<p>Development at Park Farm, Stoneham (COM5) has the potential to result in isolated development, with the potential of an adverse effect on biodiversity and heritage assets</p>	<p>This site should come forward as part of the wider site within Eastleigh Borough (land south of Chestnut Avenue)</p> <p>The features of biodiversity value should be</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Policy COM5 and the supporting text to the policy identify the need for a comprehensive approach to development (i.e. that the proposal would not be a stand alone scheme) and that vehicular access should be through the proposed</li> </ul>

What is mitigation for? What is the impact of the policies?	Mitigation measures	How have the proposed mitigation measures been taken into account?
	<p>conserved and where possible enhanced</p> <p>Ensure that any development is planned in a way that is sensitive to the historic environment, recognise that there are likely to remain adverse impacts on the historic landscape in combination with the wider proposals in terms of the impact on the historic landscape</p>	<p>allocation within Eastleigh Borough</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Policy E5 relates to the conservation and enhancement of biodiversity, including SINCS</li> <li>- Policy E9 sets out requirements in relation to heritage assets, including listed buildings and their setting, with a specific requirement also included in policy COM5</li> </ul>
<p>Development at Bargain Farm, Nursling and Rownhams for economic development and park and ride facilities (LE5 and T3) have the potential to have an adverse impact on heritage assets (including a listed building)</p>	<p>Ensure that any development is planned in a way that is sensitive to the historic environment, including the listed building and its setting</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Policy E9 sets out requirements in relation to heritage assets, including listed buildings and their setting</li> <li>- Policy LE5 includes a criteria seeking to ensure development respects the setting of the listed building</li> </ul>
<p>Development at Ganger Farm, Romsey for formal recreation purposes (LHW2) has the potential to adversely affect biodiversity, including the foraging habitat of barbastelle bats associated with Mottisfont Bats SAC, and adversely affect the setting of the Sir Harold Hillier Gardens and Arboretum (historic park and garden)</p>	<p>Ensure that the site is planned sensitively to ensure features of biodiversity value are conserved and where possible enhanced, in particular this includes the need for further consideration of whether the site is used by barbastelle bats (reference Mottisfont Bats SAC) and the potential impact of any floodlighting (see HRA for more detail)</p> <p>Ensure that any development is planned in a way that is sensitive to the historic environment, including the setting of the Sir</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Policy E5 relates to the conservation and enhancement of biodiversity, including international designations – policy LHW2 also includes a requirement to avoid harming biodiversity</li> <li>- Policy LHW2 highlights the need to protect the setting of the Sir Harold Hillier Gardens and Arboretum</li> <li>- The supporting text to policy LHW2 highlights the need to take account of the potential implications including on Mottisfont Bats and the Arboretum, including in relation to potential</li> </ul>

What is mitigation for? What is the impact of the policies?	Mitigation measures	How have the proposed mitigation measures been taken into account?
	Harold Hillier Gardens and Arboretum	floodlighting - Policy E9 sets out requirements in relation to heritage assets

## **5. Conclusion**

- 5.1 This Sustainability Appraisal report in relation to modifications to the Revised Local Plan has been prepared to meet the requirements of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended) and the SEA Regulations (and Directive).
- 5.2 While this report has focused on the 'main' modifications, there has also been consideration of the sustainability implications proposed 'minor' modifications. In relation to the 'main' modifications, this appraisal has considered the approach to alternative options and significant effects.
- 5.3 Chapter 4 of this report includes an updated assessment of the likely effects of the Revised Local Plan, incorporating the implications of all the modifications.
- 5.4 The Sustainability Appraisal process has been drawn on throughout the production of the Revised Local Plan. The consideration of options and potential effects has enabled the identification of mitigation measures which have been included within the Revised Local Plan, which should also be considered in the determination of planning applications.
- 5.5 The monitoring framework set out within the November 2013 Sustainability Appraisal has been reviewed and is considered to remain appropriate.
- 5.6 This report has been published for consultation alongside the schedule of proposed modifications to the Revised Local Plan DPD.

**Appendix 1: Sustainability Appraisal Framework** (taken from the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report, 2011)

Indicative Test	Target	Indicators	SEA topic	Community Plan Theme(s)
<b>Objective 1. Avoid and reduce the risk of flooding and the resulting detrimental effects to public wellbeing, the economy and environment.</b>				
<i>Flood risk has been identified as an issue within the Borough both in rural and urban areas. The LDF should ensure flood risk is addressed.</i>				
a. Will it involve inappropriate development in an area of moderate or high flood risk (Flood Risk Zones 2 and 3)? b. Will it help reduce the risk of flooding?	- Prevent new inappropriate development within Flood Risk Zones 2, 3a and 3b, in line with PPS25 - Promote the use of sustainable drainage systems	- Number of properties at risk of flooding - Number of planning permissions granted contrary to the advice of the Environment Agency	Water Population Human Health Soil Biodiversity Flora Fauna Landscape Material Assets Cultural Heritage	Environment Local Economy Local Communities Health and Wellbeing Leisure and Culture
<b>Objective 2. Support the mitigation against and adaptation to climate change. Promote energy efficiency and renewable energy sources.</b>				
<i>Climate change is a key issue and carbon dioxide emissions from the Borough are relatively high. There is a need for the Borough to work towards national targets to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and increase the use of renewable energy sources (which can also have energy security benefits), whilst ensuring it is prepared for the forecast impacts of climate change.</i>				
a. Will it help reduce greenhouse gas emissions? b. Will it reduce demand for energy? c. Will it improve energy efficiency? d. Will it increase the use of renewable sources of energy? e. Will it help reduce vulnerability to the effects of climate change? f. Will it restrict the adaptation /	- Climate Change Act 2008: reduce greenhouse gas emissions by at least 26% by 2020 and 80% by 2050 - Avoid development that will hamper the adaptation of	- Carbon dioxide / greenhouse gas emissions of the Borough per capita - Energy use (electricity and gas) per person / consumer - Installed renewable energy capacity	Climatic Factors Air Material Assets Population Landscape Water Human Health Soil Biodiversity	Environment Health and Wellbeing Leisure and Culture Local Economy Local Communities Transport

Indicative Test	Target	Indicators	SEA topic	Community Plan Theme(s)
evolution of the environment to climate change (e.g. habitat migration)?	the environment to climate change		Flora Fauna Cultural Heritage	
<b>Objective 3. Improve the efficient use of land and conserve soil resources.</b>				
<i>There are national objectives relating to the efficient use of land. There are limited opportunities in the Borough to re-use previously developed land; however the LDF has a role in promoting the use of previously developed land and efficient use of land.</i>				
a. Will it encourage the re-use of previously developed land or the re-use of buildings? b. Will it encourage the efficient use of land? c. Will it help reduce the amount of greenfield development? d. Will it conserve soil resources (including the best and most versatile agricultural land)? e. Will it support the appropriate re-use of contaminated land (and can risks associated with historic contamination be adequately addressed)?	- Minimise the use of the best and most versatile agricultural land	- Proportion of new dwellings built on previously developed land (PPS3 definition) - Density of residential development (dwellings per hectare)	Soil Biodiversity Flora Fauna Landscape Material Assets	Environment Local Economy Local Communities
<b>Objective 4. Promote the efficient and sustainable use of resources, whilst ensuring the sustainable management of waste.</b>				
<i>Reducing resource consumption and generation of waste are national and regional objective. The LDF has a role to play in delivering these objectives.</i>				
a. Will it promote a more efficient use of resources (including energy and	- National targets of recycling and	- Domestic per household / consumer consumption	Material Assets Soil	Environment Local Economy

Indicative Test	Target	Indicators	SEA topic	Community Plan Theme(s)
natural resources – water is covered below)? b. Will it encourage the use of sustainable materials? c. Will it help reduce the amount of waste generated? d. Will it support increased recycling and composting of waste?	composting at least 40% of household waste by 2010, 45% by 2015 and 50% by 2020	of electricity and gas - Waste produced per resident - Test Valley and Hampshire waste generation, recycling and composting rates - Number of renewable energy applications permitted	Water Air Landscape Climatic Factors	
<b>Objective 5. Protect and enhance the water environment and ensure the sustainable management of water resources.</b>				
<i>The quality of the water environment in the Borough is generally good and this should be maintained / improved in line with the requirements of the Water Framework Directive. Test Valley is within an area of serious water stress, therefore it is important to manage the water environment in a sustainable way.</i>				
a. Will it protect the quality of the water environment? b. Will it aid in the delivery of the Water Framework Directive requirements? c. Will it help to safeguard groundwater sources? d. Will it help to reduce the demand for water? e. Will sufficient water infrastructure be available to support development?	- No deterioration in the status of water bodies and work towards good status (WFD) - Average per capita consumption of no more than 130 litres per person per day by 2030 (based on UK Water Strategy) - Not exceeding the	- Achievement of Water Framework Directive targets - Water consumption per person - Condition of sites of biodiversity importance (e.g. River Test SSSI)	Water Biodiversity Flora Fauna Human Health Material Assets Soil	Environment Health and Wellbeing

Indicative Test	Target	Indicators	SEA topic	Community Plan Theme(s)
	capacity of water infrastructure - Promote the use of sustainable drainage systems			
<b>Objective 6. Conserve and enhance the Borough's biodiversity.</b>				
<i>The Borough has a high quality natural environment, which includes a range of sites and species of nature conservation importance. The LDF should support the conservation and enhancement of the Borough's biodiversity.</i>				
a. Will it help conserve or enhance the Borough's biodiversity? b. Will it support the delivery of the Biodiversity Action Plan? c. Will it conserve or enhance sites designated for their nature conservation interest (including local designations)? d. Has it been tested under the Habitats Regulations (issues identified in Appendix 4 may provide a steer)?	- Ensure the integrity and favourable conservation status of SACs, SPAs and Ramsar sites - SSSIs should be in favourable or recovering condition - Conserve / enhance the local biodiversity in accordance with the BAP (to include Biodiversity Opportunity Areas) - Promote the provision of links / corridors / stepping	- Condition of SSSIs - Number / amount of BAP priority species and BAP habitats within the Borough - Extent of locally designated sites and proportion in positive management	Biodiversity Flora Fauna Landscape Soil Water Air Climatic Factors Material Assets	Environment

Indicative Test	Target	Indicators	SEA topic	Community Plan Theme(s)
	stones between habitats and avoid fragmentation			
<b>Objective 7. Reduce air pollution and ensure air quality is maintained or enhanced.</b>				
<i>The air quality in the Borough is generally good and it is important that this is maintained or enhanced. The LDF has a role to play in ensuring this objective is delivered.</i>				
a. Will it help minimise air pollution? b. Will it help meet air quality targets?	- National air quality targets - Avoid exceeding critical levels / loads for habitats	- Performance against national air quality targets - Number of Air Quality Management Areas - Critical levels / loads for specific habitats	Air Human Health Climatic Factors	Environment Health and Wellbeing
<b>Objective 8. Conserve and enhance the Borough's landscape and settlement character.</b>				
<i>The Borough has a predominately rural character and includes areas of protected landscape. The LDF has a role in conserving the landscape and settlement character, as well as the character of the countryside. This includes consideration of the Borough's townscapes.</i>				
a. Will it conserve or enhance the landscape character? b. Will it conserve or enhance settlement character, including the distinction between settlements? c. Will it ensure new development is appropriately integrated with existing development? d. Will it encourage the preservation and enhancement of the	- Have regard to the purpose of landscape designations and avoid development which will have an inappropriate impact on these designations - Development	- Area / number of statutory designations within the Borough - Delivery of management plans for statutory designations	Landscape Cultural Heritage Material Assets Biodiversity Flora Fauna Soil	Environment Local Communities Leisure and Culture

Indicative Test	Target	Indicators	SEA topic	Community Plan Theme(s)
countryside? e. Will it respect the purpose / objectives of statutory designations? f. Will it keep the Borough as an attractive place to visit?	should respect / be appropriate to the local landscape and settlement character			
<b>Objective 9. Conserve and enhance the historic environment.</b>				
<i>The historic environment forms a key part of the Borough's character and it is important that it is conserved and where possible enhanced.</i>				
a. Will it conserve or enhance the historic environment (including non-statutory designations and locally important features)? b. Will it conserve and enhance the historic built environment and its setting?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Reduce the heritage assets on the 'at risk' register</li> <li>- Development should conserve / enhance the historic environment and its setting</li> <li>- Development should conform with the guidance within Conservation Area Character Appraisals where appropriate</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Number of listed buildings, Conservation Areas, Scheduled Ancient Monuments, and Historic Parks and Gardens</li> <li>- Number of heritage assets on the 'at risk' register</li> </ul>	Cultural Heritage Landscape Material Assets	Environment Leisure and Culture Local Communities

Indicative Test	Target	Indicators	SEA topic	Community Plan Theme(s)
<b>Objective 10. Ensure that everyone has the opportunity to live in a decent, sustainably constructed and affordable home suitable to their needs.</b>				
<i>The cost of housing in comparison to wages is considered to be an issue in Test Valley. The LDF should support the provision of affordable housing and a mix of housing to meet housing need (to include accounting for changes in the demographics of the Borough).</i>				
a. Will it support the delivery of an appropriate level of housing? b. Will it help increase the amount of affordable housing? c. Will it support the provision of a mix of housing to meet local needs? d. Will it promote the sustainable construction of housing? e. Will it help people in housing need?	- Deliver 798 affordable homes between 2011/12 and 2015 (including 58 rural affordable homes) - Reduce the number of homeless households - All new dwellings to be zero carbon by 2016	- Net additional dwellings completed - Housing trajectory - Number of affordable homes delivered - The number of households accepted as homeless - Proportion of new dwellings compliant with Code for Sustainable Homes standards	Population Material Assets Human Health	Local Communities Environment
<b>Objective 11. Reduce poverty and social exclusion, whilst maintaining and seeking to improve the health and wellbeing of the population, particularly in areas of deprivation within the Borough. Reduce crime and the fear of crime.</b>				
<i>The Borough includes pockets of deprivation which the LDF has a role in addressing. Furthermore, the LDF has a role in ensuring development is designed to reduce crime and the fear of crime.</i>				
a. Will it help address areas of higher deprivation? b. Will it encourage healthy lifestyles? c. Will it provide equal opportunities for everyone?	- Reduce deprivation within the Borough, particularly in Andover - Reduce levels of	- Index of Multiple Deprivation - Unemployment rate - Life expectancy - Disability claimant rate	Population Human Health	Community Safety Health and Wellbeing Local Economy Local Communities

