

## Appendix 1: Comments received from Stage A Scoping Report: 2005-2006

Date	Organis- ation	Comments	Response
12 Dec 05	DCC, Research and Development Section	There could be more data on Air Quality that could be provided by us or through PDC air quality monitoring. CO2 estimated emissions are also available by district now. Trend data could be provided for beach and water quality. We could also provide much more comprehensive data on accessibility by using accession software e.g. % of households within 30 minutes of a... by public transport. We can also provide trend data on rural services and education.	Inserted all data provided
13 Dec 05	PDC: Sustainability Officer	A1 needs to assess <i>A sustainable Future for Purbeck</i> , A2: should include % of communities with Parish Plan, School, Church, Local Meeting Place, Post Office, Text on Sustainability (pg 1) should quote from the UK Government Sustainable Development Strategy	Inserted and amended
13 Dec 05	PDC: Senior Planning Officer	Consult DWT and PDC Heritage Team	Consulted
15 Dec 05	PDC: Community Safety Officer	No comments to make	Noted
16 Dec 05	PDC: Purbeck Community Partnership Officer	Keep indicators simple, few in number, and to the point	Noted
16 Dec 05	PDC: Housing Officer	Stage A1 should include <i>Purbeck Housing Strategy</i>	Inserted
21 Dec	PDC: Team Leader, Design and Conserva- tion	Information given: 2 Area Appraisals done. Target to do 1 per year. 80 listed buildings at risk – 6% of total – getting worse	Inserted
22 Dec	English Heritage	Owing to the volume of work that is being generated by the introduction of the new planning arrangements and Sustainability Appraisal in this region, we are finding it necessary to prioritise which consultations we are able to respond to. Although we have not been able to provide a response at this stage, I must stress that this does not reflect our obligation to advise you on, and potentially object to, any specific development proposal which may subsequently arise from this or later versions of the document which is the subject of the consultation, and which may, despite the strategic environmental assessment, have adverse effects on the historic environment.	
22 Dec	DCC: Cultural and Community Planning Officer, DCC	Should include key message which supports cultural entitlement. The Dept of Culture, Media, and Sport PSA targets for 2003-2006 include: to enhance the take-up of sporting opportunities by 5-16 year olds within and beyond the curriculum. To increase significantly the take-up of cultural and sporting opportunities by new users aged 20 and above from priority groups, to improve the productivity of the tourism, creative and leisure industries. A1 should include Better places to live: Government, Identity and the Value of the Historic an Built Environment, DCMS 2005, Culture at the Heart of Regeneration: Summary of Responses, DCMS 2005, Dorset's Local Area Agreement 2005-2008. The Dorset Strategic Partnership (DSP) Culture Theme Group leads on delivery of the DSP's goals for culture within the Local Area Agreement, and its associating existing and emerging partnerships: Creative Industries Task Group; Creative Coast Group; Village Venues Task Group; Quality Design Forum. Include data around improving literacy, % of employees in knowledge-based sector. The creative industries form part of this sector, and a countywide partnership has developed a vision for this work and has achieved funding from the DSP and the Arts Council to engage Tom Fleming Creative Consultancy to carry out an options	Comments noted. Some of the suggested documents inserted. Additional data inserted where appropriate and available

Date	Organis- ation	Comments	Response
		appraisal and write a business plan. It would be helpful to include data around artists involved in quality design initiatives and public art projects. Re data to fill in gaps: DCC Adult Education, Creative Industries Task Group, DCC Cultural and Environmental Services. DCC Cultural services has access to data, and we would also recommend that you consult your arts officer.	
22 Dec	PDC: Housing Officer	Housing Investment Programme Annual Report – housing sold off 02/03 = 17, 03/04 = 16, 04/05 = 7	Inserted
22 Dec	DCC: Children’s Services	The School Organisation Plan 2003 – 2008 was approved in November 2003. We will be consulting on changes next year. The first Dorset Children and Young Peoples Plan, covering the period 2006 – 2009, is currently being consulted upon. A copy of the full document is available and can be accessed via website.	Inserted
23 Dec	PDC: Sustainability Officer	Percentages given for A2 re stronger and more vibrant communities	Inserted
3 Jan	SWRDA	We vary rarely comment in detail on the SA work attached to LDFs, usually concentrating on the Core Strategy and any significant Area Action Plans. However, it is good to see the economic (and socio economic) issues being addressed in the SA. I would refer you to the Regional Economic Strategy (and associated evidence) available on our website ( <a href="http://www.southwestrda.org.uk">www.southwestrda.org.uk</a> ) for additional baseline issues and data. We would certainly review LDF documents in their ability to help to deliver this strategy.	Noted
4 Jan	DCC Research and Development	Stage A2 – need national comparators. Additional data provided	Nat. comps and additional data inserted
4 Jan	DCC Sustainability Officers	Should be made clearer that A4 is the conclusion of the earlier stages. Additional data suggested on Eco Homes.	Noted and changes made.
5 Jan	PDC Dev Con	Data on planning applications that have consulted archaeologist	Inserted
5 Jan	English Heritage	No comments at this stage	Noted
9 Jan	GOSW	“My main reservation concerns how you use and develop objectives and this is something for the whole report/approach. Making the SA truly relevant to the area to which it relates is something I also raised with East Dorset/Christchurch. You tend to be taking frwd the RSDF objectives and applying them wholesale to the district. A part of the scoping process should be to develop your own objectives through A1 to A4”. “Stage A1 looks at objectives you inherit from other plans and programmes (e.g. Protection of landscape and ecological sites, brownfield targets and so on), the baseline information A2 helps you pick up issues and trends affecting Purbeck helping to identify sustainability issues. One result of identifying key sustainability issues, stage A3, is to then develop objectives for your SA framework, presented in A4. Hence the framework is ‘your own’ in the sense that it applies specifically to your LDF and Purbeck. It should also help you ensure that you have a relevant and manageable number of really key issues and objectives”.(In section 1.19, it would be useful to explain that the development plan chain of conformity from RSS to Core Strategy to other DP and SPDs. Worth doing, as you pick in detail on RSS for example under A1.) A1: One of the roles of this section is also to highlight tensions, synergies and constraints from regional. National and other strategies and objectives. For	Noted and changes made Noted, in particular the reference to relevant and manage- able number of really key issues and objectives.

