

**North Dorset District Council
Local Development Framework**

Sustainability Appraisal Report

**Managing Housing Land Supply in North Dorset
Supplementary Planning Document**

July 2007

Contact:

Adam Neil

Planning Policy Officer

Tel: 01258 484331

Email: aneil@north-dorset.gov.uk

Fax: 01258 484230

North Dorset District Council

Nordon

Salisbury Road

Blandford Forum

Dorset

DT11 7LL

1.0 Non-Technical Summary

- 1.1 This document constitutes the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Report of the Managing Housing Land Supply in North Dorset Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). One of the key functions of SA is the identification of the benefits and risks of different development and policy options, to allow balanced decisions to be made by North Dorset District Council (the Council) and to move towards more sustainable forms of development. This document includes an assessment of 5 Options which were developed through consultation with key stakeholders. This Report has identified a Preferred Option, which the Council views is the most sustainable option.
- 1.2 The preparation of this SA Report has so far involved two stages:
 - **Stage A:** The production of a Scoping Report, which identifies and sets out the scope of the SA. This document was issued for consultation in September/October 2006 and adopted in March 2007.
 - **Stage B:** The production of this SA Report for formal consultation alongside the Managing Housing Land Supply SPD.
- 1.3 During late 2006 a Scoping process was carried out to help identify the key sustainability issues relevant to North Dorset District Council and a Scoping Report was produced. Through the Scoping process a SA Framework was developed, which has been used in this Report to appraise the SPD. The framework comprises of 16 SA Objectives covering a range of Social, Economic and Environmental objectives.
- 1.4 The 5 Options for the SPD were tested against the SA Objectives in appraisal matrices to identify the likely effects of each option. This appraisal identified that Option 5 was likely to have the most positive effect in delivering development which is socially, economically and environmentally sustainable.
- 1.5 By controlling the release of allocated and non-allocated sites Option 5 is likely to deliver the most positive and sustainable effects.
- 1.6 This Report also identifies possible negative effects of introducing the SPD. It was identified that the SPD could have a negative effect on the average cost of housing in the District. Option 5, however, will allow development through the controlled release of sites and therefore is likely to impact the least on the cost of market housing.
- 1.7 The SA concluded that Option 5 would be the most sustainable option. This option would be unlikely to cause any 'significant effects on the environment' as defined by EC Directive 2001/42/EC.

Contents

List of Tables	5
1.0 Non-Technical Summary	3
2.0 Introduction	6
3.0 Stage A – The Scoping Report and the SA Framework	8
4.0 Assessing ‘saved’ Local Plan policies against the SA Framework	9
5.0 Stage B: Developing and Refining Options and Assessing Effects	14
6.0 Glossary	28

Appendices

Appendix A Summary of Local Plan ‘saved’ policies

List of Tables

Table 1	Stages in the Sustainability Appraisal	6
Table 2	SA Framework Objectives	8
Table 3	Compatibility Matrix of Relevant Saved Policies	10
Table 4	Compatibility Matrix of SPD Objectives against the SA Framework	14
Table 5	Appraisal of Options	18

2.0 Introduction

- 2.1 This document constitutes the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Report of the Managing Housing Land Supply in North Dorset Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), which this document should be read in conjunction with. The SPD will be subject to formal public consultation in March 2007. Prior to this formal consultation period, the preparation of the SPD underwent informal consultation with key interest groups including land agents and developers and town and parish council members.
- 2.2 The reason for the Council producing a SPD is to 'expand' and 'provide additional detail' to policies set out in a DPD, or a relevant policy in the existing 'saved' Local Plan. Adopted SPDs will form part of the planning framework for the area and therefore will be informed by extensive community involvement and SA. However they are not required to be independently examined and will not therefore form part of the statutory development plan.
- 2.3 This SPD will be supplementary to a number of policies in the North Dorset District-Wide Local Plan, which was produced under the recently replaced Town & Country Planning Act, 1990. As the SPD is supplementary to a saved plan which did not undergo full sustainability appraisal, this SA Report will need to set out the likely significant social, economic and environment effects of the saved policy/policies it is helping to implement.
- 2.4 Paragraph 4.1.6 of the ODPM's guidance, *Sustainability Appraisal of Regional Spatial Strategies and Local Development Documents* (2005), states that where the SPD has been prepared on the basis of a saved plan that has not been subject to SA, the Council will need to carry out a SA of that policy or policies and report on those. This report is contained within Section 4.0, below.
- 2.5 Government guidance indicates that SA should follow a five stage approach in order to fully accord with the requirements of the SEA Directive and the sustainability objectives of the Government. Table 1 illustrates the five stages.