Indicative Test	Target	Indicators	SEA topic	Community Plan Theme(s)
d. Will it help make a safer place? e. Will it help reduce the fear of crime?	crime and fear of crime within the Borough - Improve access to facilities and services (including open space / green space)	- Crime rate per 1,000 population - Death rates from circulatory disease and cancer - Conception rates for under 18s - Availability of public open space per 1,000 population		
<b>Objective 12. Ensure the local economy is thriving with high and stable levels of growth. Raise levels of enterprise and productivity promoting a diverse economy (including tourism) with high value and low impact, whilst stimulating economic regeneration.</b>				
<i>Economic growth is an objective for the region although the impacts of recession are recognised. The Borough has a high level of employment but there are some areas of deprivation and opportunities for regeneration that need to be addressed. The growth of a sustainable rural economy should be supported.</i>				
a. Will it support the Borough's economy? b. Will it help maintain rates of employment? c. Will it reduce unemployment and income deprivation? d. Will it help retain and provide a variety of employment opportunities? e. Will it support the needs of small businesses? f. Will it encourage investment	- Maintain / improve levels and variety of employment land - Support opportunities for home based working - Support local and small scale businesses	- Net employment completions - Index of Multiple Deprivation (including income and employment domains) - Number of employee jobs - Percentage of working age people in employment - Proportion claiming Jobseekers Allowance	Population Material Assets	Local Economy Local Communities Environment

Indicative Test	Target	Indicators	SEA topic	Community Plan Theme(s)
opportunities in the Borough? g. Will it support the rejuvenation of the employment estates within the Borough? h. Will it help provide more high skilled jobs? i. Will it support sustainable tourism?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amount of vacant commercial floorspace</li> <li>- Proportion of vacant units in the primary shopping centres</li> <li>- Gross Value Added</li> </ul>		
<b>Objective 13. Enable residents and visitors to have access to and enjoy a wide range of high quality cultural and leisure activities.</b>				
<i>There is a range of leisure and cultural activities available within the Borough, the LDF has a role in protecting existing facilities and promoting the establishment of new leisure and cultural opportunities.</i>				
a. Will it improve the quality and accessibility of cultural and leisure activities? b. Will it add to the variety of cultural and leisure activities? c. Will it encourage residents and visitors to participate in cultural and leisure activities?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increase participation in leisure and cultural activities</li> <li>- Increase the amount / standard of the public open space and accessible natural greenspace within the Borough</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Community Plan and Corporate Plan monitoring</li> <li>- Surpluses and deficits in public open space provision (based on per 1,000 population)</li> <li>- Access to natural greenspace (based on ANGSt)</li> <li>- Additional length of cycleways provided</li> </ul>	Cultural Heritage Population Landscape	Leisure and Culture Local Communities Local Economy Health and Wellbeing

Indicative Test	Target	Indicators	SEA topic	Community Plan Theme(s)
<b>Objective 14. Improve access to all services and facilities, whilst improving the efficiency and integration of transport networks and the availability of sustainable modes of transport.</b>				
<i>Improving access to key services and facilities is particularly important for the rural areas, while new development should be planned to take account of accessibility and opportunities improve sustainable modes of transport.</i>				
<p>a. Will it make it easier and quicker to access key services and facilities?</p> <p>b. Will it provide local facilities / services close to communities (and support those already in place)?</p> <p>c. Will it support the retention and enhancement of sustainable modes of transport?</p> <p>d. Will it ensure the integration of transport networks?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Maintain or improve accessibility (including as measured by the Index of Multiple Deprivation barriers to housing and services domain)</li> <li>- Increased length of walking and cycling routes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Number of passengers using community transport</li> <li>- Road traffic accidents</li> <li>- Traffic levels on key routes through the Borough</li> <li>- Proportion of trips made by non-car modes</li> <li>- Distance travelled to work</li> <li>- Percentage of new residential development within 30 minutes public transport time of local services</li> <li>- Number of travel plans for new developments likely to have a significant traffic impact</li> <li>- Barriers to housing and services domain of the Index of Multiple</li> </ul>	<p>Population</p> <p>Material Assets</p> <p>Climatic Factors</p> <p>Air</p> <p>Human Health</p>	<p>Transport</p> <p>Local Communities</p> <p>Local Economy</p> <p>Leisure and Culture</p> <p>Health and Wellbeing</p> <p>Environment</p>

Indicative Test	Target	Indicators	SEA topic	Community Plan Theme(s)
		Deprivation		
<b>Objective 15. Raise educational achievement levels and develop the opportunities for everyone to acquire the skills they need throughout life, supporting the development of a skilled workforce.</b>				
<i>Raising the standard of education is a regional priority and there is a need to address areas of educational and skill deprivation.</i>				
a. Does it encourage lifelong learning (including training and skills development)? b. Will it improve opportunities for better education and access to training? c. Will it address areas of greater education and skills deprivation?	- Improve basic skills levels and meet national targets	- Percentage of people with higher level qualifications	Population	Education and Lifelong Learning Local Economy

## Appendix 2: Main Modifications and Consideration of Alternatives

Modifications for the Revised Local Plan (RLP) are documented as ~~strikethrough~~ text representing potential deletions and underlined text representing potential insertions. Where changes relate to maps, these have not been replicated in association with the below table but are available within document reference TVBC14<sup>19</sup>.

Ref	Policy/Para	Modification	Approach to the Consideration of Alternatives
TVBC/ MM/5 /1	Para 5.12	Amend wording to read: “The housing led scenarios range between 292 and 834dpa. A figure of 292dpa assumes that all units are affordable. This exceeds the Council’s corporate target of delivering 200 affordable units per annum <sup>39</sup> . A figure of 834dpa dwellings <del>would</del> deliver the objectively assessed <u>affordable</u> housing need <del>(of 292dpa)</del> , however this relies on open market housing development delivering affordable housing as sought in line with Policy COM7. This...”	This modification seeks to provide clarification on housing scenarios identified through the evidence base. Therefore it is not appropriate to consider alternatives.
TVBC/ MM/5 /2	Para 5.22	Add additional wording “The Council has worked with other PUSH authorities to ensure a consistent evidence based in South Hampshire. For the rest of Test Valley, the SHMA takes account of the housing market within which it is located. The proposed housing requirement figures do not rely upon any neighbouring authorities to meet the Borough’s own housing need. <u>Similarly, no request has been received from any neighbouring authorities, for the Borough to contribute towards meeting their housing need</u> ”.	This wording is a statement of fact regarding the Duty to Co-operate. Therefore it is not appropriate to consider alternatives.
TVBC/ MM/5 /3	Para 5.31	Amend wording to read: “The new homes built over the plan period should provide a mix of sizes and types to meet the demographic changes of the Borough and the results of the Strategic Housing Market Assessment. The SHMA identified a need for a variety of house types. <u>It also identified a number of household groups which may have particular housing needs. This includes</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Older people</u></li> </ul>	The text is drawing information from the evidence base to provide context, therefore it does not represent an option against which alternatives can be assessed. In relation to the consideration of the needs of specific household groups, there would be the potential to provide a specific policy addressing this matter; however

<sup>19</sup> Available on the Council’s website at: <http://www.testvalley.gov.uk/resident/planningandbuildingcontrol/planningpolicy/local-development-framework/revised-local-plan-examination/>

Ref	Policy/Para	Modification	Approach to the Consideration of Alternatives
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>People with disabilities</u></li> <li>• <u>Households with children</u></li> <li>• <u>Young people</u>”</li> </ul>	<p>the Council did not consider this to be a reasonable option as it would duplicate matters covered in policies COM1 and COM7 (paragraph 5.107) in relation to providing an appropriate mix of housing to meet the needs of the community.</p>
TVBC/ MM/5 /4	Para 5.46	<p>Amend supporting text to add additional paragraph 5.46a  <u>“Some schemes, such as those submitted under the rural exception affordable housing or community led development policies, are likely to come forward on sites outside of the defined settlement boundary. Such schemes may be acceptable if they meet social or economic needs of that community. Parish Councils may wish to bring forward Neighbourhood Development Plans which include proposals for additional development. The choice of sites could be either within or outside of settlement boundaries provided that the site selection takes into account the principles of sustainable development and the relevant policies within the Revised Local Plan.”</u></p>	<p>During the Hearing sessions, the Inspector sought that the position be clarified in terms of how Neighbourhood Development Plans could bring forward options for additional development outside settlement boundaries whilst remaining in general conformity with the strategic policies. While there would be different ways of achieving this, it is not considered that there are sufficiently distinct options to undertake an appraisal. The option of not including such text would also not be reasonable in light of the request for clarification on the matter. A separate policy would be unlikely to deliver anything further than is included within the modification based on the reason why it was requested.</p>
TVBC/ MM/5 /5	Para 5.73	<p>Amend wording to read:  <u>“A range of community facilities are proposed to serve the needs of the new neighbourhood which will also be accessible to existing residents of the adjoining areas. This includes a local centre, including shops, community hall and health provision and a primary school. These facilities will help create opportunities to influence travel behaviour to local services both within the development and to the town centre. To achieve this, the local centre services, community facilities and school could be co-located and be delivered early in the development. Early provision should also be made for travel to town centre services by modes other than the private car to encourage and establish sustainable travel patterns. These routes should be safe, convenient and attractive. The precise location and phasing of the facilities and local centre</u></p>	<p>The main change to the text relates to the clarification that provision should be made for the early delivery of the local centre services, community facilities and school, as well as modes of travel to the town centre. The review of this text to provide clarification was sought by the Planning Inspector therefore there are not considered to be sufficiently distinct alternatives to appraisal.</p>

Ref	Policy/Para	Modification	Approach to the Consideration of Alternatives
		uses <u>and non-car routes</u> will be determined through the detailed planning of the site....”	
TVBC/ MM/5 /6	Para 5.75	Amend wording to read: “...A new pedestrian/cycle bridge over the railway line is to be provided between the A27/A3057 and the site to link <u>it</u> to the town centre. <del>The feasibility of creating a link for public transport to the existing built up area would be considered as part of the future detailed planning of the site.</del> <u>To encourage the use of sustainable modes of transport improvements will also be required to off site cycle and pedestrian routes to accommodate the impact of additional movement from the site. The site should also be served by public transport and that the provision of bus services will be required. The improvements will be informed by a detailed Transport Assessment.</u> ”	During the Hearing sessions the Inspector sought clarification of this text to cover off site improvements and reduce the potential for misunderstanding the proposals in relation to bus provision. As such, there are not considered to be sufficiently distinct alternatives to appraisal.
TVBC/ MM/5 /7	Policy COM5	Amend wording of policy to read: “A site at Park Farm, Stoneham (see Map C) is allocated for approximately 50 dwellings <u>to come forward alongside residential development of land south of Chestnut Avenue.</u> ”	No alternatives have been considered as this modification reflects the position in the November 2013 Sustainability Appraisal (see paragraph 9.114).
TVBC/ MM/5 /8	Policy COM5	Add additional text at the end of the policy to read: “ <u>Any future proposal would need to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the listed structure or its setting or any historic feature of interest.</u> ”	No alternatives have been appraised as this modification results from a request for clarification from the Inspector to cover heritage matters within the policy, rather than relying on the Heritage policy. Alternative wording to achieve this was not considered to result in sufficiently distinct options to consider.
TVBC/ MM/5 /9	Para 5.81	Amend text to read: “Land to the north of Park Farm is proposed for development by Eastleigh Borough Council in its Local Plan. There is an opportunity to achieve a comprehensive development of the area by including land <u>within</u> the Borough for development. The sustainability of the site relies on the delivery of the proposed allocation and infrastructure improvement within the Eastleigh Local Plan. <u>Development would need to be brought forward in line with that development proposed to the north of the site at land south of Chestnut Avenue. The residential development envisaged in COM5 would not be</u>	No alternatives have been considered as this modification reflects the position in the November 2013 Sustainability Appraisal (see paragraph 9.114).

Ref	Policy/Para	Modification	Approach to the Consideration of Alternatives
		<p><del>acceptable in principle as a stand alone proposal.</del> The Councils are working together on the combined proposals to ensure delivery is properly phased and that the infrastructure requirements can accommodate both proposals.</p> <p><del>Development would need be brought forward in line with that development proposed to the north of the site at land south of Chestnut Avenue."</del></p>	
TVBC/ MM/5 /10	Policy COM7	<p>Amend to read:  <del>"In assessing the suitability of such sites for the provision of affordable housing the Council will take into account:</del>            a) <del>the size, suitability and the economics of provision; and</del>            b) <del>the need to achieve a successful housing development</del></p> <p>[to follow after the 4<sup>th</sup> bullet point] <u>"and which will be secured via a legal agreement.</u></p> <p><u>In assessing the suitability of such sites for the provision of affordable housing the Council will take into account the size, suitability and the economics of provision.</u></p> <p><u>Development should provide for the appropriate integration of affordable housing and market housing, in order to achieve an inclusive and mixed community.</u></p>	<p>The amendment was put forward as a result of a request by the Inspector to clarify the meaning of criterion b. The modification also seeks to ensure consistency with the supporting text. There were not considered to be sufficiently distinct alternatives to appraise relative to the sustainability objectives. The option of no text was not considered to be reasonable in light of ensuring consistency with paragraph 50 of the NPPF.</p>
TVBC/ MM/5 /11	Policy COM9	<p>Add additional criterion bA)  <u>"It is demonstrated that the community supports the proposal; and..."</u></p>	<p>This amendment responds to a request for clarity during the Hearing Sessions to ensure consistency between the policy and supporting text, thus being more explicit about community support. It is considered that there are not sufficiently distinct alternatives to appraise in dealing with this matter.</p>
TVBC/ MM/5 /12	Para 5.135	<p>It is proposed to replace paragraph 5.135 to read:  <del>"New dwellings under Policy COM 8 and COM10 are restricted to those with a local connection or their employment requires them to be based at that location. The Council believes that a similar approach should apply to gypsy,</del></p>	<p>This paragraph was reviewed in line with a request from the Inspector and through further discussion at the relevant Hearing session in relation to how criterion d of the policy will be</p>

Ref	Policy/Para	Modification	Approach to the Consideration of Alternatives
		<p><del>traveller and travelling showpeople sites. This would help integration with the existing settled community. To support the applicant's case it should be demonstrated that they have a specific reason to locate within the Borough. In considering applications it will need to be demonstrated that there is a specific reason to locate within the Borough. This could include the lack of availability of alternative accommodation, a local connection or their employment requires them to be at that location. This would help justify a countryside location where there is generally a restriction on development. "</del></p>	<p>applied. It is considered that there are not sufficiently distinct alternatives to appraise in the context of the application of this criterion, rather than the principle of the criterion itself.</p>
<p>TVBC/ MM/6 /1</p>	<p>Para 6.17</p>	<p>Amend paragraph to read:            "The Council wishes to retain the Science Park's focus as a centre for the knowledge driven industry <del>but</del> <u>and</u> recognises that there may be need for support facilities. <del>Proposals for support facilities whose predominant patronage would arise from the needs of the employees and companies based at the Science Park may be appropriate. Proposals for support facilities provided for the benefit of occupiers of the Science Park and their employees or which are necessary for its proper management will be permitted, provided that such facilities occupy no more than 10% of the floor area of buildings on the Science Park. This could include but should not be limited to, financial and professional services linked to the nature of the companies located on the Science Park. The Council recognises that in order to develop products it may be necessary to produce prototypes or to have limited production runs. Occupiers would need to demonstrate that any such production would be closely related to the Science Park's research and development activity.</del> The type of use, terms of occupancy and other matters (such as the provision of support facilities and landscaping) are controlled by planning agreements..."</p>	<p>The Inspector requested that this be re-considered in relation to being more explicit regarding the proportions of supporting facilities within the site and the approach to ancillary operations that may be undertaken on site. While alternative figures could be considered for the support facilities, the position set out is consistent with legal agreements in place for the site and supported by the representative for the site, therefore it is considered that alternative figures would not be reasonable to assess.</p>
<p>TVBC/ MM/6 /2</p>	<p>Para 6.19</p>	<p>Amend paragraph to read:            "Land at Benham Campus (Kennels Farm) was identified within the Borough Local Plan (2006) and development has commenced. It is proposed to allocate additional land south of Benham Campus to allow for the expansion of the Science Park. This would provide opportunities for other knowledge based companies to locate, expand and benefit from the existing facilities at the Science Park. <u>Future proposals should comprise scientific research and</u></p>	<p>In line with the above, it is not considered that alternative approaches to the matters modified in this paragraph would be reasonable. Therefore no alternatives have been appraised.</p>