Date	Organis- ation	Comments	Response
		<p>example, the protection of the many designations covering various parts of the district, and how this may be seen to have both positive and negative local implications. It's really useful to set out the most important of these compatibility issues as you're likely to return to them in A4. You might think more about relationships between docs as well as just messages from them. The 3 bullets on p85 of the guidance are a useful way of framing your 'key messages' to pick up this dimension. A2: It would be useful to have some very brief comments on at least some of the indicators as per paragraph 3.2.9 to know the current state, good or bad etc and the trend, A2: what scope there is for LDFs to have an influence. This is a good way to check how relevant each indicator may be to an LDF and idy'ing gaps in data. The reader can then better understand those areas you pick out as key under para 4.8 (which is to be added later?) If only for good housekeeping, it's helpful to mark those indicators which form part of your AMR as well as you SA/SEA baseline. A3: This is where my initial comment on objectives surfaces most significantly. You need to focus on the key issues flowing from areas (omitted) in your para 4.8 or commentary on the baseline. Overall you seem to have a manageable number of key issues but I'm not sure that these truly derive from step A2- A3 or you just repeating issues relating to each RSDF objective. (See my initial comment). A3: Probably best if you just set out the key issue/problem, without an objective at this stage. Appendix 8 of the guidance provides an eg. You also have a no of indicators for each issue and sometimes group them to several issues. You might like to review these so it is clearer precisely how you will actually assess effects on each issue. (Are all indicators relevant and equally important? When and what sorts of qualitative judgement will also be needed) A4: See my initial comment on objectives. Generally, again this looks like a manageable number of headline objectives and the RSDF is a useful starting point to develop your own. Following on from my comment on A3 and indicators, it would be useful to have one headline indicator (as per the eg in appendix 9 of the guidance p107). You include detailed decision making criteria and these are helpful. In this section you should also go on to highlight some of the tension between issues. East Dorset and Christchurch have been doing this with a matrix and further commentary. It is also the opportunity to refer to the effects of national, regional and other plan and programmes that have significant effects on the district. This is difficult to do without objectives developed through A1-A3. Your scoping report should also set out the structure and level of detail of the SA report you propose. You may need to be advised by your own legal advice to ensure that requirements of the SEA Directive are met.</p>	
11 Jan	PDC Tourism Officer	Additional data provided from Dorset Tourism Data Project Consortium	Inserted
13 Jan	DCC Transport Liaison	<p>1.20 Do you need to give an indication of the timetable for the RSS ?. 1.20 Ref RPG Note 10. 3.0 Purbeck issues should not be identical to EDDC / XCh . A1 Planning Policy Statement 6: Planning for Town Centers (2005) typo centres, Planning Policy Guidance Note 13: Transport (2002) 2001 not 2002, Documents listed at 44,45,46 but not others, Reclaiming Rural highways is listed twice A4: Help make suitable housing available .... Indicator '% housing with central heating ' is this an appropriate indicator of suitability? Does this not conflict with energy consumption / health / eco standard aspirations ? Reduce Need to travel by car ..... Avoiding development which generates further road traffic is too onerous. The majority of travel in Dorset (there being limited rail as none road based travel) is by road therefore all development will generate road traffic even if it's by cycle or walking – the only scenario where this might be offset is for re development where there was a 'credit' which is probably rare in Purbeck. Help everyone access basic services ..... The ability to send children to any school, 'parental preference' undermines the proximity principle. However the opportunity for accessing schools which are not the closest should still promote access by sustainable modes. Additional Indicator possibly number of schools with a travel plan? Encourage a switch .. to rail / water freight ..... Whilst the opportunity for switching to these modes is laudable, care must be taken that any proposals do not result in inducing / redistributing traffic into unsuitable areas consequential to establishing interchanges.</p>	Noted and changes made
13 Jan 06	DCC Senior Strategic Planner	The baseline work needs to be expanded to consider 1) a methodology for the prioritisation of reports, plans and strategies, 2) key issues need to be extracted from each document, 3) indicators need to be based on issues identified through the above. This should aim to	Noted and changes made

Date	Organis- ation	Comments	Response
		<p>provide a district baseline that has district issues embedded within it, 4) comparators need a level of conformity throughout Appendix 2. For example the Bracknell Forest SA does this very well in three columns, National, Regional and local, 5) analysis of baseline data would have allowed for the inclusion of trends in many instances (Appendix 2), 6) Scoping Methodology (Sec. 2) needs to include an explanation of how you will prioritise reports, plans and strategies utilised in the baseline, 7) There needs to be a note on cumulative impacts and the need to mitigate for impacts at the point of delivery where necessary and where no viable alternative is available. The whole document requires drawing together this will only be achieved by the full development of the baseline so allowing the above material to be built upon it. Detailed Points: 1.20 Should read 'Regional Planning Guidance' rather than 'Regional Planning Policy', 2. Needs expanding as suggested in points (1) above., 3.0 Key emerging issues for Purbeck cannot be exactly the same as for Christchurch and East Dorset, 3.2 States that there is a hierarchy to documents that may influence their significance. This hierarchy does not show through in the list of documents or elsewhere ((1) above), 3.5 typo. In the subtitle 'General'.</p>	
13 Jan 06	Environ- ment Agency	<p>We have produced a large amount of guidance to aid the production of Strategic Environmental Assessments (SEA), which we understand will be incorporated into Sustainability Appraisals. Therefore as well as reading our comments below, I recommend that you visit our website at <a href="http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk">www.environment-agency.gov.uk</a>. You can find SEA information by accessing the 'About Us' link at the top of the page, then selecting 'Policy', and then 'Strategic Environmental Assessment'. Plans &amp; Programmes. Below are plans and programmes that should be included in your list: National:, Hazardous Waste Directive, The Waste Electrical &amp; Electronic Equipment (WEEE) Directive, Securing the Future – UK Government Sustainable Development Strategy (Defra, March 2005). Includes a chapter on preparing for climate change, The Planning Response to Climate Change – Advice on Better Practice (ODPM, September 2004), BRE's Environmental Assessment Method (BREEAM – inc. EcoHomes), Regional &amp; Local: Dorset Stour Catchment Abstraction Management Strategy (CAMS), Frome, Piddle and Poole Harbour CAMS, River Basin Management Plans (prepared by the EA under the Water Framework Directive), Poole Bay &amp; Christchurch Bay Shoreline Management Plan (SMP) Durlston Head to Portland Bill SMP, Stour Catchment Flood Management Plans (CFMP), West Dorset CFMP, Frome and Piddle CFMP, Water Level Management Plans (WLMPs), Areas Benefiting from Flood Defences and their Standards (ongoing EA project), Fisheries Action Plans, Salmon Action Plans, Biodiversity Action Plan, Landcare Project (EA), Baseline Data &amp; Indicators, Below is a list of your "headline objectives" with additional suggested indicators, and the source for that data: Reduce vulnerability of the economy to climate change: % of properties within Flood, Zones 2 &amp; 3 receiving Flood Warning Service, Number of Flood Warnings issued per year, data source: Environment Agency. Protect and enhance habitats and species - % of SNCIs in favourable condition, data source: Dorset Wildlife Trust, Losses or increases in area of BAP habitats (e.g. heathland, wetland etc), data source: Dorset Biodiversity Partnership or Dorset Environmental Records Centre, River Quality – chemical &amp; biological, data source: Environment Agency, Compliance with bathing water standards, data source: Dorset for You website and Environment Agency, Km of river supporting salmonid species, data source: Environment Agency, Minimise consumption and extraction of natural resources – Amount of water abstracted (m3 per district area per year), data source: water companies and Environment Agency. Tonnage of minerals extracted within the area, data source: Dorset County Council?? The objectives "Reduce vulnerability of the economy to climate change" and "Reduce vulnerability to flooding, sea level rise " seem very similar and are no doubt interlinked. It may be worth combining them into one objective, but keeping both associated indicators. The objective "Keep water consumption within local carrying capacity" is essentially included within "Minimise consumption and extraction of natural resources". The former could be eliminated and a reference made to water in the latter, e.g. ".....extraction of natural resources, including water". SA Objectives – This table (appendix 4) sets out what the SA process will ask of all the policies in a very clear and useful manner. There is some overlap between this and appendix 3. If it is possible it may be worth combining them to reduce repetition and have the information all together in order to view and understand it easily. We are aware that the page size may have been a factor in</p>	Noted. The most important documents have been inserted. All suggested data inserted where available. Other changes made in line with suggestions