Table 1: Stages in the Sustainability Appraisal

Stage	Description
Stage A	Setting the context and objectives, establishing the baseline and deciding on the scope (Scoping Report)
Stage B	Developing and refining options and assessing effects
Stage C	Preparing the SA Report
Stage D	Consulting on draft SPD and SA Report
Stage E	Monitoring the significant effects of implementing the SPD

- 2.6 A single Scoping Report (Stage A) can be prepared for more than one Local Development Document (LDD), provided that the Report gives sufficient information at the level of detail required for each of the documents concerned (ODPM, 2005, para 3.2.20). The Council produced a draft SA Scoping Report which was prepared and advertised for five weeks of public consultation between 15th September and 20th October 2006 and has ratified this document in the light of the representations received.
- 2.7 This Scoping Report has now been formally adopted by the Council and will be used as the basis for future SA of relevant documents, including the Housing Land Supply SPD. The SA Scoping Report document is available on the Council's website, www.north-dorset.gov.uk, and hard copies are available on request. This SA Report will therefore form Stage B of the SA process.

3.0 Stage A – The Scoping Report and the SA Framework

- 3.1 The Scoping Report sets out a SA Framework that will be used to test the sustainability of policies and objectives in all future DPDs and SPDs produced by the Council.
- 3.2 The Framework consists of sustainability objectives based on the regional SA Framework devised by the South West Regional Assembly. The Council's Framework comprises 16 broad sustainability objectives relating to the key themes of social, economic and environmental issues (Table 2)

Table 2: SA Framework Objectives

1	Improve Health, reducing health inequalities and promoting healthy lifestyles, especially routine daily exercise
2	Help make suitable housing available and affordable for everybody
3	Give everyone access to learning, training, skills and knowledge
4	Reduce crime and fear of crime
5	Promote stronger, more vibrant communities
6	Give everyone in the region access to satisfying work opportunities, paid and unpaid
7	Reduce poverty and income inequality
8	Reduce the need/desire to travel by car and make public transport, cycling and walking easier and more attractive
9	Meet local needs locally, helping everyone access basic services easily, safely and affordably
10	Protect and enhance habitats and biodiversity
11	Promote the conservation and wise use of land
12	Protect North Dorset's local distinctiveness, including its cultural and historical assets, landscapes and townscapes
13	Reduce vulnerability to flooding and adapt to the implications of climate change, harnessing opportunities that may arise
14	Reduce consumption of non-renewable energy and emissions of greenhouse gases
15	Reduce waste production and the consumption of water and minerals
16	Minimise land, water, air, light, noise and genetic pollution

4.0 Assessing ‘saved’ Local Plan policies against the SA Framework

- 4.1 Before options to achieve the SPD’s primary objective(s) can be prepared and appraised, Government guidance requires a SA of the ‘saved policies’ to which the SPD is supplementary to, as these policies were adopted prior to the requirements for SA of development plans. This appraisal will help in identifying whether the relevant saved policies in the North Dorset District-Wide Local Plan accord with the Council’s objectives for sustainable development, as set out in the SA Framework (Table 2).
- 4.2 A number of policies in the adopted Local Plan relate to the provision, location, type and phasing of dwellings that would be acceptable within the District. The Housing Land Supply SPD however, only deals with the issue of housing land supply. In order to ensure that the appraisal is complete, the SA assesses all housing-related policies, rather than just those that relate to housing land supply. This assessment was completed through the compatibility matrix below, which indicates whether the relevant policies in the adopted Local Plan are compatible with the SA Framework objectives.
- 4.3 The compatibility matrix of saved policies is presented in Table 3. A synopsis of the policies is presented in Appendix A.