Ref	Policy/Para	Modification	Approach to the Consideration of Alternatives
		<p><u>development and ancillary industrial production. Occupiers would need to demonstrate that any such production would be closely related to the Science Park’s research and development activity. Any support facilities should be for the benefit of occupiers of the Science Park and their employees or be necessary for its proper management provided that such facilities occupy no more than 10% of the floor area of buildings on the Science Park.”</u></p>	
<p>TVBC/ MM/6 /3</p>	<p>Para 6.22</p>	<p>Amend to read “Land at the southern end of the site as is the primary location for employment as it is closest to the local road network. However, through the <u>Masterplan for Whitenap and the</u> detailed design of the site opportunities for part of the employment requirement may come forward within it, for example as part of the proposed Local Centre.”</p>	<p>This modification seeks to make it explicit that masterplanning undertaken in relation to policy COM3 would incorporate the employment floorspace element allocated through LE3. This was sought by the Inspector. It is considered that there are no reasonable alternatives in this case.</p>
<p>TVBC/ MM/6 /4</p>	<p>Policy LE4</p>	<p>Amend policy to read: <del>Approximately 5 hectares of land for employment (Class B8) south of Brownhill Way, Nursling (see Map F) is proposed to be allocated. Development will be permitted provided that:</del></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><del>a) 15m of landscaping on the boundaries of the site with the M271, and Brownhill Way is provided;</del></li> <li><del>b) Access to the site is provided via</del> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><del>i. New vehicular access to Brownhill Way</del></li> <li><del>ii. Pedestrian and cycle access to Brownhill Way; and</del></li> </ul> </li> <li><del>c) The development provides appropriate improvements to the transport network</del></li> </ul> <p><u>“South of Brownhill Way, Nursling, (see Map F) the use of land and buildings will be restricted to storage and distribution uses (Class B8) and ancillary processing and assembly within Class B1.”</u></p>	<p>During the Hearing sessions, it was requested that consideration be given to framing this policy so as to retain the use of the site established through a planning permission, rather than as an allocation. While this represents an alternative approach, it does not fundamentally change the implications for the site, particularly in light of the planning permission which is being implemented on this site. In light of the position of the Inspector and the planning permission being in place, it is not considered to be reasonable to test alternative styles of policies for this use of the site.</p>
<p>TVBC/ MM/6 /5</p>	<p>Para 6.26</p>	<p>Amend to read “<del>Whilst the</del> The site, including land within Southampton City, has <del>outline</del> planning permission<sup>69</sup> for a 38,200sqm warehouse, plus 4,500sqm of offices</p>	<p>This modification provides factual updates, including a reference to planning permission granted for the site and a cross reference to the</p>

Ref	Policy/Para	Modification	Approach to the Consideration of Alternatives
		<p>and plant (including land within Southampton City), of which 26,200sqm is within Test Valley. This permission is currently being implemented. The policy has been included in order to provide a framework for the site given its special characteristics for Class B8 use and in the context of a strategic requirement for such floorspace in South Hampshire<sup>69A</sup>. <del>Proposals for the site should be comprehensive and take into account land within Southampton City. The proposal would need to provide landscaping on its boundaries taking account of existing features and adjoining uses. Improvements to the transport network should be provided. The development's impact will need to take account of proposed and permitted development which has yet to be completed in both Test Valley and Southampton City.</del></p> <p><sup>69</sup> 11/02859/FULLS – erection of a regional distribution centre (42,820 m2 gross area)</p> <p><sup>69A</sup> PUSH and RLP evidence base, and Table 8</p>	<p>evidence base. Therefore no alternatives have been appraised.</p>
<p>TVBC/ MM/6 /6</p>	<p>Policy LE6</p>	<p>Amend to read:  “Development for <del>high quality</del> office/research/manufacturing Class B1 and exceptionally support facilities at Adanac Park, Nursling (see Map F) will be permitted provided that:  <del>a) the development is for users seeking to establish a major operation with secure boundaries and a clear corporate identity;</del>  <u>a b) it is designed to a high standard to respect the characteristics of the site, including its existing development, and neighbouring land uses; and</u>  <del>c) any built development should be designed to a high standard and should not exceed 2,500 square metres of gross floorspace per hectare</del>  <u>d b) the development provides appropriate improvements to the transport network.”</u></p>	<p>The modifications proposed to this policy relate to changes raised through the Hearing session. They also reflect changes in position following on from the planning history of the site. As such, no sufficiently distinct alternatives have been identified for appraisal in the context of the sustainability objectives.</p>
<p>TVBC/ MM/6 /7</p>	<p>Para 6.47</p>	<p>Amend 3<sup>rd</sup> bullet to read:  “• Keep under review its own land holdings, <u>including George Yard / Black Swan Yard, Walworth Business Park and Portway Business Parks</u>”</p>	<p>This modification seeks to clarify the Council's landholdings that could be considered in the context of the bullet point. The clarification was sought by the Inspector. There are not considered to be reasonable alternatives to this</p>

Ref	Policy/Para	Modification	Approach to the Consideration of Alternatives
TVBC/ MM/6 /8	Policy LE10	Delete existing paragraph 6.92 and insert amended paragraph to form 6.51a within the supporting text section to policy LE10 <u>“In some cases the particular existing uses on site may be causing such serious environmental harm that their removal may be desirable and redevelopment of the site for more appropriate business activities may be justified. It would need to be demonstrated that the displaced uses would not be seeking an alternative site which would simply mean the relocation of the environmental problem to another location and that the redevelopment proposal would result in a substantial gain in terms of environmental impacts, such as traffic and visual impact and other potential nuisances.”</u>	modification. The location of the paragraph effectively comprises a typographical correction, with the amendment to the wording seeking to ensure consistency between the policy and supporting text. As such, there are not considered to be reasonable alternatives to this modification.
TVBC/ MM/6 /9	Policy LE15	Amended to read: “ <u>Development fronting on to the High Street (Map 47a)</u> will be permitted provided that”  Add Map 47a to define the Local Centre (as a frontage).	The Inspector sought the clarification of where the policy would apply through the definition of an area. Therefore, no alternatives have been identified in terms of whether or not to include a boundary.  In addition, alternative approaches to defining the extent of the frontage have not been appraised as this was undertaken as a technical exercise in the context of what the policy is seeking to achieve (this reflects the approach for the definition of frontages and town centre boundaries in the November 2013 appraisal report).
TVBC/ MM/6 /10	Para 6.85	Amend paragraph 6.85 to read: “The aim is to keep the amount of new building required in the countryside to a minimum and to protect the character of the existing building, by maintaining its original structure, built form, architectural detail, materials and general design. <del>Proposal which will result in the creation of another building to fulfil the function of that being converted will not be supported.</del> However, where proposals for alternative use require the creation of new <u>ancillary</u> buildings	The review of this text was sought by the Inspector to provide clarity and ensure compatibility with the policy wording. No sufficiently distinct alternatives have been identified.

Ref	Policy/Para	Modification	Approach to the Consideration of Alternatives
		and/ or extensions to that being converted these will be considered on their own merits. <u>The Council wishes to ensure that uses ancillary to the new use of the building, such as additional car parking or open storage, do not have an impact on the surrounding countryside.</u>	
TVBC/ MM/6 /11	Policy LE18	Amend Policy to add an additional criterion: <u>“iiA) in the case of seasonal structures these are temporary in nature and do not have an adverse impact on the landscape; and”</u>	A review of this policy was sought by the Inspector to ensure consistency between the policy and supporting text. Therefore, no reasonable alternatives have been identified.
TVBC/ MM/6 /12	Policy LE18	Amend Policy to read: <u>“Proposals which involve the loss of serviced accommodation (Class C1) and non-serviced tourist accommodation, including caravan and camping sites, will only be permitted provided that it can be demonstrated that the existing living accommodation unit is no longer economically viable or required.”</u>	A review of this text was sought through discussion at the Hearing session to ensure all types of accommodation are explicitly considered. Therefore, no reasonable alternatives have been identified.
TVBC/ MM/6 /13	Para 6.100	Amend paragraph 6.100 to read: <u>“Any proposal which <del>resulted</del> results in the loss of tourist accommodation including caravan and camping sites would need to demonstrate that it is no longer economically viable or required. This will be evidenced by appropriate marketing for a six month period at an appropriate price reflecting the tourist restriction.”</u>	The modification responds to a request from the Inspector to consider the wording, as such no alternatives have been appraised.
TVBC/ MM/7 /1	Policy E1	It is proposed to include text at the end of Policy E1 to read: <u>“Development will not be permitted if it is of poor design and fails to improve the character, function and quality of the area.”</u>	The modification responds to a request from the Inspector to reconsider how the policy covers poor quality design. As such no alternatives have been appraised.
TVBC/ MM/7 /2	Para 7.14	It is proposed to amend the wording of paragraph 7.14 to read: <u>“Original and innovative designs can be used to <del>enliven areas of poor design,</del> help raise the standard of design in an area although it is important that such designs do not detract from the visual unity of areas that already have a successful, compatible mix of styles and materials. The inclusion....”</u>	The modification responds to a request to provide clarity in terms of consistency with the NPPF, as such no alternatives have been appraised.
TVBC/ MM/7 /3	E7	Amend last element of policy E7 to read: <u>“Criteria c) – d) need to be satisfied unless it can be demonstrated that it is not <del>technically or</del> financially viable.”</u>	The modification responds to a request from the Inspector, as such no alternatives have been appraised.

Ref	Policy/Para	Modification	Approach to the Consideration of Alternatives
TVBC/ MM/7 /4	Para 7.58	<p>Insert new paragraph after 7.58 to read:  <u>“7.58a There are a number of organisations involved in flooding matters, including the Environment Agency<sup>1</sup> and the Lead Local Flood Authority (Hampshire County Council)<sup>2</sup> In addition to its responsibilities as a local planning authority the Council is committed to working with relevant organisations managing flooding across the Borough. Following the flooding within the Borough in 2013/14, the Council is working in partnership with the relevant agencies to develop measures to manage risks of flooding in the future. Implementation of any measures would depend on the availability of funding”</u></p> <p>Footnotes:  <u>1 Environment Agency is responsible for flood risk from rivers and the sea, as well as regulating large reservoirs.</u>  <u>2 The Lead Local Flood Authority is responsible for managing the risk of flooding from groundwater, surface water runoff and ‘ordinary watercourses’ (i.e. water courses that are not part of a main river).</u></p>	<p>During the Hearing session it was requested that further consideration be given to the proactive approach to flood risk. Therefore no alternative has been appraised on not including text. The resultant wording provides an overview of the current position in terms of the operations of the Council. As such, no reasonable alternatives were identified.</p>
TVBC/ MM/7 /5	Para 7.70	<p>Amend the wording of the bullet points and insert new bullet point to read:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recognising importance of heritage assets individually through the putting forward for listing buildings and structures <del>and the designation and review of conservation areas</del>;</li> <li>• <u>Undertaking a review of existing Conservation Area appraisals within the Borough;</u></li> <li>• Maintaining and monitoring the register of buildings and other structures at risk which are <del>either disused and/or neglected</del> <u>most at risk through neglect, decay or other threats</u>, working with others to consider opportunities and proposals to bring them back into an appropriate sustainable use, and where necessary using legislative powers to address specific issues;</li> <li>• <u>Considering the merits of undertaking a Historic Environment Action Plan. This will include the possibility of working jointly with neighbouring authorities.</u></li> </ul>	<p>This amendment (along with others set out below) responds to discussion during the Hearing sessions around reviewing the policy and supporting text to ensure consistency with legislation and the NPPF, as well as taking account of representations from English Heritage. On this basis, no alternatives have been appraised as it would not be reasonable to promote options that were not consistent with national policy and legislation.</p>

Ref	Policy/Para	Modification	Approach to the Consideration of Alternatives
TVBC/ MM/7 /6	Para 7.70	<p>Insert a new paragraph 7.70a to read:  <u>“The Council has produced a guidance note on Listed Buildings which includes details on the responsibilities of owners and how to apply for Listed Building consent. A similar guidance note has been published dealing with Conservation Areas. These are available on the Council’s website.”</u></p>	<p>This is a statement of information available from the Council, therefore it is not considered appropriate to assess alternatives.</p>
TVBC/ MM/7 /7	Policy E9	<p>Amend criterion b), d) and insert criterion e) and f) to read:            b) <u>the significance of the heritage asset has informed the proposal through an assessment proportionate to its importance.</u>            d) <u>the nature of the heritage asset prevents all reasonable use; and</u>            e) <u>its conservation can not be achieved by either a viable alternative use, support from public ownership or funding from other sources; and</u>            f) <u>the harm or loss is outweighed by the benefit of bringing the site back into use.”</u></p> <p>Also amend text below these criteria to read:  <u>“Development which will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset will be considered against the public benefit of the proposal, including and securing a viable use.”</u></p>	<p>These amendments respond to discussion during the Hearing sessions around reviewing the policy and supporting text to ensure consistency with legislation and the NPPF, as well as taking account of representations from English Heritage. On this basis, no alternatives have been appraised as it would not be reasonable to promote options that were not consistent with national policy and legislation.</p>
TVBC/ MM/7 /8	Policy E9	<p>Amend last element of policy E9 to read:  <del>“Where the loss of a heritage asset is agreed the Council will need to be satisfied that there are approved and detailed plans and delivery mechanisms for the proposal’s implementation.”</del>  <u>The Council will only permit the loss of the whole or part of a heritage asset where it can be demonstrated that the new development will proceed after the loss has occurred”.</u></p>	
TVBC/ MM/7 /9	Para 7.71	<p>Amend paragraph 7.71 to read:  <u>“...be undertaken sensitively having fully recorded, understood and appreciated the significance of the heritage asset. Any proposals will need to demonstrate that any changes are justified and the loss or harm is minimised. In considering the benefits of the proposal the Council will consider the degree of harm to the significance of the heritage asset. In weighing the benefit of the</u></p>	