Date	Organis- ation	Comments	Response
		determining how many tables are included within the report. If both tables remain (appendix 3 and 4), the extra indicators suggested above should be included in appendices 2, 3, and 4. EcoHomes Standards. We are pleased to see that this method of ensuring sustainable construction is mentioned. However, EcoHomes is only one aspect of BRE's Environmental Assessment Method (BREEAM). BREEAM also includes similar standards being applied to commercial and industrial properties. Therefore we would wish to see these sustainability standards applied to all types of development. In addition, we recommend that a certain proportion of development should aim for 'excellent' standard, as well as 'very good' standard. Waste – It would be useful to have an indicator to show how much waste is actually managed and dealt with entirely within the borough/district boundary, particularly for hazardous waste. This is a growing issue for Local Authorities as waste regulations become more and more stringent. For example, the number of sites now able to deal with hazardous waste legally has been reduced considerably in recent times. It is of benefit for Local Authorities to build this into plans and policies, when planning for waste management.	
20 Jan 06	South West Regional Assembly	The Assembly will endeavour to respond within the consultation period.	No further comments have been received
24 Jan 06	DCC: Research and Development	First, with regard to the earnings data on page 9, the data given in the DDB is not wrong, but it shows the mean earnings. I've since found out that the preferred measure is now median earnings and this is what is quoted nationally. To be in line with other publications, you may prefer to use the median as well. If so, the data you need are as follows (also updated to 2005): Average gross weekly earnings for full time adults (workplace based): Purbeck, £412, DCC £398, GB, £432. Average gross weekly earnings for full time adults (residence based): Purbeck, £419, DCC, £414, GB, £433. Source: Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings (ONS), 2005, median earnings. On page ten, over the last seven years, GVA per resident head would appear to be on a broad downward trend in both Purbeck and in Dorset cc. Note that the Purbeck data is estimated ie not released by ONS at this level. Also on page ten and on eleven: Employees in the knowledge-based sector: the GB figure is 23%, in tourism (direct): the GB figure is 8% in ag/fishing: the GB figure is 1%. The above figures were for 2003 from the Annual Business Inquiry. The 2004 data are now available giving the following results (please note that the Tourism definition used in 2004 has now been changed to include catering and also some transport sectors. This is in line with the national definition and the new SIC 2003 classification): Agriculture, PDC 3.1%, DCC 2.4% GB 0.9% Knowledge 17% 15.4%, 22.9%, Tourism direct, 11.9%, 11.2%, 11.6%, Source: ABI 2004, ONS	Noted and Amendme nts made to baseline data.
27 Jan 06	Team Leader, Partnerships and Implementati on	Relevant strategies for Dorset not mentioned are:-BDPEP Workspace Strategy 2003, BDPEP Economic Development Strategy 2005-2016 – Raising the Game, Purbeck Community Plan Jan 2006.	Inserted
18 Feb 06	Dorset Wildlife Trust	I note you have used parts of the Christchurch/East Dorset report as a start point for your document (and we would encourage further joint working to gain consistency). Therefore the responses made by English Nature (EN) and DWT to that document will also be useful for you (I have emailed these). You asked me to concentrate on Stage A2 (Baseline Data). These have been developed further than those in the Christchurch/East Dorset draft, however some of the comments from English Nature remain pertinent eg the need to make indicators more relevant to the LDF and development. I am interested in the proposed indicators of % of land with more than x European protected and BAP species; I'm assuming this arose out of the discussion with DERC and that they can supply the baseline/monitoring data to assess this. Again something relating to development, eg the number of developments negatively/positively affecting protected and/or BAP species would be useful. The other indicators suggested by EN's response to EDDC/CBC would also be helpful to include – eg those relating to greenspace and green infrastructure, heathland support areas, coastal squeeze and water and air quality. In terms of what data DWT holds or could help you with, the situation is much the same as I explained to	Noted. Changes made and DERC consulted for data



Date	Organis- ation	Comments	Response
		<p>EDDC/CBC. As you will be aware, Dorset Environmental Records Centre (DERC) have much biodiversity information which will be of use in monitoring both statutory and non-statutory nature conservation interests. In addition DWT holds some information on condition of Sites of Nature Conservation Interest (SNCI), where these have been monitored in recent years. I did point out, however, in my response to the draft SCI last March that there is much work needed to bring the baseline data for SNCIs up to date due to lack of resources for survey work in recent years. For example at that time (May 2005) only 12% of SNCIs in Purbeck had been monitored since 2000. One role of the SEA process could be to identify those SNCIs which lack baseline condition information and which would potentially be impacted (adversely or positively) by the LDF, eg in the vicinity of built up areas or extensions. In this way the financial resources required for monitoring to maintain an accurate baseline could be identified and allocated, but would be limited by excluding those sites (the majority of SNCIs in Purbeck) in the wider countryside which are more likely to be impacted by agriculture/forestry policies. The above raises the issue that additional resources will be required to establish an accurate baseline and monitor this on an ongoing basis. Some suggested indicators, such as SNCI condition could be carried out through DWT, but presently we do not have the funding to undertake them on the full and ongoing basis which you would need. We would be happy to discuss this issue further in relation to indicators we could help with.</p>	
18 Feb 06	English Nature (Joint response with Christchurch and East Dorset)	<p>You will be aware that in October the European Court ruled that UK land use plans should be subject to appropriate assessment of their implications for SACs (and by virtue of this ruling SPAs also). We understand Government is developing policy advice and possible legislation on this matter. Christchurch and East Dorset contain substantial areas of SAC and SPA and much lies within or in close proximity to developed parts of the Borough/District. Because of this context the Local Development Framework is likely to raise land use considerations that would require the implications for SACs and SPAs to be assessed. In the interim while Government advice is being developed we strongly suggest that the Sustainability Appraisal should include the considerations on appropriate assessment set out in Article 6 of the Habitats Directive. The wording in the Directive suggests that a formal assessment should be concluded as a final stage of the appraisal so as to inform approval decisions on the final content of a Submission document. However, it would be wise to proceed with the process of an appropriate assessment at a much earlier stage so as to avoid taking forward land use policy or proposals that, at a later time, are found to be inconsistent with the requirements for protecting SACs and SPAs under Article 6. We support the use of indicators for the Sustainability Appraisal. We feel there should be a common set of core environmental indicators that apply to LDF appraisals across south-east Dorset and especially the conurbation. This is because environmental challenges such as relieving urban pressures on the Dorset Heathlands are common to all the local authority areas. This is something East Dorset and Christchurch may wish to take forward with Poole, Bournemouth and Purbeck through officer level working groups. With regard to the draft report we feel the indicators for environmental quality and assets are too narrow in scope. Also some of the indicators are rather broad brush and, in our opinion, would not likely provide an adequate 'test' in the Sustainability Appraisal at a local level. The attached pages contain a series of suggested core indicators across a range of environmental qualities for your consideration. Information on some of these indicators is readily available from English Nature. We believe information for most others is also readily available from other agencies or can be extracted from documents or databases. The indicator on greenspace is likely to require spatial analysis of information on GIS.</p>	Noted and changes made
27 Feb 06	DERC	Data provided on SNCIs, SSSIs and Priority Habitats.	Inserted
28 Mar 06	PDC: Waste Management Team	Updated waste data provided	Inserted

## Appendix 2: Response to Preferred Options 2006 Sustainability Appraisal

### Wool Parish Plan Steering Group

The draft SA is clear, thorough and informative. However, it is the usual and best practice to have the SA done 'out of house' as was done for the SW region draft RSS. As PDC did their draft SA 'in house' it should be subjected to 'peer review' for validation. The SA analysis seems fair and diligent, but peer review would confirm this. If no peer review is undertaken then this document remains the opinion of its author (s) and carries little authority. There are weaknesses and gaps in the Core Strategy document which are identified by the SA with which we concur. Three selected examples of which are shown below: - There are few statements on reducing crime or antisocial behaviour; - The management of tourist volumes to achieve sustainable tourism, or definitions of sustainable tourism; - The protection of our precious environments and the quality of life of residents in the face of tourism have not been addressed.

#### Officer's response:

Comments noted. The peer review is in the form of regular meetings with other Dorset authorities to review best practice in preparing SA. Whilst every effort is made to use evidence backed up by research, the author recognises that personal opinion can be a risk and therefore outside opinion is always sought where researched evidence is lacking.

### SGB Developments Ltd

Useful to learn how the SA objectives were used to test the sustainability effects of the Preferred Options document and how following on from this it was influenced. Was also interesting to learn the statistics this study produced. The objective of interest to me is 'Does the document provide suitable and affordable housing, particularly for local needs?' The answer is no. There are currently no small scale proposals to develop housing close to the settlement boundaries of Wareham. Existing proposals appear to be concerned with larger scale developments on the outskirts of the town centres, creating larger dwellings that are not currently required within the Purbeck Community. If planning is granted for these larger dwellings, which I understand to be in Worgret and Holton Heath area, then traffic congestion will increase, particularly on the A351. The Housing Needs Survey 2006 found that there was a local need for 1 and 2 bed dwellings. If I am able to pursue development of my site I would be able to assist with meeting the local need.

**Officer's response:** Comments noted

### Malcolm Munro

On the whole I commend this document as it does appear to have recognised some of the drawback and concerns I have listed, particularly in respect to additional housing as referred to in PO64.

**Officer's response:** Comments noted

### Bere Regis Parish Council

We refer you to page 41 of the Sustainability Appraisal in which you state that additional housing would lead to out-commuting. While additional employment may be provided in the village, it will not necessarily be used by people in the village, and because of Bere Regis' good road connections, it could lead to out commuting from other villages to Bere Regis. You also state in Appendix 7 of the Sustainability Appraisal that PO64, as it increases the need to travel, fails to meet the objective of reducing waste and gas emissions etc. Thus the objective of minimising pollution and preparing for climate change is not met. We understand the main focus of PPG13 is to reduce the need to travel. Any development in Bere Regis would not achieve this.

**Officer's response:** Comments noted

### Mr & Mrs R L Maxted

We fully concur with the recommendation made on page 41 that "Any housing in Bere Regis should be of a size to enhance viability of existing services, but not to add large scale numbers of out-commuters onto the road network" etc. This reinforces the view that only 'small scale' future housing development should be permitted.

**Officer's response:** Comments noted

## **Studland Parish Council**

The Parish Council considers that the document is far too technical and complex for the average councillor or unqualified resident to understand and to be able to formulate constructive comments, other than of a very basic nature. They also consider that the contents were aimed at planning engineers and technicians and that in order to be able to comment the document should have been drafted in layman's terms. Parish Councils, other than through Parish Plans, have very little influence on decisions made by the District Council, and any comments would generally therefore have little relevance.

**Officer's response:** Comments noted

## **Natural England**

The sustainability appraisal recognises some of the key environmental problems that would result from the Core Strategy. In particular, it points out that the Strategy would be likely to result in a net increase in carbon emissions. We would strongly advise that proposals that contribute to this conclusion are re-examined. The SA does not fully recognise some of the specific impacts on internationally designated sites and we believe that in order to adequately fulfill the requirements of the SEA Directive it will need to be revised in the light of the anticipated work toward an appropriate assessment. There is no assessment of the environmental impact of the road schemes that are presented in the Strategy and so for this part of the Strategy we do not believe that the requirements of the SEA Directive have been met. We believe that the monitoring indicators that are inadequate and do not reflect the key outcomes of the plan. Advice on indicators was given in responses to a previous draft and we would also draw your attention to advice given by Natural England to North Dorset (included in the response from DWT). Some of these indicators could be monitored without a significant resource input from the local authority so it is unclear why they have not been used.