Ref	Policy/Para	Modification	Approach to the Consideration of Alternatives
		<p>proposal the Council will have special regard to the desirability of preserving <u>the building or its setting or any historic features of interest [insert footnote].</u>"</p> <p>Footnote: <u>Section 66(1) Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990</u></p>	
TVBC/ MM/7 /10	Para 7.72	<p>Amend 1<sup>st</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> bullets to read:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “an analysis of the asset to establish their <u>historic, architectural and archaeological</u> significance both as a whole and specific parts effected by the proposal;</li> <li>• demonstrate that the assessment has informed the <del>proposed development</del> <u>proposed use of the heritage asset and that it is compatible with its conservation.</u>”</li> </ul>	
TVBC/ MM/7 /11	Para 7.74	<p>Amend paragraph 7.74 to read  “...significant impact on a heritage asset as a result of poor design (<del>such as extensions and alterations</del>) which has not taken account of the significance of it, for example its historic character or the pattern of development. Even small additions or alterations (<u>such as extensions and alterations</u>) may be inappropriate as they may not complement the existing appearance, materials or finishes. This is the case for both external and internal additions and alterations. <u>The use of traditional, local materials and building techniques, where appropriate, would help minimise the impact on the asset.</u>”</p>	
TVBC/ MM/7 /12	Para 7.75	<p>Insert footnote to read:-  “..to the significance of the asset [<u>insert footnote</u>]. In considering...”</p> <p><u>“More details on how the setting is important to heritage assets can be found in ‘The Setting of Heritage Assets – English Heritage (2011)’</u></p>	
TVBC/ MM/7 /13	Para 7.76	<p>Relocate paragraph 7.78 to form paragraph 7.76 and amend to read:  “The harm or loss of part or whole of a heritage asset will need to be justified as such assets are irreplaceable and should be retained wherever possible and feasible. Where the proposal <del>seeks</del> <u>would result in</u> the substantial harm or loss of a designated heritage asset the Council will require evidence that there are considerable public benefits to justify its loss or that there are no other</p>	

Ref	Policy/Para	Modification	Approach to the Consideration of Alternatives
		<p>mechanisms for supporting the retention of the asset <u>in the medium term</u>. The merits of an alternative use may be considered where this would retain the asset providing it would not result in the loss of its important elements. It would also be important to ensure that any alternative use is capable of funding the conservation of the asset. Should the substantial harm or loss, <u>either in whole or in part</u>, be agreed the Council will require a clear indication that <del>the development will and that the loss of the asset was justified</del> <u>there are detailed plans and delivery mechanisms for the proposal’s implementation. In order to advance the understanding of the significance of the asset to be lost the Council will require a proportionate record to be produced and made publicly available. The condition of an historic building resulting from deliberate damage and neglect will not be taken into account in any decision.”</u></p>	
TVBC/ MM/7 /14	Para 7.77	<p>Relocate the existing wording of paragraph 7.77 to a new paragraph 7.81 and insert a new paragraph 7.77 to read:  <u>“Conservation areas are areas of special architectural or historic interest, the character or appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance. In considering proposals for development in Conservation Areas the Council will require that the layout, form, scale, massing, density, roofscape and external appearance of the proposal to conserve and enhance the specific historic and architectural interest. It will be necessary to show the development in context with its surroundings, including existing buildings, trees and other features which contribute to the character of the Conservation Area.”</u></p>	
TVBC/ MM/7 /15	Para 7.78	<p>Renumber paragraph 7.79 to become paragraph 7.78 and amend to read:  <u>“Within conservation areas not all buildings contribute to its significance as a designated heritage asset. The Council would support proposals which would result in an enhancement of a conservation area or its setting through the alteration or replacement of those buildings which do not make a positive contribution. Proposals should demonstrate that they will make a contribution to the character and quality of the conservation area which is at least equal to or better when compared with the existing. In those case where the building(s) does make a positive contribution to the significance of the conservation area justification that the public benefit outweighs the harm will need to be</u></p>	

Ref	Policy/Para	Modification	Approach to the Consideration of Alternatives
		provided.”	
TVBC/ MM/7 /16	Para 7.79	Insert new paragraph 7.79 to read: “ <u>Development which would involve ground disturbance in areas of known archaeological potential should be sensitively designed and located. A desk based archaeological assessment, and in certain circumstances a field evaluation, will be required. Where the preservation in situ of the archaeological remains is not possible or feasible the Council will require a programme of archaeological investigation, excavation and recording.</u> ”	
TVBC/ MM/7 /17	Para 7.80	Delete paragraph 7.80 “ <del>Within conservation areas not all buildings contribute to its significance as a designated heritage asset. Proposals which result in the loss of such buildings and are replaced by development which preserves or enhances the conservation area will be supported. In those case where the building(s) does make a positive contribution to the significance of the conservation area justification that the public benefit outweighs the harm will need to be provided</del> ”	
TVBC/ MM/7 /18	Para 7.80	Relocate paragraph 7.76 to form paragraph 7.80. Include a modification to footnote 116 to read:-  “The Council’s Conservation Area appraisal identifies <u>appraisals identify</u> a number of locally important buildings however this is not an exhaustive list. <u>The appraisals are available on the Council’s website.</u> ”	
TVBC/ MM/8 /1	Policy LHW2	Insert additional wording in criterion d) to read: “d) avoid harming <u>biodiversity and the amenity of nearby</u> residents and visitors to the Sir Harold Hillier Gardens and Arboretum; and”	These amendments were sought in light of discussion at the Hearing session to provide clarity within the policy, rather than relying on other policies within the Revised Local Plan. Therefore, no alternatives have been appraised
TVBC/ MM/9 /1	Policy T1	Include additional criterion to Policy T1 to read: “ <u>e) Provision is made to support and promote the use of sustainable transport, including the submission of a site travel plan where appropriate</u> ”.	The modification was proposed following discussion at the Hearing session to ensure consistency between the supporting text and policy, particularly in relation to site travel plans. Given the specific nature of the request for

Ref	Policy/Para	Modification	Approach to the Consideration of Alternatives
			modification, no alternatives have been appraised.
TVBC/ MM/9 /2	Para 9.16	Amend paragraph 9.16 to read: “The park and ride site forms part of a Transport Strategy for Southampton and is included with the Transport for South Hampshire’s [footnote] proposals for the sub-region. Part of Bargain Farm lies within Southampton and could be included within the park and ride proposal. <u>The facility may provide a general park and ride for the public and/or for specific named employers.</u> Regard should <u>also</u> be given to the requirements of policy LE5.”  [Footnote: Transport for South Hampshire Transport Delivery Plan (February 2013).	No alternatives have been considered in relation to this modification as it relates to a clarification of the potential occupier of the site – this had been fed into the November 2013 Sustainability Appraisal report (see paragraph 13.20).
TVBC/ MM/1 1/1	Policy ST1	Amend policy text to read; “Where a development has a significant impact on the labour market <del>the Council will seek a contribution</del> <u>contributions</u> towards the enhancement of skills training and the provision of apprenticeships within the local community <u>will be required.</u> ”	This modification has been put forward in response to discussion at the Hearing session to strengthen the policy. As such, no alternatives have been considered.
TVBC/ MM/1 2/1	Para 12.18	Amend wording to read: “It may be necessary to review all or part of the Plan in order to react to specific elements. <u>The Council has identified a number of contingency actions should there be an issue with delivery of either housing or employment proposals.</u> These are identified in the respective chapters. <u>An early review of all or part of the Revised Local Plan may be required if the plan becomes inconsistent with the requirements of national policy. The need for a review will be identified through the Authority’s Monitoring Report.</u> The NPPF requires local plans to be kept up to date and have a 15 year time frame. The Council has identified in its Local Development Scheme (2014) that it intends to commence the review of the Local Plan in 2016.”	No alternatives have been considered to this modification as it has been put forward following a request from the Inspector to include links within this Chapter to other relevant sections of the RLP and to clarify the approach to reviews of the plan.
TVBC/ MM/A NNEX D	Annex D	Amend housing trajectory (see TVBC14)	Whilst recognising that there are alternative ways of phasing the delivery of strategic allocations, the amendment to the trajectory are based on information provided by the site promoters. The

Ref	Policy/Para	Modification	Approach to the Consideration of Alternatives
			modification of the trajectory to reflect this information was requested by the Inspector during the Hearing sessions. As such, no alternatives have been appraised.
TVBC/ MM/ MAP5	Map 5	Include south of Brownhill Way (Policy LE4) within settlement boundary  Also, include land in the M271 motorway corridor, between M27 Junction 3 and the Borough boundary with Southampton City, within settlement boundary.	The amendments to these boundaries seek to update maps as a result of planning permissions being granted (prior to the submission of the RLP) which are now being implemented. As such, no alternatives have been identified.
TVBC/ MM/ MAP8 A	Map 8a	Amend settlement boundary to include the housing permission at land at Morleys Green, Ampfield	
TVBC/ MM/ MAP2 9	Map 29	Amend settlement boundary to include additional land at Michelmersh Brickworks.	This modification was put forward following discussion at a Hearing session and a request to review the boundary in light of the area of hard surfacing. As this was a technical exercise in conjunction with other parties, no alternative boundaries have been appraised.
TVBC/ MM/ MAP4 7A	Map 47a	Insert additional map to define Stockbridge Local Centre (Policy LE15)	See comments under TVBC/MM/6/9.

### Appendix 3: Main Modifications and Likely Significant Effects

Modifications for the Revised Local Plan (RLP) are documented as ~~strikethrough~~ text representing potential deletions and underlined text representing potential insertions. Where changes relate to maps, these have not been replicated in association with the below table but are available within document reference TVBC14<sup>20</sup>.

Modification Reference	Policy / Para in RLP	Modification	Is it likely to have a significant effect? <sup>21</sup>
TVBC/MM/5/1	Para 5.12	Amend wording to read: “The housing led scenarios range between 292 and 834dpa. A figure of 292dpa assumes that all units are affordable. This exceeds the Council’s corporate target of delivering 200 affordable units per annum <sup>39</sup> . A figure of 834dpa dwellings <del>would</del> deliver the objectively assessed <u>affordable housing need (of 292dpa)</u> , however this relies on open market housing development delivering affordable housing as sought in line with Policy COM7. This...”	This wording seeks to clarify the sentence in relation to the details provided within the evidence base. It is not considered to have a likely significant effect.
TVBC/MM/5/2	Para 5.22	Add additional wording “The Council has worked with other PUSH authorities to ensure a consistent evidence based in South Hampshire. For the rest of Test Valley, the SHMA takes account of the housing market within which it is located. The proposed housing requirement figures do not rely upon any neighbouring authorities to meet the Borough’s own housing need. <u>Similarly, no request has been received from any neighbouring authorities, for the Borough to contribute towards meeting their housing need</u> ”.	This new wording is a statement of fact regarding the Duty to Co-operate. It does not relate to policy wording or the interpretation of policy. Therefore no significant effects would arise from this modification.
TVBC/MM/5/3	Para 5.31	Amend wording to read: “The new homes built over the plan period should provide a mix of sizes and types to meet the demographic changes of the Borough and the	The additional text seeks to provide clarification on the outcomes of the evidence and how this relates to the need

<sup>20</sup> Available on the Council’s website at: <http://www.testvalley.gov.uk/resident/planningandbuildingcontrol/planningpolicy/local-development-framework/revised-local-plan-examination/>

<sup>21</sup> This relates to significant effects beyond those identified in the November 2013 Sustainability Appraisal Report.

Modification Reference	Policy / Para in RLP	Modification	Is it likely to have a significant effect? <sup>21</sup>
		<p>results of the Strategic Housing Market Assessment. The SHMA identified a need for a variety of house types. <u>It also identified a number of household groups which may have particular housing needs. This includes</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Older people</u></li> <li>• <u>People with disabilities</u></li> <li>• <u>Households with children</u></li> <li>• <u>Young people”</u></li> </ul>	<p>to provide a mix of housing. Therefore no significant effects would arise from this modification.</p>
TVBC/MM/5/4	Para 5.46	<p>Amend supporting text to add additional paragraph 5.46a  <u>“Some schemes, such as those submitted under the rural exception affordable housing or community led development policies, are likely to come forward on sites outside of the defined settlement boundary. Such schemes may be acceptable if they meet social or economic needs of that community. Parish Councils may wish to bring forward Neighbourhood Development Plans which include proposals for additional development. The choice of sites could be either within or outside of settlement boundaries provided that the site selection takes into account the principles of sustainable development and the relevant policies within the Revised Local Plan.”</u></p>	<p>This text seeks to provide clarification on the application of policies for development outside the settlement boundaries. In addition, it establishes that Neighbourhood Development Plans could bring forward additional development within or outside settlement boundaries. This has been given further consideration as part of this appraisal. It is likely that any Neighbourhood Development Plans seeking to allocate additional development would need to be subject to its own strategic environmental assessment / sustainability appraisal.</p>
TVBC/MM/5/5	Para 5.73	<p>Amend wording to read:  <u>“A range of community facilities are proposed to serve the needs of the new neighbourhood which will also be accessible to existing residents of the adjoining areas. This includes a local centre, including shops, community hall and health provision and a primary school. These facilities will help create opportunities to influence travel behaviour to local services both within the development and to the town centre. To achieve this, the local centre services, community facilities and school could be co-located and be delivered early in the development. Early</u></p>	<p>This amendment does not change the facilities proposed within the local centre or the need for sustainable modes of travel but clarifies that they should be provided early in the development. While this has the potential to have a positive effect on promoting the use of such provisions, it is not considered likely to have a significant effect.</p>

Modification Reference	Policy / Para in RLP	Modification	Is it likely to have a significant effect? <sup>21</sup>
		<p><u>provision should also be made for travel to town centre services by modes other than the private car to encourage and establish sustainable travel patterns. These routes should be safe, convenient and attractive. The precise location and phasing of the facilities and local centre uses and non-car routes will be determined through the detailed planning of the site...."</u></p>	
TVBC/MM/5/6	Para 5.75	<p>Amend wording to read:            "...A new pedestrian/cycle bridge over the railway line is to be provided between the A27/A3057 and the site to link <u>it</u> to the town centre. <del>The feasibility of creating a link for public transport to the existing built up area would be considered as part of the future detailed planning of the site.</del> <u>To encourage the use of sustainable modes of transport improvements will also be required to off site cycle and pedestrian routes to accommodate the impact of additional movement from the site. The site should also be served by public transport and that the provision of bus services will be required. The improvements will be informed by a detailed Transport Assessment.</u>"</p>	<p>This amendment highlights the need for offsite works to encourage sustainable modes of travel and update the wording in relation to public transport. This brings matters that would be linked to policy T1 into the supporting text for the proposals at Whitenap in Romsey. While the changes provide clarification on the expectations in relation to promotion of sustainable travel, they are not considered to result in likely significant effects.</p>
TVBC/MM/5/7	Policy COM5	<p>Amend wording of policy to read:            "A site at Park Farm, Stoneham (see Map C) is allocated for approximately 50 dwellings <u>to come forward alongside residential development of land south of Chestnut Avenue.</u>"</p>	<p>This amendment reflects the position set out within the Sustainability Appraisal (November 2013, see paragraph 9.114) about the site coming forward with development to the north within Eastleigh Borough. As such, it is not considered to result in a likely significant effect.</p>
TVBC/MM/5/8	Policy COM5	<p>Add additional text at the end of the policy to read:            "<u>Any future proposal would need to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the listed structure or its setting or any historic feature of interest.</u>"</p>	<p>Paragraph 9.115 and Table 39 of the Sustainability Appraisal (November 2013) recognised the need to have regard to the heritage assets within this site in the context of the heritage policy (E9) within the RLP. This modification makes a more specific reference to this matter but does</p>

Modification Reference	Policy / Para in RLP	Modification	Is it likely to have a significant effect? <sup>21</sup>
			not raise a new consideration. Therefore it is not considered to result in a likely significant effect.
TVBC/MM/5/9	Para 5.81	<p>Amend text to read:                      “Land to the north of Park Farm is proposed for development by Eastleigh Borough Council in its Local Plan. There is an opportunity to achieve a comprehensive development of the area by including land <u>within</u> the Borough for development. The sustainability of the site relies on the delivery of the proposed allocation and infrastructure improvement within the Eastleigh Local Plan. <u>Development would need to be brought forward in line with that development proposed to the north of the site at land south of Chestnut Avenue. The residential development envisaged in COM5 would not be acceptable in principle as a stand alone proposal.</u> The Councils are working together on the combined proposals to ensure delivery is properly phased and that the infrastructure requirements can accommodate both proposals. <del>Development would need be brought forward in line with that development proposed to the north of the site at land south of Chestnut Avenue.”</del></p>	This amendment reflects the position set out within the Sustainability Appraisal (November 2013, see paragraph 9.114) about the site coming forward with development to the north within Eastleigh Borough. As such, it is not considered to result in a likely significant effect.
TVBC/MM/5/10	Policy COM7	<p>Amend to read:                      “<del>In assessing the suitability of such sites for the provision of affordable housing the Council will take into account:</del>                      a) <del>the size, suitability and the economics of provision; and</del>                      b) <del>the need to achieve a successful housing development</del></p> <p>[to follow after the 4<sup>th</sup> bullet point] <u>“and which will be secured via a legal agreement.</u></p> <p><u>In assessing the suitability of such sites for the provision of affordable housing the Council will take into account the size, suitability and the economics of provision.</u></p>	This modification is not considered to result in a likely significant effect as it is seeking to clarify what is meant by the previous criterion b rather than substantially changing the likely implications of the policy.

Modification Reference	Policy / Para in RLP	Modification	Is it likely to have a significant effect? <sup>21</sup>
		<p><u>Development should provide for the appropriate integration of affordable housing and market housing, in order to achieve an inclusive and mixed community.</u></p>	
TVBC/MM/5/11	Policy COM9	<p>Add additional criterion bA)  <u>“It is demonstrated that the community supports the proposal; and...”</u></p>	<p>The modification seeks to clarify an expectation that as well as being involved in preparing an application that there is support for it, which was already set out within the supporting text. This amendment is not considered to result in a likely significant effect.</p>
TVBC/MM/5/12	Para 5.135	<p>It is proposed to replace paragraph 5.135 to read:  <del>“New dwellings under Policy COM 8 and COM10 are restricted to those with a local connection or their employment requires them to be based at that location. The Council believes that a similar approach should apply to gypsy, traveller and travelling showpeople sites. This would help integration with the existing settled community. To support the applicant’s case it should be demonstrated that they have a specific reason to locate within the Borough. In considering applications it will need to be demonstrated that there is a specific reason to locate within the Borough. This could include the lack of availability of alternative accommodation, a local connection or their employment requires them to be at that location. This would help justify a countryside location where there is generally a restriction on development.”</del></p>	<p>The modification seeks to provide clarification of the application of criterion d of the policy. Therefore it is not considered to result in a likely significant effect.</p>
TVBC/MM/6/1	Para 6.17	<p>Amend paragraph to read:  <del>“The Council wishes to retain the Science Park’s focus as a centre for the knowledge driven industry but and recognises that there may be need for support facilities. Proposals for support facilities whose predominant patronage would arise from the needs of the employees and companies based at the Science Park may be appropriate. Proposals for support facilities provided for the benefit of occupiers of the Science Park and</del></p>	<p>This amendment is unlikely to have a significant effect, particularly in the context of existing legal agreements setting the threshold for support facilities and manufacturing uses being ancillary.</p>

Modification Reference	Policy / Para in RLP	Modification	Is it likely to have a significant effect? <sup>21</sup>
		<p><u>their employees or which are necessary for its proper management will be permitted, provided that such facilities occupy no more than 10% of the floor area of buildings on the Science Park. This could include but should not be limited to, financial and professional services linked to the nature of the companies located on the Science Park. The Council recognises that in order to develop products it may be necessary to produce prototypes or to have limited production runs. Occupiers would need to demonstrate that any such production would be closely related to the Science Park’s research and development activity. The type of use, terms of occupancy and other matters (such as the provision of support facilities and landscaping) are controlled by planning agreements....”</u></p>	
TVBC/MM/6/2	Para 6.19	<p>Amend paragraph to read:                      “Land at Benham Campus (Kennels Farm) was identified within the Borough Local Plan (2006) and development has commenced. It is proposed to allocate additional land south of Benham Campus to allow for the expansion of the Science Park. This would provide opportunities for other knowledge based companies to locate, expand and benefit from the existing facilities at the Science Park. <u>Future proposals should comprise scientific research and development and ancillary industrial production. Occupiers would need to demonstrate that any such production would be closely related to the Science Park’s research and development activity. Any support facilities should be for the benefit of occupiers of the Science Park and their employees or be necessary for its proper management provided that such facilities occupy no more than 10% of the floor area of buildings on the Science Park.</u>”</p>	<p>This amendment is unlikely to have a significant effect in the context of the policy approach for the whole Science Park.</p>
TVBC/MM/6/3	Para 6.22	<p>Amend to read                      “Land at the southern end of the site <del>as</del> <u>is</u> the primary location for employment as it is closest to the local road network. However, through the <u>Masterplan for Whitenap and the detailed design of the site</u> opportunities for part of the employment requirement may come forward within it, for example as part of the proposed Local Centre.”</p>	<p>This modification is not likely to result in significant effects. It intends to clarify that master planning would be undertaken in relation to employment uses on the site as well as residential development.</p>

Modification Reference	Policy / Para in RLP	Modification	Is it likely to have a significant effect? <sup>21</sup>
TVBC/MM/6/4	Policy LE4	<p>Amend policy to read:  <del>Approximately 5 hectares of land for employment (Class B8) south of Brownhill Way, Nursling (see Map F) is proposed to be allocated. Development will be permitted provided that:</del></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><del>d) 15m of landscaping on the boundaries of the site with the M271, and Brownhill Way is provided;</del></li> <li><del>e) Access to the site is provided via                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><del>i. New vehicular access to Brownhill Way</del></li> <li><del>ii. Pedestrian and cycle access to Brownhill Way; and</del></li> </ul> </del></li> <li><del>f) The development provides appropriate improvements to the transport network</del></li> </ul> <p><u>“South of Brownhill Way, Nursling, (see Map F) the use of land and buildings will be restricted to storage and distribution uses (Class B8) and ancillary processing and assembly within Class B1.”</u></p>	<p>The policy and supporting text changes seek to reflect that planning permission exists for the site in line with the original wording of LE4. Discussion during the Hearing session resulted in the approach to the policy being reviewed so it is framed so as to retain the permitted use (which is being implemented). While this has removed some of the detailed matters on access points and landscaping requirements, given other policies in the RLP provide a general approach to these matters (and that the plan needs to be considered as a whole) it is considered that this modification is unlikely to result in a significant effect.</p>
TVBC/MM/6/5	Para 6.26	<p>Amend to read  <del>“Whilst the The site, including land within Southampton City, has outline planning permission<sup>69</sup> for a 38,200sqm warehouse, plus 4,500sqm of offices and plant (including land within Southampton City), of which 26,200sqm is within Test Valley, This permission is currently being implemented. The policy has been included in order to provide a framework for the site given its special characteristics for Class B8 use and in the context of a strategic requirement for such floorspace in South Hampshire<sup>69A”</sup>. Proposals for the site should be comprehensive and take into account land within Southampton City. The proposal would need to provide landscaping on its boundaries taking account of existing features and adjoining uses. Improvements to the transport network should be provided. The development’s impact will need to take account of proposed and permitted development which has yet to be completed in</del></p>	

Modification Reference	Policy / Para in RLP	Modification	Is it likely to have a significant effect? <sup>21</sup>
		<p><del>both Test Valley and Southampton City.”</del></p> <p><sup>69</sup> 11/02859/FULLS – erection of a regional distribution centre (42,820 m2 gross area)</p> <p><sup>69A</sup> PUSH and RLP evidence base, and Table 8</p>	
TVBC/MM/6/6	Policy LE6	<p>Amend to read:            “Development for <del>high quality</del> office/research/manufacturing Class B1 and exceptionally support facilities at Adanac Park, Nursling (see Map F) will be permitted provided that:            a) <del>the development is for users seeking to establish a major operation with secure boundaries and a clear corporate identity;</del>            a b) it is designed to a high standard to respect the characteristics of the site, including its existing development, and neighbouring land uses; and            c) <del>any built development should be designed to a high standard and should not exceed 2,500 square metres of gross floorspace per hectare</del>            d b) the development provides appropriate improvements to the transport network.”</p>	<p>The modifications have the potential to affect the nature of proposals that come forward within Adanac Park, including the scale of built development. However, other policies within the RLP provide a framework for design and landscaping considerations, therefore this is not considered to result in a likely significant effect.</p>
TVBC/MM/6/7	Para 6.47	<p>Amend 3<sup>rd</sup> bullet to read:            “• Keep under review its own land holdings, including <u>George Yard / Black Swan Yard, Walworth Business Park and Portway Business Parks</u>”</p>	<p>This modification is seeking to provide a clarification of the Council’s land holdings that may be relevant. It is not considered to result in a likely significant effect.</p>
TVBC/MM/6/8	Policy LE10	<p>Delete existing paragraph 6.92 and insert amended paragraph to form 6.51a within the supporting text section to policy LE10            “<u>In some cases the particular existing uses on site may be causing such serious environmental harm that their removal may be desirable and redevelopment of the site for more appropriate business activities may be justified. It would need to be demonstrated that the displaced uses would not be seeking an alternative site which would simply mean the relocation of the environmental problem to another location and that the redevelopment proposal would result in a substantial gain in terms of environmental impacts, such as traffic and visual impact and other</u></p>	<p>This relocation of the paragraph within the RLP and the removal of text to ensure greater consistency with the policy are not considered to result in a likely significant effect.</p>

Modification Reference	Policy / Para in RLP	Modification	Is it likely to have a significant effect? <sup>21</sup>
		<del>potential nuisances.”</del>	
TVBC/MM/6/9	Policy LE15	Amended to read: “Development <u>fronting on to the High Street (Map 47a)</u> will be permitted provided that”  Add Map 47a to define the Local Centre (as a frontage).	Modifications to the policy and the insertion of a map are not considered to result in a likely significant effect as they aim to be more explicit where the Council would apply this policy.
TVBC/MM/6/10	Para 6.85	Amend paragraph 6.85 to read: “The aim is to keep the amount of new building required in the countryside to a minimum and to protect the character of the existing building, by maintaining its original structure, built form, architectural detail, materials and general design. <del>Proposal which will result in the creation of another building to fulfil the function of that being converted will not be supported.</del> However, where proposals for alternative use require the creation of new <u>ancillary</u> buildings and/ or extensions to that being converted these will be considered on their own merits. <u>The Council wishes to ensure that uses ancillary to the new use of the building, such as additional car parking or open storage, do not have an impact on the surrounding countryside.</u> ”	This modification is not considered to result in a likely significant effect when considered in the context of the RLP, including the policy to which this text relates and other policies (including on landscape matters).
TVBC/MM/6/11	Policy LE18	Amend Policy to add an additional criterion: <u>“iiA) in the case of seasonal structures these are temporary in nature and do not have an adverse impact on the landscape; and”</u>	These modifications seek to clarify the application of policy LE18 and increase the consistency between the policy and supporting text. They are not considered to result in likely significant effects.
TVBC/MM/6/12	Policy LE18	Amend Policy to read: “Proposals which involve the loss of <u>serviced accommodation (Class C1) and non-serviced tourist accommodation, including caravan and camping sites,</u> will only be permitted provided that it can be demonstrated that the existing <u>living</u> accommodation unit is no longer economically viable or required.”	
TVBC/MM/6/13	Para 6.100	Amend paragraph 6.100 to read: “Any proposal which <del>resulted</del> <u>results</u> in the loss of tourist accommodation <u>including caravan and camping sites</u> would need to demonstrate that it is no longer economically viable or required. This will	

Modification Reference	Policy / Para in RLP	Modification	Is it likely to have a significant effect? <sup>21</sup>
		be evidenced by appropriate marketing for a six month period at an appropriate price reflecting the tourist restriction.”	
TVBC/MM/7/1	Policy E1	It is proposed to include text at the end of Policy E1 to read: “ <u>Development will not be permitted if it is of poor design and fails to improve the character, function and quality of the area.</u> ”	While this modification is considered to have a positive effect in terms of being more explicit on the approach to poor design, it is not considered to be result in likely significant effects.
TVBC/MM/7/2	Para 7.14	It is proposed to amend the wording of paragraph 7.14 to read: “Original and innovative designs can be used to <del>enliven areas of poor design,</del> <u>help raise the standard of design in an area</u> although it is important that such designs do not detract from the visual unity of areas that already have a successful, compatible mix of styles and materials. The inclusion....”	Given the nature of the modification, it is not considered that it will result in a likely significant effect.
TVBC/MM/7/3	E7	Amend last element of policy E7 to read: “Criteria c) – d) need to be satisfied unless it can be demonstrated that it is not <del>technically</del> or financially viable.”	This modification not considered result in a likely significant effect.
TVBC/MM/7/4	Para 7.58	Insert new paragraph after 7.58 to read: “ <u>7.58a There are a number of organisations involved in flooding matters, including the Environment Agency<sup>1</sup> and the Lead Local Flood Authority (Hampshire County Council)<sup>2</sup> In addition to its responsibilities as a local planning authority the Council is committed to working with relevant organisations managing flooding across the Borough. Following the flooding within the Borough in 2013/14, the Council is working in partnership with the relevant agencies to develop measures to manage risks of flooding in the future. Implementation of any measures would depend on the availability of funding”</u>  Footnotes: <u>1 Environment Agency is responsible for flood risk from rivers and the sea, as well as regulating large reservoirs.</u>	This modification provides an overview of the organisations responsible for matters associated with flood risk and how they work together. This is not considered to result in likely significant effects.