**Officer's response:** Comments noted. Suggestions for additional monitoring have been incorporated

## **Government Office for the South West**

Whilst we do not comment in detail on the Sustainability Appraisal we are unclear as to what alternative options arising through the Issues and Options process were considered as part of the sustainability appraisal process and how the SA process is influencing the selection of Preferred Options. Instead the approach seems rather to use SA to report on effects in a rather neutral way.

**Officer's response:** Comments noted. It is hoped that the pre-submission SA has addressed these concerns.

## **Wool Partnership**

The summary of key sustainability issues facing Purbeck refers to housing being expensive in relation to salaries, and suggests that this is exacerbated by people from outside the area buying second homes or investment properties. This fails to acknowledge the link between housing supply and house prices, and the historic under provision of housing against strategic targets in Purbeck. The review of key documents in appendix 1 should be updated to include the Barker Review of housing supply, and commentary on the problem of housing affordability in Purbeck should recognise the link between house prices and the level of housing provision. It is unclear how the recommended level of housing growth of 78 per year on page 29 has been reached or how it relates to officially recognised forecasts of household growth, existing structure plan recommendations, and local housing needs studies. Unless this information can be qualified or referenced it should not be included in the sustainability appraisal. The identification of Wool as a sustainable location for growth alongside Swanage and Wareham is fully supported. Wool benefits from few of the constraints to outward expansion that affect Wareham and Swanage, this should be acknowledged in the sustainability appraisal.

**Officer's response:** Comments noted. Wool has not now been put forward in the pre-submission document for an assessment.

## **Dorset Wildlife Trust**

The SA points out a number of key weaknesses within the Preferred Options, particularly the impacts of housing growth on the environment and energy consumption, the likelihood of growth in traffic counteracting the gains made through energy efficiency and the potential impacts of climate change. The housing and transportation proposals are in particular pulled out as needing further work to ensure suitability. These proposals should be re-examined in light of the conclusions of the SA.



**Officer's response:** Comments noted. It is the role of the SA to point out where there might be issues of sustainability. However, while the LDF must be aware of them, it is not obliged to take on specific recommendations as there may be other factors at play (eg political factors) which are considered to outweigh sustainability issues.

#### **Mr Alexander Ward**

The problem with the Sustainability Appraisal Report is that some of the principles as applied to the Parish of Wool & Bovington are in clear contradiction with each other. For example in "I2 Report of the World Summit on Sustainable Development. UN Johannesburg (2002)" it would appear that the "Key objectives/requirements" are "Recognise the needs of everyone. Protection of the environment. The prudent use of natural resources. Climate change and energy. Sustainable communities." The corresponding "Implications for Purbeck's LDF" states, "The LDF can assist in achieving the commitments. The policies and supporting text should reflect these objectives, many of which are followed up in UK guidance and strategies". But what do we find in practice? For Wool it appears that for reasons of sustainability houses are to be built on green fields in and around the Parish. This may well meet the aims of sustainability but it certainly cannot be said that that to build houses on green fields is making prudent use of resources. Green fields are vital to the nation's ability to produce food from its own resources. In conclusion it is clear that the LDF is not achieving the commitments and it is not reflecting the objectives, it is meeting one objective at the expense of another to the detriment of the nation on the one hand and the residents of the Parish of Wool & Bovington on the other.

**Officer's response:** The following will be clarified and developed further in the second Preferred Options document: (1) The spatial options relating to changes over the plan period; (2) The settlement strategy; (3) Locations for future housing supply. These will provide a more specific set of choices for comment (2006). Updated response: the 2010 pre-submission document has clarified and developed specific locations for development.

#### **CPRE Purbeck and Poole Group**

Although we found the contents difficult to digest due to the amount of material it contained, it is nevertheless a commendably independent view of the Core Strategy Options. The recommendations in Chapter 8 should all be included in a revised Core Strategy when it would undoubtedly be strengthened. There is no mention of the Wool Planning for Real document in Appendix 1 (Review of Key Documents) despite it being referred to in the Preferred Options.

**Officer's response:** Comments noted.

#### **Pikes Farm**

Need special consideration of Organford.

**Officer's response:** Comments noted

#### **BL Holdings Ltd**

Please see comments in relation to individual policies and paragraphs and the attached sustainability assessment indicating that the development of land at Holton Heath is a sustainable option for employment development.

**Officer's response:** Comments noted

#### **Studland Parish Council**

Appendix 2 - Heritage. A) Conservation Areas. The Parish Council is very concerned that the District Council is proposing to neglect its responsibilities by not engaging in an up to date character appraisal in respect of reviewing and maintaining Conservation Areas. Studland Parish Council has been requesting an appraisal for several years. It is difficult to understand why only one Conservation Area is to be appraised per year, it could be 25 years before Studland Conservation Area is considered. B) Listed Buildings. The Parish Council considers that the preservation of listed buildings is of major importance and that the number of listed buildings at risk should be reduced. C) Trees. There does not appear to be any reference to any policy regarding the preservation of trees and tree planting schemes. D) Tourism. The Council considers that there should be no further expansion in tourism. There is no evidence to show benefits to local residents. Costs of tourism and the damage to the environment appear to outweigh the benefits. Hotels are closing, day visitors contribute little but cause additional pollution with vehicles and litter. Encouraging visitors to areas of interest cause erosion and damage to the very features that require protection. Control must be exercised over present unofficial visitor

accommodation which places a financial burden on facilities with little opportunity for recovery, due to the lack of enforcement action. Local businesses suffer due to road congestion, which results in longer journeys for deliveries and collections, and local residents spend longer going about their normal activities.

**Officer's response:** Comments noted

### **Bere Regis Parish Council**

Your own Sustainability Appraisal indicates clearly that PO64 is not only non-beneficial, but actually harmful. We are opposed to PO64 although we are in favour of small-scale managed development for the benefit of local people.

**Officer's response:** Comments noted

### **Mr Nick Storer**

Would like to have seen the document go further to help protect fish stocks and the marine environment.

**Officer's response:** Comments noted

### **Mr E Storer**

A balanced community needs balanced housing. 470 required for Swanage in the future. Restrictive planning is not helpful. Swanage Town boundary could be extended from the junction at the High Street and Seymer Road to include the area known as Pierhead Triangle. This would help with development worthy of 2026. Affordable Housing - what figure for basic rate earners? Can properties be built to this figure? Can redeemable mortgages be arranged to support advancement and recycle the initial purchase of First Time Buyers?

**Officer's response:** Comments noted

### **Mr F G Eltham**

Feel that the DSA is less than critical over the CSPO. It fails to indicate that if you over-develop a village (e.g. Wool) without extra shops etc then it becomes less self-contained which is contrary to your desires. It fails to mention that you should be more forceful over building styles when they are attached to well established dwellings. Both documents are littered with jargon and recursive links. The DSA is weak in its suggestions that over dense development is not conducive to a 'thriving community'. It fails to criticise the vagueness of the term 'local'. The DSA makes no mention of the potential parking congestion at the Spar / Post-Office in Wool. The current Barratts development will possibly increase the population of Wool by 400. The distance involved will oblige the new residents to use cars. And the current parking availability at the Spar is very limited. During the summer months in particular is chaotic; further pressure put on this area will lead to a potentially dangerous situation. The simple fact that there is no mention or consideration indicates ignorance of local conditions and that any previous comments by residents have been ignored. The DSA has also failed to criticise the authors of the CSPO document about not researching the plans of current shop owners. Wool will be losing the only butchers shop in the next few years - the intention of this site is to be developed for housing. This will further reduce the 'self-contained' functionality of the village. Neither the DSA nor the CSPO indicate an appropriate style for new development. This may have been left intentionally vague so that Developers can dictate styles and building densities to suit costs. The DSA also fails to realise that if you build houses before you provide local employment then those dwellings will be owned or tenanted by non locals and non locally employed people. This will result in extra commuting which will obviously have an impact on carbon emissions. I completely disagree that Wool is one of the most sustainable locations for housing. Wool will shortly have another 146 houses with probably another 30 in the site previously allocated for a Doctors surgery. By then we will have one less shop. And there appears to be no mention of whether the local schools will have to be expanded or whether children will have to be 'shipped' elsewhere. In my opinion, Wool has had its quota. The new Barratts estate may have 100 extra children school age and NO plans or contingency have been alluded to in either document indicating a preference for building houses and not the consequences.

**Officer's response:** Comments noted

### **Mrs J Eltham**

With any further development Wool will not be sustainable. Lacking in critical appraisal, especially with respect to parking congestion at Spar & the school capacity for children of new residents. Fails to

comment on the consequences of development.

**Officer's response:** Comments noted

**CPRE Purbeck and Poole Group**

Regrettably the Sustainability Appraisal Report was not distributed to us with the other documents. When we obtained a copy we were dismayed to find that we were faced with two to three hundred pages. In the short time available it was not possible to peruse it to the depth that it deserves. However, the preparation has clearly taken much time and effort and we were pleased to see that there was a strong correlation between many of the remarks it contains and our own comments.

**Officer's response:** Comments noted. Ensure that copies of all documents are readily available to view on the Councils website and at display locations around the District for the second Preferred Options consultation. The next SA will have a separate technical summary.

**Name:** Mrs M Lighthouse  
Have not had sight of this.

**Officer's response:** Comments noted. Ensure that copies of all documents are readily available to view on the Councils website and at display locations around the District for the second Preferred Options consultation. The next SA will have a separate technical summary.

## Appendix 3: Response to consultation on review of Scoping Report 2007

### Additional indicators suggested by Natural England

- The indicator on SSSI condition is useful but we suggest it is refined for use with the LDF. This is because the condition of a large part of the SSSI area depends on factors such as agricultural and forestry policy that lie outside the influence of development planning. Therefore taken in isolation the indicator may rather poorly reflect the performance of the LDF in conserving and enhancing SSSIs. We suggest the indicator is augmented by identifying the % of SSSI that is not favourable or recovering due to development related adverse reasons. This information is readily available from English Nature.
- An indicator is required on trends in the abundance of and damage to biodiversity and geodiversity outside SSSIs
- We consider the indicator on open space managed for nature conservation will be difficult to determine and does not clearly measure either biodiversity gain or the local availability of accessible natural greenspace. Based on English Nature research, a more meaningful indicator on greenspace would be to establish the area in the towns and conurbation that does/does not have good access to natural greenspace. This is as much about protecting and promoting biodiversity as providing a healthy environment for local residents and could equally appear under the heath objective.
- It would also be useful in addressing pressures on heathland SSSI to have a related indicator on the availability of alternative greenspace to heathland SSSI
- Heathland SSSIs are influenced by land use and management in the areas immediately surrounding them. Positive management of these areas for example to provide alternative access or to facilitate better grazing management of the heath is being promoted through the RSS by the identification of heathland support area in key areas around heathland SSSI. These measures are a key part of mitigation for increased housing numbers. We would therefore expect these measures to be taken forward through LDFs (in conjunction with other mechanisms of delivery) and recommend an indicator
- An indicator is needed to show whether the coast is being managed in a more sustainable way. There are two complementary key measures that we suggest. The first is the amount of natural coast that can, if dictated by natural processes, role back with sea level rise and not be reduced or squeezed out against urban development or coast or flood defences. The second is a measure on the degree to which soft solutions that work with coastal process are being used on the coast.
- The General Quality Assessment for river water quality is a widely used measure on river health but it does not address some important aspects of ecological health, for example eutrophication and sediment load. When available we suggest this indicator is replaced with that for ecological quality under the Water Framework Directive. In the interim a more informative indicator on river health and trend could be obtained by supplementing the GQA measure
- Heathland restoration and re-creation and the occurrence of woodland are strong issues for biodiversity and local amenity, especially within and close to the conurbation. We therefore suggest the indicator in the report on heathland is refined as below. The indicator should be used in conjunction with targets for heathland and woodland areas and distribution established from regional and county BAPs. Changes and trend in heathland area are available from the periodic CEH heathland surveys, the latest in 2005. The Forestry Commission may be able to provide comparable woodland survey data.

- Compliance with air quality standards should include an indicator on the exceeding of critical acid and nutrient levels for the natural vegetation. The critical level is the level of atmospheric pollution below which the vegetation is unlikely to be damaged. Addressing this aspect of environmental quality is likely to be particularly challenging owing to the scale of NOx emissions, especially from the use of fossil fuels. Acidic and/or low nutrient vegetation such as heathland and lichens are particularly vulnerable to atmospheric pollution and the LDF area contains several SSSIs with these interests. The indicator could thus be limited to the 1km squares (modelled air quality data is provided on this basis) containing SSSIs.
- An indicator is required to show whether pressure on the water environment from consumptive water abstraction is being eased or is increasing. The form of the indicator should be discussed with the Environment Agency.