Modification Reference	Policy / Para in RLP	Modification	Is it likely to have a significant effect? <sup>21</sup>
		<p><u>2 The Lead Local Flood Authority is responsible for managing the risk of flooding from groundwater, surface water runoff and ‘ordinary watercourses’ (i.e. water courses that are not part of a main river).</u></p>	
TVBC/MM/7/5	Para 7.70	<p>Amend the wording of the bullet points and insert new bullet point to read:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recognising importance of heritage assets individually through the putting forward for listing buildings and structures <del>and the designation and review of conservation areas;</del></li> <li>• <u>Undertaking a review of existing Conservation Area appraisals within the Borough;</u></li> <li>• Maintaining and monitoring the register of buildings and other structures at risk which are <del>either disused and/or neglected</del> <u>most at risk through neglect, decay or other threats, working with others to consider opportunities and proposals to bring them back into an appropriate sustainable use, and where necessary using legislative powers to address specific issues;</u></li> <li>• <u>Considering the merits of undertaking a Historic Environment Action Plan. This will include the possibility of working jointly with neighbouring authorities.</u></li> </ul>	<p>This amendment clarify how the heritage policy would be applied and other work will be undertaken by the Council in relation to heritage matters, having regard to national guidance and relevant legislation. They are not considered to result in likely significant effects.</p>
TVBC/MM/7/6	Para 7.70	<p>Insert a new paragraph 7.70a to read:  <u>“The Council has produced a guidance note on Listed Buildings which includes details on the responsibilities of owners and how to apply for Listed Building consent. A similar guidance note has been published dealing with Conservation Areas. These are available on the Council’s website.”</u></p>	<p>This is a statement of information available from the Council, therefore it is not considered to have a likely significant effect.</p>
TVBC/MM/7/7	Policy E9	<p>Amend criterion b), d) and insert criterion e) and f) to read:            b) the significance of the heritage asset has informed the proposal <u>through an assessment proportionate to its importance.</u>            d) <u>the nature of the heritage asset prevents all reasonable use; and</u>  <del>d)-e)</del> <u>its conservation can not be achieved by either a viable</u></p>	<p>The amendments clarify how the heritage policy would be applied, having regard to national guidance and relevant legislation. They are not considered to result in likely significant effects.</p>

Modification Reference	Policy / Para in RLP	Modification	Is it likely to have a significant effect? <sup>21</sup>
		<p>alternative use, support from public ownership or funding from other sources; <u>and</u></p> <p>f) <u>the harm or loss is outweighed by the benefit of bringing the site back into use.</u></p> <p>Also amend text below these criteria to read:                      “Development which will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset will be considered against the public benefit of the proposal, <u>including and securing a viable use.</u>”</p>	
TVBC/MM/7/8	Policy E9	<p>Amend last element of policy E9 to read:                      “<del>Where the loss of a heritage asset is agreed the Council will need to be satisfied that there are approved and detailed plans and delivery mechanisms for the proposal’s implementation.</del>”  <u>The Council will only permit the loss of the whole or part of a heritage asset where it can be demonstrated that the new development will proceed after the loss has occurred</u>”.</p>	
TVBC/MM/7/9	Para 7.71	<p>Amend paragraph 7.71 to read:                      “...be undertaken sensitively having fully recorded, understood and appreciated the significance of the heritage asset. <del>Any proposals will need to demonstrate that any changes are justified and the loss or harm is minimised.</del> <u>In considering the benefits of the proposal the Council will consider the degree of harm to the significance of the heritage asset. In weighing the benefit of the proposal the Council will have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any historic features of interest [insert footnote].</u>”</p> <p><u>Footnote: Section 66(1) Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990</u></p>	
TVBC/MM/7/10	Para 7.72	<p>Amend 1<sup>st</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> bullets to read:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “an analysis of the asset to establish their <u>historic, architectural and</u></li> </ul>	

Modification Reference	Policy / Para in RLP	Modification	Is it likely to have a significant effect? <sup>21</sup>
		<p><u>archaeological</u> significance both as a whole and specific parts effected by the proposal;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• demonstrate that the assessment has informed the <del>proposed development</del> <u>proposed use of the heritage asset and that it is compatible with its conservation.</u></li> </ul>	
TVBC/MM/7/11	Para 7.74	<p>Amend paragraph 7.74 to read            "...significant impact on a heritage asset as a result of poor design (<del>such as extensions and alterations</del>) which has not taken account of the significance of it, for example its historic character or the pattern of development. Even small additions or alterations (<u>such as extensions and alterations</u>) may be inappropriate as they may not complement the existing appearance, materials or finishes. This is the case for both external and internal additions and alterations. <u>The use of traditional, local materials and building techniques, where appropriate, would help minimise the impact on the asset.</u>"</p>	
TVBC/MM/7/12	Para 7.75	<p>Insert footnote to read:-            "...to the significance of the asset [<u>insert footnote</u>]. In considering..."</p> <p><u>"More details on how the setting is important to heritage assets can be found in 'The Setting of Heritage Assets – English Heritage (2011)'</u></p>	
TVBC/MM/7/13	Para 7.76	<p>Relocate paragraph 7.78 to form paragraph 7.76 and amend to read:            "The harm or loss of part or whole of a heritage asset will need to be justified as such assets are irreplaceable and should be retained wherever possible and feasible. Where the proposal <del>seeks</del> <u>would result in</u> the substantial harm or loss of a designated heritage asset the Council will require evidence that there are considerable public benefits to justify its loss or that there are no other mechanisms for supporting the retention of the asset <u>in the medium term</u>. The merits of an alternative use may be considered where this would retain the asset providing it would not result in the loss of its important elements. It would also be important to ensure that any alternative use is capable of funding the</p>	

Modification Reference	Policy / Para in RLP	Modification	Is it likely to have a significant effect? <sup>21</sup>
		<p>conservation of the asset. Should the substantial harm or loss, <u>either in whole or in part</u>, be agreed the Council will require a clear indication that <u>the development will and that the loss of the asset was justified there are detailed plans and delivery mechanisms for the proposal's implementation</u>. In order to advance the understanding of the <u>significance of the asset to be lost the Council will require a proportionate record to be produced and made publicly available</u>. <u>The condition of an historic building resulting from deliberate damage and neglect will not be taken into account in any decision.</u>"</p>	
TVBC/MM/7/14	Para 7.77	<p>Relocate the existing wording of paragraph 7.77 to a new paragraph 7.81 and insert a new paragraph 7.77 to read:  <u>"Conservation areas are areas of special architectural or historic interest, the character or appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance. In considering proposals for development in Conservation Areas the Council will require that the layout, form, scale, massing, density, roofscape and external appearance of the proposal to conserve and enhance the specific historic and architectural interest. It will be necessary to show the development in context with its surroundings, including existing buildings, trees and other features which contribute to the character of the Conservation Area."</u></p>	
TVBC/MM/7/15	Para 7.78	<p>Renumber paragraph 7.79 to become paragraph 7.78 and amend to read:  <u>"Within conservation areas not all buildings contribute to its significance as a designated heritage asset. The Council would support proposals which would result in an enhancement of a conservation area or its setting through the alteration or replacement of those buildings which do not make a positive contribution. Proposals should demonstrate that they will make a contribution to the character and quality of the conservation area which is at least equal to or better when compared with the existing. In those case where the building(s) does make a positive contribution to the significance of the conservation area</u></p>	

Modification Reference	Policy / Para in RLP	Modification	Is it likely to have a significant effect? <sup>21</sup>
		<u>justification that the public benefit outweighs the harm will need to be provided.</u> "	
TVBC/MM/7/16	Para 7.79	Insert new paragraph 7.79 to read: <u>"Development which would involve ground disturbance in areas of known archaeological potential should be sensitively designed and located. A desk based archaeological assessment, and in certain circumstances a field evaluation, will be required. Where the preservation in situ of the archaeological remains is not possible or feasible the Council will require a programme of archaeological investigation, excavation and recording."</u>	
TVBC/MM/7/17	Para 7.80	Delete paragraph 7.80 <del>"Within conservation areas not all buildings contribute to its significance as a designated heritage asset. Proposals which result in the loss of such buildings and are replaced by development which preserves or enhances the conservation area will be supported. In those case where the building(s) does make a positive contribution to the significance of the conservation area justification that the public benefit outweighs the harm will need to be provided"</del>	
TVBC/MM/7/18	Para 7.80	Relocate paragraph 7.76 to form paragraph 7.80. Include a modification to footnote 116 to read:-  "The Council's Conservation Area <del>appraisal identifies</del> <u>appraisals identify</u> a number of locally important buildings however this is not an exhaustive list. <u>The appraisals are available on the Council's website.</u> "	
TVBC/MM/8/1	Policy LHW2	Insert additional wording in criterion d) to read: "d) avoid harming <u>biodiversity and the amenity of nearby</u> residents and visitors to the Sir Harold Hillier Gardens and Arboretum; and"	This modification clarifies how the policy would be applied. It is not considered to result in a likely significant effect particularly having regard to other policies within the RLP.
TVBC/MM/9/1	Policy T1	Include additional criterion to Policy T1 to read: "e) <u>Provision is made to support and promote the use of sustainable</u>	This modification has the potential to have a positive effect on the promotion of

Modification Reference	Policy / Para in RLP	Modification	Is it likely to have a significant effect? <sup>21</sup>
		<u>transport, including the submission of a site travel plan where appropriate</u> ".	sustainable travel (which could have indirect effects e.g. on health and air quality matters). However, it is not considered to result in a likely significant effect.
TVBC/MM/9/2	Para 9.16	Amend paragraph 9.16 to read: "The park and ride site forms part of a Transport Strategy for Southampton and is included with the Transport for South Hampshire's [footnote] proposals for the sub-region. Part of Bargain Farm lies within Southampton and could be included within the park and ride proposal. <u>The facility may provide a general park and ride for the public and/or for specific named employers.</u> Regard should <u>also</u> be given to the requirements of policy LE5."  [Footnote: Transport for South Hampshire Transport Delivery Plan (February 2013).	The extra text seeks to be clearer about the potential future users of this site. This is not considered to result in a likely significant effect.
TVBC/MM/11/1	Policy ST1	Amend policy text to read; "Where a development has a significant impact on the labour market <del>the Council will seek a contribution</del> <u>contributions</u> towards the enhancement of skills training and the provision of apprenticeships within the local community <u>will be required.</u> "	The modification strengthens the terms of this policy, which has the potential for a positive effect in terms of skills development. However, this is not considered to have a likely significant effect
TVBC/MM/12/1	Para 12.18	Amend wording to read: "It may be necessary to review all or part of the Plan in order to react to specific elements. <u>The Council has identified a number of contingency actions should there be an issue with delivery of either housing or employment proposals. These are identified in the respective chapters. An early review of all or part of the Revised Local Plan may be required if the plan becomes inconsistent with the requirements of national policy. The need for a review will be identified through the Authority's Monitoring Report.</u> The NPPF requires local plans to be kept up to date	This modification sets out the approach to monitoring of the RLP and clarifies the approach to review. This is not considered to result in a likely significant effect.

Modification Reference	Policy / Para in RLP	Modification	Is it likely to have a significant effect? <sup>21</sup>
		and have a 15 year time frame. The Council has identified in its Local Development Scheme (2014) that it intends to commence the review of the Local Plan in 2016.”	
TVBC/MM/AN NEXD	Annex D	Amend housing trajectory (see TVBC14)	The amendments to the housing trajectory would have an implication on effects in terms of their timing (e.g. with Hoe Lane and Park Farm proposed earlier within the plan period than previously envisaged, therefore the resultant effects are also likely to occur in the shorter term). However, these are not considered to result in changes to the nature of the significant effects identified.
TVBC/MM/M AP5	Map 5	Include south of Brownhill Way (Policy LE4) within settlement boundary  Also, include land in the M271 motorway corridor, between M27 Junction 3 and the Borough boundary with Southampton City, within settlement boundary.	These modification are not considered to result in a likely significant effect, given the site is proposed for development for which permission has already been granted.
TVBC/MM/M AP8A	Map 8a	Amend settlement boundary to include the housing permission at land at Morleys Green, Ampfield	This is not considered to result in a likely significant effect as permission has been granted for residential development of this site.
TVBC/MM/M AP29	Map 29	Amend settlement boundary to include additional land at Michelmersh Brickworks.	Given the scale of the amendment and that it has been put forward to better reflect the situation on the ground, this is not considered to result in a likely significant effect.
TVBC/MM/M AP47A	Map 47a	Insert additional map to define Stockbridge Local Centre (Policy LE15)	See comments under TVBC/MM/6/9.

## Appendix 4: Minor Modifications Assessment

Modifications for the Revised Local Plan (RLP) are documented as ~~strikethrough~~ text representing potential deletions and underlined text representing potential insertions. Where changes relate to maps, these have not been replicated in association with the below table but are available within document reference TVBC14<sup>22</sup>.

Ref	Policy/Para	Proposed minor modification	Sustainability Appraisal / Strategic Environmental Assessment Implications
TVBC/M /1	Various	References to Local Plan to be amended to Revised Local Plan	Comprises a typographical correction, therefore no significant sustainability implications.
TVBC/M /2	Various	Renumber table references.	Comprises a typographical correction, therefore no significant sustainability implications.
TVBC/M /3	Various	Renumber figure references.	Comprises a typographical correction, therefore no significant sustainability implications.
TVBC/M /G/1	Glossary	Insert definition of National Planning Practice Guidance to read <u>“An online resource published by central Government which provides guidance on how to apply the NPPF”</u>	This is a clarification through the provision of a factual definition. Therefore there are no significant sustainability implications.
TVBC/M /2/1	Para 2.54	Amend to read <u>“..there is The Plaza Theatre Theatre....”</u>	Comprises a typographical correction, therefore no significant sustainability implications.
TVBC/M /3/1	Table 3, Local Environment section	Amend to read: <u>“... existing portfolio ...”</u>	Comprises a typographical correction, therefore no significant sustainability implications.
TVBC/M /5/1	Para 5.5	Amend to read: <u>“... South Hampshire SHMA which <del>is</del> <u>has</u> been prepared ...”</u>	Comprises a typographical correction, therefore no significant sustainability implications.
TVBC/M /5/2	Para 5.13	Amend to read: <u>“excess of what has been previously <del>or</del> forecast”</u>	Comprises a typographical correction, therefore no significant sustainability implications.
TVBC/M /5/3	Table 5	Amend title of table 5 to <u>“ net housing completions (2000/01- <del>2012/13</del> 2013/14)</u>	Comprises a typographical correction / update, therefore no significant sustainability implications.