As a result of the above comments, the following data has been included:

- % of SSSI in favourable or recovering condition and % unfavourable, by development related reasons.
- Extent of SNCIs and RIGs and number damaged, by economic sector.
- % (and spatial distribution) of urban land (or residential land if this can be defined) more than 500m from accessible natural greenspace over 2ha in size.
- % (and spatial distribution) of urban land (or residential land if this can be defined) more than 500m from accessible natural greenspace that is over 2ha in size and is not heathland SSSI.
- % of land in heathland support areas in favourable use and management
- % (or area) of land inside the outer boundary of the Green Belt (ie within the conurbation and its margins) that is heathland and % (or area) woodland or plantation.
- % of coast where coastal squeeze is predicted.
- % of coast with 'soft' flood or coast protection that harnesses natural coastal processes to reduce flood or erosion risk.
- % of river length meeting River Quality Objectives
- Number of pollution incidents to the freshwater or marine environment, by economic sector.
- % of 1km squares containing SSSIs where air quality exceeds the critical level for acidification or eutrophication of the natural vegetation.
- Index of groundwater level and river flow in selected aquifers and rivers exploited for public water supply\*.

\* DERC response: *This information can be extracted from air quality Web sites but requires expert understanding. It is also planned to be available through SSSI condition assessments in due course.*



## Appendix 4: Consultee responses for SA 2009

The following comments were received in 2009 in response to *Planning Purbeck's Future 2009* and are set out below (some have been abbreviated, but the salient points are included):

### Natural England

- Levels of phosphorus in the Frome and for Bere Stream exceed water quality standards for favourable condition of an SSSI.
- Levels of nitrate in the Frome have been rising, and the trend is upwards.
- Levels of nitrogen in Poole Harbour are such that the Harbour is classified as eutrophic.

#### ***Response to representation:***

- Comments have been incorporated into this document (the comments re Poole Harbour have been taken into account in the HRA)

### Environment Agency

The relevance and messages of the following documents should be fully assessed:

- Planning Policy Statement 9 (PPS9)
- Article 10 of the Habitats Directive
- Planning Policy Statement 1 (PPS1)
- The Water Framework Directive
- UK Biodiversity Action Plan

#### ***Response to representation***

- The above documents have been addressed in more detail.

### Government of the South West

- Housing objective in the SA does not enable an assessment of whether enough housing is being provided.
- ...need to test the implications of different levels of housing as part of the Sustainability Appraisal, taking account of environmental, economic and social sustainability

#### ***Response to representation***

- Housing objective has been amended.
- Higher level growth has not been put forward in this Core Strategy. The SA's role is to test "reasonable alternatives" as put forward in the Core Strategy. Higher levels are likely to be tested in further DPD.

### Swanage Town Council

The Sustainability Appraisal needs to address how "hollowing out" of communities can be avoided when economic pressures on Dorset County Council will prompt it to merge facilities and services.

#### ***Response to representation***

- This SA has advised what mitigation would be required for development in communities at risk of losing facilities. This is now incorporated into policies.

### **Redwood Partnership**

The sustainability appraisal does not appear to provide an objective framework for the assessment of all of the options for development, and as such it is not possible to demonstrate that the plan is the most appropriate taking into consideration all reasonable alternatives.... There is clearly potential for further housing growth at Wool to contribute to self containment and reduce the need to travel, improving the overall sustainability of the Core Strategy, this needs to be explicitly recognised in the SA.

#### ***Response to representation***

- Objective framework for all three reasonable alternatives for consultation in 2009 is now included in appendix.
- At the time of the 2009 consultation, the Wool option would not have been in general accordance with the then RSS. However, this option may be put forward as a reasonable alternative in a future DPD, should additional housing growth be proposed. If this should happen, then this option would be assessed against SA objectives.

### **C G Fry**

Statistics that inform the SA should be updated regularly

#### ***Response to representation***

- This has been done

## Appendix 5: Health Impact Assessment (HIA)

This section is taken from Chapter 8 of SA for Planning Purbeck's Future 2009.

### Introduction and Methodology

The HIA is an important tool in assessing how policies, plans or programmes have the potential to contribute to better health and well-being, as well as assessing any potential risk to this. There is no formal procedure for undertaking HIAs, but the SSA of the RSS provides a useful background with identifying three detailed objectives, as follows: improve health, reduce health inequalities, promote healthy lifestyles.

The table below identifies how each one of the SA Objectives relates to issues and challenges in the field of health.

**Table 7.1: SA Objectives and how they relate to health**

	<b>SA Objective</b>	<b>How could this assist in physical and mental health and well-being?</b>
<b>Health</b>	Improve health and promote healthy lifestyles	By encouraging good access to health provision and recreational facilities
<b>Housing</b>	Provide suitable and affordable housing, particularly for local needs	By ensuring provision of good quality, sustainable housing
<b>Training &amp; Development</b>	Give everyone access to learning, training, skills & cultural events	By providing good access to facilities
<b>Crime</b>	Reduce crime and fear of crime	By providing safe and secure places and routes
<b>Community</b>	Promote stronger, more vibrant communities	By promoting participation in community events
<b>Work</b>	Improve employment opportunities in Purbeck	By ensuring local provision of employment
<b>Living standards</b>	Reduce poverty and help everyone afford a good standard of living	By addressing health and welfare needs of those living in poverty
<b>Tourism</b>	Harness the economic potential of tourism in a sustainable way	By bringing additional employment opportunities into Purbeck
<b>Accessibility</b>	Help everyone access basic services, reduce the need to travel by car and encourage cycling, walking and use of public transport	By promoting facilities in accessible locations
<b>Climate change</b>	Reduce vulnerability to flooding and sea level rise and plan for climate change	By providing protection from flooding and coastal erosion.
<b>Biodiversity</b>	Protect and enhance habitats and species	By ensuring good quality natural environment which promotes human health and well-being
<b>Heritage</b>	Protect and enhance Purbeck's unique landscape and townscape, & cultural and historical assets	By ensuring a good quality environment which promotes human health and well-being

	<b>SA Objective</b>	<b>How could this assist in physical and mental health and well-being?</b>
<b>Water</b>	Reduce water consumption	By conserving water supplies for future generations
<b>Energy</b>	Reduce waste and minimise energy consumption and greenhouse gas emissions	By providing protection from high fuel costs
<b>Pollution</b>	Minimise land, water, air, light, and noise pollution	By reducing all kinds of pollution and its associated health impacts

Significant impacts identified are set out below, as well as suggestions for overcoming them.

**Table 7.2: Impacts identified and overcoming them**

<b>Potential adverse health impact identified</b>	<b>How could adverse impact be overcome?</b>
Light pollution from urban areas such as Poole is gradually encroaching in rural areas.	Liaison with DCC on appropriate street lighting.
Climate change could lead to more unpredictable weather patterns, with more heatwaves and more frequent and heavy rainfall.	New development needs to maximise energy efficiency and use of renewable energy.
More intense development in existing settlements risks reducing natural green spaces.	The more densely populated settlements may need to have additional tree planting and green space provision.
Restricting access to heathlands could reduce opportunities for physical exercise	Access needs to be managed carefully so that both humans and protected species are taken into account. Any restrictions on heathland access should be offset by appropriate facilities, whether new or upgraded.

## Appendix 6: Equalities Impact Assessment

This section is taken from Chapter 8 of SA for Planning Purbeck's Future 2009.

### Introduction

All Local Authorities are required to undertake an Equality Impact Assessment (EQIA) of new policy. This duty is set out in the Race Relations (Amendment) Act 2000 under which all public authorities have a duty to:

- Eliminate unlawful racial discrimination
- Promote equality of opportunity
- Promote good relations between people of different racial groups

Other relevant acts include the Sex Discrimination Act 1975, the Sex Discrimination (Gender Reassignment) Regulations 1999, the Gender Recognition Act 2004, Employment Equality (Sex Discrimination) Regulations 2005, the Disability Discrimination Act (DDA) 1995, Employment Equality (Sexual Orientation) Regulations December 2003, Civil Partnership Act 2005, Employment Equality (Religion or Belief) Regulations 2003, Age Discrimination 2006, Human Rights Act 1998.

### EQIA Methodology

This EQIA assesses the effects of the Core Strategy on different groups of people. It aims to raise concerns about discrimination and makes specific recommendations. Any significant recommendations are included in the last chapter of this document.

The methodology for dividing diversity groups is adapted from the Dorset County Council Toolkit. The methodology for assessment of the document uses the Sustainability Appraisal objectives.

**Table 8.1: Diversity Issues (Source: DCC Toolkit)**

Diversity	Includes	Issues
<b>Age</b>	Children, young people, teenagers, older people, retired people	Assumptions about the age range, experience, capability and 'generational viewpoints' Teenage parents, children as carers.
<b>Disability</b>	Mobility, sight, hearing, speech and language disability or difficulty, learning difficulties, mental health, distress issues	Accessibility of formats & communication, signage e.g. Braille, audiotape, induction loop. Physical and sensory access including transport, environment. Giving enough time, removing barriers that cause the 'disability'.
<b>Belief</b>	Supernatural and natural beliefs that are held, eg Agnosticism, Christianity, Humanism, Islam, Judaism.	Respecting diverse faiths and beliefs. Harassment, segregation, viewpoints, dignity.
<b>Gender</b>	Women, men, girls, boys, carers of those with disabilities, young children and older people	Women as predominantly main carer, physical access (pushchairs & toddlers, single parents, caring costs/facilities/restrictions on time re caring. Underachievement or under-representation, balance on groups/working parties/community representation. Safety.



Diversity	Includes	Issues
		Occupational segregation. Domestic violence.
<b>Race &amp; Ethnicity</b>	Black and ethnic minority communities & individuals including gypsies, travellers and faith communities	Respecting and reflecting diverse cultures, lifestyles, customs & values for women, men, boys and girls (e.g. single sex provision). Communication formats, language needs, translation. Isolation, work pattern of ethnic minority businesses. Harassment
<b>Sexual Orientation</b>	Lesbian, gay, bisexual or heterosexual	Assumptions about partners or family types, invisibility, dignity. Homophobic attacks.
<b>Income</b>	Low or no income, unemployed, part-time, seasonal workers	Access to personal transport & ICT, childcare costs, shift work, double disadvantage groups e.g. low-income single parents.
<b>Geography</b>	Coastal, single dwelling, homes with multiple occupation, rented, village, town, rural/urban	Multiple disadvantage, isolation & dispersal, distance from service or facilities or shared community perspective, transport difficulties

## Summary

**Age:** The document is unlikely to lead to prejudice or disadvantage based on age. It is likely to have a beneficial effect on younger people and in particular on young families who may not be in a position to afford to buy their own homes. Children in particular would benefit from the provision of good quality affordable housing located near facilities such as schools and play areas, while young families in general need good access to facilities such as shops and GP surgeries.

**Disability:** The document is unlikely to lead to prejudice or disadvantage based on disability. It is likely to have a beneficial effect if Building for Life criteria are adopted.

**Belief:** The document is unlikely to lead to prejudice or disadvantage based on belief.

**Gender:** The document is unlikely to lead to prejudice or disadvantage based on gender. The emphasis on reducing the need to travel and on accessibility, as well as the promotion of community facilities and services will have the potential to assist those at home with young children – more likely to be women.

**Race:** The document is unlikely to lead to prejudice or disadvantage based on race and ethnicity.

**Sexual orientation:** The document is unlikely to lead to prejudice or disadvantage based on sexual orientation.

**Income:** The document is unlikely to lead to prejudice or disadvantage based on income

**Geography:** The document is unlikely to lead to prejudice or disadvantage based on geography

**General Comments:** While the document overall is unlikely to lead to prejudice or disadvantage based on the above groups, it needs to be acknowledged that prejudice

and disadvantage already exist through the cumulative and long-term impact of many different policies, not necessarily related to spatial planning. The effect is most noticeable on gender, income, and geography. *Planning Purbeck's Future 2009* is unlikely to worsen the current situation, and weaknesses identified are those over which the spatial planning system has little control. For this reason, there are no additional recommendations to make to address equality issues.

### Equality Strengths and Weaknesses

Equality strengths	Equality weaknesses
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Aiming to locate dwellings near services should help to reduce the need to travel – addresses gender, geography and income.</li> <li>• Improvement in provision of affordable housing – addresses income disadvantage</li> <li>• Introducing energy efficiency measures and lifetime homes criteria will assist “fuel poor”, particularly the elderly and those with young children</li> <li>• Promotion of Building for Life criteria – addresses disadvantage based on age and income.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The strong policies in support of energy efficiency may be offset by growth in traffic which could lead to disadvantage based on income, in that those on lower incomes tend to live in busier areas.</li> <li>• Focus on self-containment of communities could be offset by closure of local facilities which could lead to disadvantage based on gender and geography.</li> <li>• Rising fuel prices could continue to affect those on low incomes, in particular when heating the home and when travelling.</li> <li>• The need for affordable housing is insatiable, and will not be fully met. Those on low income will continue to suffer disadvantage in this respect</li> </ul>