<sup>22</sup> Available on the Council’s website at: <http://www.testvalley.gov.uk/resident/planningandbuildingcontrol/planningpolicy/local-development-framework/revised-local-plan-examination/>

Ref	Policy/Para	Proposed minor modification	Sustainability Appraisal / Strategic Environmental Assessment Implications
TVBC/M/5/4	Footnote 41	Amend text to “TVBC <del>Annual Monitoring Report 2012/13</del> <u>Authority Monitoring Report 2013/14</u> and HCC completion figures”	Comprises a typographical correction / update, therefore no significant sustainability implications.
TVBC/M/5/5	Para 5.26	Amend to read “The rural figure of 36 dwellings per annum <del>is apportioned to the Rural Villages as identified in the settlement hierarchy. The figure for Rural Villages Test Valley is indicative</del> <u>a minimum and relies on would be made up of rural exception schemes affordable housing, community led development or other applications coming forward. Subject to relevant policies in the plan, a higher number of dwellings could be delivered in Rural Test Valley.</u> ”	<p>This modification sought to provide clarification on how the rural figure would be viewed (i.e. a minimum rather than an indicative figure) which is consistent with the position already established through policy COM1. As such, this modification is not considered to result in any significant sustainability implications.</p> <p>It is recognised that through the housing figure being a minimum, the effects of the plan may be greater than has been set out, which results in uncertainty on the degree of likely effects as a result. However, the mitigation provisions contained within the Revised Local Plan (e.g. policies on heritage, biodiversity, infrastructure provision) would apply to proposals coming forward irrespective of whether the minimum housing figure is exceeded.</p>
TVBC/M/5/6	Policy COM1	Amend wording within second column of policy table to read “ <u>Minimum</u> housing requirement for 18 year...”	<p>This modification seeks to provide clarity that all figures within policy COM1 would be treated as minimums, not just the overall requirement. This is not considered to result in a significant sustainability implication.</p> <p>It is recognised that through the housing figure being a minimum, the effects of the plan may be greater than has been set out, which results in uncertainty on the degree of likely effects as a result. However, the mitigation provisions contained within the Revised Local Plan (e.g. policies on heritage, biodiversity, infrastructure provision) would apply to proposals coming forward irrespective of whether the minimum housing figure is exceeded.</p>

Ref	Policy/Para	Proposed minor modification	Sustainability Appraisal / Strategic Environmental Assessment Implications
TVBC/M/5/7	Para 5.37	Amend to read: “...There are also a number of smaller greenfield sites which have permission but have yet to <del>be</del> commence.”	Comprises a typographical correction, therefore no significant sustainability implications.
TVBC/M/5/8	Table 6	Reference to footnote 44 to be replaced with footnote 45	Comprises a typographical correction, therefore no significant sustainability implications.
TVBC/M/5/9	Table 7	Reference to footnote 45 to be replaced with footnote 46	Comprises a typographical correction, therefore no significant sustainability implications.
TVBC/M/5/10	Policy COM2	Amend criterion a) of policy to read: “It is appropriate in the countryside as set out in <del>the</del> local plan <del>policies</del> <u>policy COM8-COM14, LE10, LE16-LE18; or...</u> ”	This modification seeks to clarify those policies that the Council considers relevant in the application of policy COM2. This is not considered to substantially change the approach of the policy and is not considered to have any significant sustainability effects.
TVBC/M/5/11	Para 5.51	Should refer to Annex C, not Annex B	Comprises a typographical correction, therefore no significant sustainability implications.
TVBC/M/5/12	Para 5.66	Amend text to read: “... to meet the remaining requirement <del>two</del> allocations are proposed. <del>A</del> at Whitenap, Romsey and Hoe Lane, North Baddesley. ...”	Comprises a typographical correction, therefore no significant sustainability implications.
TVBC/M/5/13	Para 5.81	Amend text to read: “... comprehensive development of the area by including land <u>within</u> the Borough...”	Comprises a typographical correction, therefore no significant sustainability implications.
TVBC/M/5/14	Policy COM6	Amend text to read: “d) Landscaping to be provided including: e) i) A landscaping belt of approximately 5 metres width south of the railway line f) ii) A landscape belt to complement .....”  renumber criterion g) and h) to read e) and f).	Comprises a typographical correction, therefore no significant sustainability implications.
TVBC/M/5/15	Policy COM6A	Amend criterion diii) to read “extension of <del>the buffer with</del> Harewood Common to <u>The Middle Way</u> ”	This represents a clarification of the text. Therefore no significant sustainability implications have been identified.

Ref	Policy/Para	Proposed minor modification	Sustainability Appraisal / Strategic Environmental Assessment Implications
TVBC/M/5/16	Para 5.107	Amend text to read: “...depending on the proposal. <u>Applicants will normally be required to enter into legal agreements to ensure that the housing is provided and retained.</u> To inform the process”.	This modification clarifies how the Council would ensure the provisions of this policy are secured. It does not change the approach of the policy and is not considered to have any significant sustainability implications.
TVBC/M/5/17	Para 5.107a	Add additional wording to read “ <u>Affordable housing should be designed and integrated with the provision of market housing to ensure the creation of mixed and inclusive communities. This can be achieved by the use of materials, housing styles and dispersing affordable housing throughout the development.</u> ”	This wording seeks to clarify how the Council would apply this policy in the context of advice within the NPPF on promotion of mixed communities. It is not considered to result in significant sustainability implications.
TVBC/M/5/18	Para 5.110	Amend text to read: “...The mix of dwellings will be guided by the identified need. Access to exception schemes will be limited in perpetuity to those who satisfy the tests of policy COM8. <u>This will be controlled by a legal agreement.</u> ”	This modification clarifies how the Council would ensure the provisions of this policy are secured. It does not change the approach of the policy and is not considered to have any significant sustainability implications.
TVBC/M/5/19	Para 5.114	Amend wording to read: “The extent of community involvement and achieving <del>the support of the majority of the</del> <u>community support</u> will be a consideration in assessing the merits of the proposal.”	This modification has been put forward following discussion at the Hearing sessions to ensure consistency between the wording of the policy and supporting text with regard to community involvement. It is not considered to substantially change the approach of the policy and it is considered that it would not result in any significant sustainability implications.
TVBC/M/5/20	Policy COM10	It is proposed to amend criterion a) ii) as follows: “financial evidence has been submitted demonstrating <del>that the</del> <u>viability of the business is viable</u> and <u>its intention</u> to be established; and”	This modification seeks to clarify how viability will be considered in relation to new businesses. It is not considered to substantially change the approach of the policy. It is not considered to result in any significant sustainability implications.
TVBC/M/5/21	Paragraph 5.121	It is proposed to modify paragraph 5.121 as follows: ‘This should include contacting landowners and/or business <u>involved in the use for which the dwelling was permitted.</u> ’	This modification seeks to ensure the policy and supporting text are consistent. It is not considered to result in any significant sustainability implications.
TVBC/M/5/22	Para 5.124	It is proposed to modify paragraph 5.124 to read: “...The Council will consider the size of the proposal compared with	This modification is a correction to reflect the policy does not include a need to consider the specifics of the size of the

Ref	Policy/Para	Proposed minor modification	Sustainability Appraisal / Strategic Environmental Assessment Implications
		the existing dwelling, the size of the resultant building and whether it would be out of scale with its plot. <del>The size of the proposal will be assessed in terms of volume (measured externally).</del> Extensions...”	proposal. Therefore, there are not considered to be any significant sustainability implications of this modification.
TVBC/M/5/23	Policy COM13	It is proposed to modify criterion e) “The site is of sufficient size to provide for <u>accommodation</u> , parking; turning and, where relevant, the servicing and storage of vehicles and equipment.”	This modification seeks to clarify how this element of the policy would be applied. It is not considered to substantially alter the approach of the policy and is not considered to result in any significant sustainability implications.
TVBC/M/6/1	Para 6.8	Include additional bullet points to read: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Work with the Partnership for Urban South Hampshire (PUSH) on an economic evidence base for the sub-regional economy.</u></li> <li>• <u>Work with neighbouring authorities to assess and if required bring forward land to meet the needs of particular business sectors, such as warehousing and distribution, including port related logistics.</u></li> </ul>	These modifications have been put forward following discussion at the Hearing sessions. They are not considered to substantially alter the approach in relation to the local economy but continue to recognise the need to co-operate with neighbouring authorities on these matters. The modifications are not considered to result in any significant sustainability implications.
TVBC/M/6/2	Table 10	Amend footnote reference from 62 to 66 and updated wording of footnote 66 to read “ <u>Planning permission for 26,177sqm of B8 floorspace has been permitted. See policy LE4.</u> “	Comprises a typographical correction and update (with permission now granted), therefore no significant sustainability implications.
TVBC/M/6/3	Policy LE1	Amend text to read: “Employment development falling within Class B1 and support facilities will be permitted within the University of Southampton Science Park (see map E), provided that: a) the use comprises scientific research and development <del>and including associated design and ancillary industrial production and exceptionally or appropriate</del> support facilities;”	During the Hearing sessions, clarification was sought on the approach to supporting facilities and the scope for ancillary processes. This matter has also been considered through a main modification linked to this matter. The modifications are not considered to substantially change the approach and are not considered to result in significant sustainability implications.
TVBC/M/6/4	Policy LE2	Amend policy text to read: “Approximately 1.5 hectares of land to the south of Benham Campus (see Map E) is proposed for allocation as an extension to the Science Park. Development will be permitted subject to: a) the use comprises scientific research and development <del>and including associated design and ancillary industrial production and</del>	During the Hearing sessions, clarification was sought on the approach to supporting facilities and the scope for ancillary processes. This matter has also been considered through a main modification linked to this matter. The modifications are not considered to substantially change the approach and are not considered to result in significant sustainability implications.

Ref	Policy/Para	Proposed minor modification	Sustainability Appraisal / Strategic Environmental Assessment Implications
		exceptionally or appropriate support facilities”	
TVBC/M/6/5	Para 6.23	Amend to read “The height of the buildings should be restricted to two storeys so that they are not dominant in the views across the site.”	This modification was put forward following discussion at the Hearing session. It is not considered to substantially change the approach and is not considered to result in significant sustainability implications.
TVBC/M/6/6	Para 6.25	Insert sub heading ‘ <u>Nursling</u> ’ above paragraph 6.25.	This provides a clarification to aid the reader in understanding the area to which this section applies. It is not considered to have any significant sustainability implications.
TVBC/M/6/7	Policy LE5	<p>Amend policy LE5 to read:</p> <p>Approximately 2 hectares of land for employment (Classes B1 and B2) north of Brownhill Way, Nursling at Bargain Farm is proposed to be allocated (see Map F). Development will be permitted provided that:</p> <p>a) a minimum width of 5m landscaping along Frogmore Lane, Adanac Drive and Yew Tree Lane is provided;</p> <p><del>b) it sustains and enhances the setting of the Grade II Listed Bargain Farm House; and</del></p> <p><del>e) b) access to the site to be provided by:</del></p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">i) vehicular access from Adanac Drive</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">ii) pedestrian and cycle access from Frogmore Lane;</p> <p><del>d) c) the development provides appropriate improvements to the transport network.</del></p> <p><u>Any future proposal would need to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the listed building or its setting or any historic feature of interest.</u></p>	This modification seeks to ensure consistency with the statutory duty under the Section 66 (1) Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. This may affect the weight given to heritage considerations but is not considered to substantially alter the approach of the policy. It is not considered to result in any significant sustainability implications but may have a positive effect on the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment.
TVBC/M/6/8	Para 6.27	Amend to read: “The proposal at Bargain Farm comprises new employment provision of approximately 2ha of employment land for B1 and B2 uses and a site (approximately 3ha) for a park and ride facility (see	This modification sets out planning permissions that have been granted in relation to the site. It comprises a factual update and the modification is not considered to have a significant sustainability implication.

Ref	Policy/Para	Proposed minor modification	Sustainability Appraisal / Strategic Environmental Assessment Implications
		<p>Policy T3). The employment allocation forms part of the strategic requirement for South Hampshire. <u>Planning permissions<sup>69B</sup> have been approved but not yet issued; in outline for B1/B2 development on the western part of Bargain Farm, and in full, for a restaurant, and 23 dwellings around Bargain Farm House</u></p> <p><u><sup>69B</sup> 14/00147/OUTS, 14/00150/OUTS &amp; 14/01861/FULLS and 14/00138/FULLS respectively</u></p>	
TVBC/M /6/9	Para 6.30	<p>“This has been implemented and occupied by the headquarters of the Ordnance Survey (OS). Whilst the outline permission has been granted for the whole site, it is only partially developed. <u>More recently, further outline planning permissions have also been granted for B1 development for areas of the site to the north and south of OS<sup>70A</sup>. The specific characteristics....</u>”</p> <p><u><sup>70A</sup> 14/00134/OUTS and 14/00141/OUTS</u>”</p>	This modification sets out planning permissions that have been granted in relation to the site. It comprises a factual update and the modification is not considered to have a significant sustainability implication.
TVBC/M /6/10	Policy LE7	<p>Amend text to read: “b) open storage, including stacking <del>of</del> <u>of</u> containers....”</p>	Comprises a typographical correction, therefore no significant sustainability implications.
TVBC/M /6/11	Para 6.51	<p>Amend to read “The Council will permit other forms of development on these sites, if it can be demonstrated that they are no longer required to meet economic development needs <u>through for example, evidence of market signals</u>. The Council will expect...”</p>	This modification has been proposed following discussion at the Hearing sessions. It is proposed in line with paragraph 22 of the NPPF. It is not considered to substantially alter the approach of the associated policy and is not considered to result in any significant sustainability implications.
TVBC/M /6/12	Para 6.52	<p>Amend sub heading to read “<u>Retail and Town Centre Uses</u>”</p>	This provides a clarification to aid the reader in understanding the area to which this section applies. It is not considered to have any significant sustainability implications.
TVBC/M /6/13	Policy LE11	<p>Part 3 of Policy LE11 to be amended as follows: “Development for retail, leisure and office use outside of the defined town centres of Andover and Romsey with a gross</p>	These amendments seek to provide clarification on the application of the policy but does not substantially change the terms of the policy. Therefore it is not considered to

Ref	Policy/Para	Proposed minor modification	Sustainability Appraisal / Strategic Environmental Assessment Implications
		<p>floorspace exceeding:                      a) 1,000sqm within Andover and Romsey, and                      b) 500sqm elsewhere <u>in the borough</u>                      will be permitted if, <u>subject to the completion of an Impact Assessment demonstrating no significant adverse impact.</u>  <del>following an Impact Assessment, it would not have a significant adverse impact. Any main town centre uses that would harm the vitality and viability of town centres will not be permitted.</del></p> <p><u>Any main town centre uses that would harm the vitality and viability of town centres will not be permitted."</u></p>	<p>have any significant sustainability implications.</p>
TVBC/M /6/14	Para 6.58	Amend sub heading above paragraph 6.58 to read " <u>Romsey Town Centre</u> "	This provides a clarification to aid the reader in understanding the area to which this section applies. It is not considered to have any significant sustainability implications.
TVBC/M /6/15	Para 6.64	Amend sub heading above paragraph 6.64 to read " <u>Andover Town Centre</u> "	This provides a clarification to aid the reader in understanding the area to which this section applies. It is not considered to have any significant sustainability implications.
TVBC/M /6/16	Para 6.74	Amend text to read: " <u>As part of the mixed used it is considered that the site can accommodate approximately 100 dwellings. The Council will produce a Supplementary Planning Document to provide more detail on how the site could come forward.</u> "	This modification sets out how the Council would seek to bring forward proposals at George Yard / Black Swan Yard. It does not change the approach of the policy or the mix of uses. Therefore it is not considered to result in any significant sustainability implications.
TVBC/M /6/17	Para 6.75	Amend sub heading above paragraph 6.75 to read " <u>Stockbridge Local Centre</u> "	This provides a clarification to aid the reader in understanding the area to which this section applies. It is not considered to have any significant sustainability implications.
TVBC/M /6/18	Policy LE15	Criterion a) amended to read: " <u>a) it is at a scale appropriate to the size of the local centre</u> Its size is appropriate to the scale and function of the local centre; <u>and</u> "	This modification seeks to clarify how the policy would be applied rather than change the approach of the policy. It is considered that it would not result in any significant sustainability implications.

Ref	Policy/Para	Proposed minor modification	Sustainability Appraisal / Strategic Environmental Assessment Implications
TVBC/M /7/1	Para 7.18	Amend to include text at the end of the paragraph to read: “...It is an important tool to inform decisions on the impact of development and ensure that development will not be an anomaly in the local landscape. <u>The merits of updating the Landscape Character Assessment will be considered by the Council. This will include the possibility of working jointly with neighbouring authorities.</u> ”	This modification sets out that the Landscape Character may be subject to review if the Council considers it appropriate to do so. This does not change the approach of policies or proposals within the RLP. It is not considered to result in significant sustainability implications.
TVBC/M /7/2	Footnote 92	Amend footnote text to read: “North Wessex Downs Management Plan <del>2009</del> — 2014 - <u>2019</u> . The Council of Partners, <del>2009</del> 2014.”	This provides an update following the approval of the latest iteration of the Management Plan. It is not considered to result in any significant sustainability implications but is a relevant consideration in terms of understanding the relationship with another relevant plan.
TVBC/M /7/3	Policy E3	Amend criterion a) of Policy E3 to read: “Development within Local Gaps (see map 48 - 56) will be permitted provided that: a) it would not diminish the physical <u>separation</u> <del> extent</del> and/or visual separation; and...”	This modification seeks to provide a clarification on the implementation of the policy following discussion at the Hearing session. It is not considered to alter the approach of the policy or result in any significant sustainability implications relative to that considered within the November 2013 Sustainability Appraisal.
TVBC/M /7/4	Policy E4	It is proposed to modify Policy E4 as follows: “Development <sup>23</sup> within residential areas of special character in Andover, Chilworth and Romsey identified on map 57 – 61 will be permitted provided that: a) the <u>resulting sizes of any both the proposed <del>or</del> and remainder of the original plot</u> , when sub-divided, <u>is are</u> not significantly smaller than those in the immediate vicinity; and”	This modification seeks to clarify how the policy would be applied but does not seek to alter the intent of the policy. There are no significant sustainability implications.
TVBC/M /7/5	Para 7.31	Amend text to read: “ <u>In order to help retain the character of the area the resulting size of any both the proposed and remainder of the original plot when sub-divided or any proposed plot</u> should not be significantly	This modification seeks to clarify how the policy would be applied but does not seek to alter the intent of the policy. There are no significant sustainability implications.

Ref	Policy/Para	Proposed minor modification	Sustainability Appraisal / Strategic Environmental Assessment Implications
		smaller than those within the immediate vicinity...”	
TVBC/M /7/6	Para 7.31	Amend text to read: “... described in the Residential Areas of Special Character <del>background paper</del> <u>topic paper.</u> ”	Comprises a typographical correction, therefore no significant sustainability implications.
TVBC/M /7/7	Policy E5	Amend first element of the policy to read: “Development in the Borough that will conserve, and where <u>possible</u> restore and / or enhance, biodiversity <del>in the Borough</del> will be permitted.”	This modification seeks to clarify how the policy would be applied but does not seek to alter the intent of the policy. There are no significant sustainability implications.
TVBC/M /7/8	Para 7.37a	Amend paragraph to read: “The Council has commenced work with neighbouring authorities and statutory bodies on preparing a long term approach for mitigating the recreational pressures on the New Forest ecological designations. <u>In the short term the Council has approved the New Forest Interim Mitigation Framework 2014 [footnote]</u> ”  [footnote: <u>For a net gain in dwellings within 13.6km of the New Forest SPA</u> ]	This is an update in relation to a document the Council has approved in relation to mitigation and the New Forest SPA. The modification itself is not considered to result in significant sustainability implications.
TVBC/M /7/9	Para 7.40	Amend paragraph 7.40 to read “...sites of geological interest will not be permitted unless the circumstances set out within the policy apply. <u>Details of the national designations can be obtained from Natural England. Information on Local Nature Reserves can be obtained from the Council. Details of the Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation within the Borough can be obtained from Hampshire Biodiversity Information Centre.</u> ”	This modification is a factual update in terms where data on certain nature conservation designations can be accessed. It is not considered to have any significant sustainability implications.
TVBC/M /7/10	Policy E6	Amend Policy E6 criterion a) to read: “Development will be permitted provided that: a) it protects, conserves and <u>where possible,</u> enhances the Borough’s Green Infrastructure network;”	This modification seeks to clarify how the policy would be applied but does not seek to alter the intent of the policy. There are no significant sustainability implications.

Ref	Policy/Para	Proposed minor modification	Sustainability Appraisal / Strategic Environmental Assessment Implications
TVBC/M /7/11	Para 7.49	<p>Amend text to read:            “The Council supports <u>the principle of other proposals which energy generating proposals which help</u> mitigate and adapt to climate change <u>within both defined settlements and the countryside. This can be achieved through the use of renewable and low carbon sources of energy. The Council will consider the merits of such proposals against the relevant policies of the local plan. In line with national guidance an applicant is not required to demonstrate the need for such proposals [footnote to NPPF paragraph 98].”</u></p>	<p>During the relevant Hearing session, further clarification was sought in relation to the approach to renewable and low carbon energy. Additional text is put forward as a modification to clarify the Council’s approach. There would be an alternative to include a specific policy on this matter; however the Council did not consider that this would add to national guidance on this topic particularly in relation to demonstrating the need for proposals. As such, this has not been further considered as a reasonable alternative. This modification has the potential to have a positive effect in relation to promotion of renewable energy. However, this is unlikely to have significant sustainability implications.</p>
TVBC/M /7/12	Policy E7	<p>Include additional criterion to read            “<u>bA) it complies with national policy and guidance in relation to flood risk”</u></p>	<p>This additional criterion re-affirms details set out within the supporting text but gives it additional weight through the inclusion within the policy. While there would be an alternative option to include a specific flood risk policy, the Council considered that it would not provide any further advice than is currently contained within national policy and guidance (in great detail), therefore this was not considered to be sufficiently distinct from the approach being pursued through this modification to generate clear alternative approaches. The inclusion of the wording within a policy is considered to add greater emphasis to this matter, which could have a positive effect but this is unlikely to be significant.</p>
TVBC/M /7/13	Para 7.57	<p>Amend wording to read            “<u>Flood Risk</u>            7.57 The NPPF sets out the approach to take in managing flooding from all possible sources<sup>107</sup>. This can include river floodplain<sup>108</sup> but also sites without adequate surface water run off, seasonal groundwater or where natural drainage is obstructed.</p>	<p>The modifications include reference to updates in guidance on this topic and are not considered to result in significant sustainability implications.</p>

Ref	Policy/Para	Proposed minor modification	Sustainability Appraisal / Strategic Environmental Assessment Implications
		Development may be permissible provided that it complies with the NPPF and national guidance, has regard to <u>local evidence and strategies including the Local Flood Risk Management Strategy</u> , and appropriate mitigation has been secured, <del>for example Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS).</del> "	
TVBC/M /7/14	7.58	Amend to read: <del>"Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) can have a role in the management of rainfall and surface water, as well as helping to improve water quality. Through the Flood and Water Management Act 2010, certain new developments will be required to make provision for the use of SuDS<sup>409</sup>. These would need to be designed in accordance with the emerging national standards and to the satisfaction of the SuDS Approval Body. In line with national guidance, major development will need to ensure SuDS are provided to manage runoff unless exceptional circumstances apply."</del>	The modifications include reference to updates in guidance on this topic and are not considered to result in significant sustainability implications.
TVBC/M /8/1	Para 8.5	Amend text to read <del>"... future management of open space provided on site will be needs to be agreed with the Council ..."</del>	Comprises a typographical correction, therefore no significant sustainability implications.
TVBC/M /8/2	Para 8.18 and footnote 120	Amend paragraph 8.18 to read: <del>"The Council has prepared and consulted on a draft approved an implementation framework<sup>120</sup> which will provide the basis for bringing forward detailed proposals to deliver the Forest Park."</del>  Amend footnote 120 to read: <del>"Forest Park Implementation Framework (Draft January 2014October 2014)"</del>	This modification updates the reference to a separate document approved by the Council. While this is relevant in terms of the relationship with other relevant plans, it is not considered to result in any significant sustainability implications.
TVBC/M /8/3	Para 8.19	Amend paragraph 8.19 to read: <del>"...effect on their living conditions. Residential amenity can potentially be affected by a number of factors such as noise, smells and changes in the level of light. Where a proposal involves a</del>	The modification seeks to clarify the range of factors that can be considered in relation to residential amenity. It is not considered to substantially change the approach of the policy or result in any significant sustainability implications.

Ref	Policy/Para	Proposed minor modification	Sustainability Appraisal / Strategic Environmental Assessment Implications
		change... “  Move paragraph 8.19 to follow Policy LHW4	
TVBC/M /9/1	Para 9.6	Alter paragraph 9.6 to state <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ‘Distance to a bus stop or railway station and frequency of service throughout the day’</li> <li>• Range of facilities within a 30 minute journey by public transport [footnote], bicycle or on foot (residential only)</li> </ul> [footnote: <u>Public transport relates to both train and bus and the 30 minutes includes waiting time, and distance to and from the bus stop/train station,</u>	This modification seeks to provide a clarification in terms of how sustainability in transport terms will be assessed. It is not considered that it will result in any significant sustainability implications.
TVBC/M /9/2	T1	Amend criterion a) to read “a) Its location is connected with existing and proposed pedestrian, cycle and public transport links to key destinations [footnote]and network and” [Footnote: <u>key destinations comprise town and local centres, primary school, secondary school, convenience store and doctors surgery.</u> ]	This modification seeks to clarify what key destinations are considered to be. This reflects facilities that have been taken into account when considering the accessibility of strategic residential sites within the November 2013 Sustainability Appraisal. This modification is not considered to result in significant sustainability implications.
TVBC/M /9/3	T1	Amend criterion d) to read:- “It does not have an adverse impact on the function, safety and character of and accessibility to the local or strategic highway network or rights of way network <del>or rights of way network.</del>	Comprises a typographical correction, therefore no significant sustainability implications.
TVBC/M /9/4	Para 9.7	Amend para 9.7 to read “...All routes and access points must be safe <u>and functional</u> for all users <u>including those with mobility problems</u> . Providing direct ....”	This modification seeks to clarify how policy T1 would be applied, recognising the functioning of the route will also be a consideration. This is not considered to result in significant sustainability implications.
TVBC/M /9/5	Para 9.9	Paragraph 9.9 to be amended as follows “... The aim of the travel plan should be to propose measures to facilitate and encourage the use of sustainable travel or <del>promoting</del>	Comprises a typographical correction, therefore no significant sustainability implications.

Ref	Policy/Para	Proposed minor modification	Sustainability Appraisal / Strategic Environmental Assessment Implications		
		reducing the need to travel”.			
TVBC/M/9/6	Para 9.13	Amend text to read “... the design and layout of new development. The scale of ...”	Comprises a typographical correction, therefore no significant sustainability implications.		
TVBC/M/11/1	Para 11.4	Paragraph 11.4 is to be amended below “Negotiating the <u>scale and type of skills and training obligation contribution</u> will vary depending on the type of proposal and its location”.	This modification seeks to clarify how policy ST1 would be applied. It is not considered to substantially change the approach and is not considered to have significant sustainability implications.		
TVBC/M/ANNEX B	Annex B	Amend row in relation to BLP policy ESN20 to read: <table border="1" style="display: inline-table; vertical-align: top;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%;">ESN20 New Local Shops and Community Facilities</td> <td style="width: 50%;"> <del>Policy COM14: Community Services &amp; Facilities</del>                      Policy COM2: Settlement Hierarchy                      Policy LE16: Re-Use of Buildings in the Countryside                 </td> </tr> </table>	ESN20 New Local Shops and Community Facilities	<del>Policy COM14: Community Services &amp; Facilities</del> Policy COM2: Settlement Hierarchy Policy LE16: Re-Use of Buildings in the Countryside	Comprises a typographical correction, therefore no significant sustainability implications.
ESN20 New Local Shops and Community Facilities	<del>Policy COM14: Community Services &amp; Facilities</del> Policy COM2: Settlement Hierarchy Policy LE16: Re-Use of Buildings in the Countryside				
TVBC/M/MAPA	Map A and Map B	Include full extent of Luzborough Plantation (see map B1)	This modification does not change the policies but seeks to provide a full map of the mitigation area. As such, it is not considered to result in significant sustainability implications.		
TVBC/M/MAPC	Map C	Amend the boundary of the allocation to include ‘The Wood Yard’	This modification was considered through EB/AD16, which considered that this modification did not have a significant effect.		
TVBC/M/MAPD 1	Map D1	Delete that part of Harewood Common designation which already benefits from planning permission for that use.	This modification seeks to clarify the aspects of Harewood Common that are new in relation to the proposed allocation. This modification is not considered to result in significant sustainability implications.		
TVBC/M/MAP30	Map 30	Amend settlement boundary to include garage that is within the curtilage of The Chesters, Green Lane, Monxton.	While this relates to a change to the settlement boundary, it relates to an update to reflect the situation on the ground. Its inclusion reflects the approach carried out as a technical exercise to the definition of the settlement boundaries. It is not considered to result in a significant sustainability implication.		

Ref	Policy/Para	Proposed minor modification	Sustainability Appraisal / Strategic Environmental Assessment Implications
TVBC/M /MAP38 a	Map 38	Amend map title to read: "Map 38 Upper Clatford / <u>Anna Valley</u> "	Comprises a typographical correction, therefore no significant sustainability implications.
TVBC/M /MAP38 b	Map 38	Amend settlement boundary to include full curtilage of Cricklade Lodge, Foundry Road, Upper Clatford.	While this relates to a change to the settlement boundary, it relates to an update to reflect the situation on the ground. Its inclusion reflects the approach carried out as a technical exercise to the definition of the settlement boundaries. It is not considered to result in a significant sustainability implication.
TVBC/M /MAP42	Map 42	Amend settlement boundary to exclude land to the north of Arbor Acres, Weyhill.	This modification was considered through EB/AD16, which considered that this modification did not have a significant effect.
TVBC/M /MAP43	Map 43	Amend settlement boundary to include land adjacent to 26 Church Street, Wherwell within settlement boundary (policy COM2).	This relates to a change to the settlement boundary following a decision through a planning appeal on this site. The modification to the settlement boundary to include this area is not considered to result in a significant sustainability implication.
TVBC/M /MAP55 a	Map 55	Deletion of that land identified as settlement on map 3 from the proposed local gap.	This modification was considered through EB/AD16, which considered that this modification did not have a significant effect.
TVBC/M /MAP55 b	Map 55	Deletion of that land at 'The Wood Yard' included in the allocation on map C from the proposed local gap.	This is a new modification to the local gap boundary, reflecting changes that had been established to the boundary of the allocation through policy COM5. While there would be an alternative of not making this change, it is not considered to be reasonable in the context of the site being included within an allocation for residential development. This change is not considered to have a substantial effect on the purpose of defining the local gap and is not considered to have a significant sustainability implication.