Table 3: Compatibility Matrix of Relevant Saved Policies

		Sustainability Objectives																Comments - Relevant to the Housing Land Supply SPD
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	
Saved Local Plan Policies	1.1	0	++	+	0	0	+	0	++	++	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	The sustainable development strategy determines the location and type of development permitted within the District, therefore having a potentially very positive impact on a number of the sustainability objectives.
	1.2	0	+	+	0	++	+	0	++	+	-	+	-	0	0	0	0	This policy could potentially have a negative effect on the protection of habitats and the local distinctiveness of the towns through the provision of major developments.
	1.3	0	+	0	0	+	+	0	++	+	-	+	-	0	0	0	0	Although on a smaller scale, this policy could potentially have a negative effect on the protection of habitats and the local distinctiveness of the towns through the provision of moderate levels of development.
	1.4	0	+	0	0	+	+	0	+	+	-	+	-	0	0	0	0	Although on a smaller scale, this policy could potentially have a negative effect on the protection of habitats and the local distinctiveness of the villages through the provision of limited development.
	1.5	0	+	0	0	+	0	0	+	0	++	++	+	0	0	0	0	Policy directs development away from small villages and hamlets, therefore will increase levels of development in more sustainable settlements, thus helping make suitable housing available and reducing the need to travel for residents.
	1.6	0	+	0	0	+	0	0	+	0	++	++	+	0	0	0	0	Policy directs development away from countryside locations, therefore will increase levels of development in more sustainable settlements, thus helping make suitable housing available and reducing the need to travel for residents.
	1.8	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	Implementation of assessment criteria will potentially improve the character, both of the natural and built environment and reduce the fear of crime within new development.
	1.10	0	+	0	0	0	+	0	--	0	+	+	+	0	+	0	0	The re-use and adaption of buildings in the countryside can help make suitable housing available and promote the wise use of resources through the conservation of building materials, however there is the potential that development in the countryside would increase the reliance on private motor transport.
	1.11	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	+	0	0	0	0	The redevelopment of farmyards within settlements has the potential to provide suitable homes and bring derelict buildings into use, however PPG3 states that agricultural buildings and their curtilage are greenfield, therefore potentially having a negative effect on the conservation and wise use of land.

1.24	0	-	0	0	+	0	0	-	0	0	-	++	0	0	0	0	Preserving and enhancing conservation areas would be likely to conserve the historical built environment, promoting stronger communities. However, this could result in less suitable development in typically non-central locations, increasing the need to travel and potentially increasing the need for greenfield development.
2.1	0	++	0	0	+	0	+	0	0	-	+	0	0	0	0	0	Policy reflects target in Structure Plan which identified the level of development required, thus having the potential to provide a suitable level of housing and promoting stronger communities. Non-allocated development will constitute a large proportion of the target, therefore reducing the need to develop greenfield sites although greenfield development will be required.
2.2	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	++	++	+	0	0	0	0	Brownfield development will be likely to have a high positive effect on the protection of habitats and the wise use of land.
2.3	0	++	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	Development is concentrated in the main towns (which act as service centres) therefore having the potential to reduce the need to travel by meeting the needs of people locally. Infill development would be likely protect habitats and conserve greenfield land.
2.4	0	++	0	0	+	0	0	+	+	--	+	-	0	0	0	0	Land has been allocated to meet the housing target for the plan period, and is likely to promote communities in the larger towns by increasing their 'critical mass', reducing the need to travel by meeting the needs of people locally. However, greenfield development is likely to affect habitats and potentially reduce the local distinctiveness of the settlements.
2.6	0	+	0	0	+	0	0	+	+	-	+	-	0	0	0	0	Infilling has the potential to meet housing needs, promote communities, reduce the need to travel by meeting needs locally and conserve greenfield land. Infilling may also reduce the viability of habitats and biodiversity and affect the historical assets and distinctiveness of settlements.
2.8	0	+	0	0	+	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Monitoring has the potential to enhance the Council's understanding of housing need and therefore can effect the promotion of stronger communities through reducing poverty issues.
2.9	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	Phasing of land has the potential to meet the need for further housing development, if there is an undersupply. If there is an overprovision, phasing can promote the protection of habitats, the conservation of land and the local distinctiveness of settlements through the control of excessive development.

2.12	0	++	0	0	+	0	+	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	The provision of affordable housing is highly likely to help make suitable housing available for people, therefore promoting stronger communities and meeting the needs of people locally.
2.13	0	++	0	0	+	0	+	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	The provision of affordable housing in settlements is highly likely to help make suitable housing available for people, therefore promoting stronger communities and meeting the needs of people locally.
2.14	0	++	0	0	++	0	++	+	++	-	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	The provision of affordable housing is highly likely to help make suitable housing available for people, therefore promoting stronger communities and meeting the needs of people locally. However, exception site development is likely to be on greenfield sites, therefore potentially affecting the conservation of habitats, use of land and local distinctiveness of the built environment.
2.15	0	+	0	0	+	0	0	-	+	0	+	-	0	0	0	0	0	Replacement dwellings in the countryside have the potential to help make suitable housing available, meeting local needs and promoting the conservation of greenfield land. However, it has the potential to increase the reliance on private motor transport and impact on the historic built environment.
2.16	0	++	0	0	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	The provision of dwellings for identified rural needs would be likely to help make suitable housing available, therefore promoting communities. Development may have the potential of reducing the need to travel to the inhabitant's place of employment; conversely development would be likely to increase the need to travel for services due to the typical location of these developments. The development of greenfield land would be likely to have a negative effect on the protection of habitats, conservation of land and the natural landscape in the District.
2.19	0	+	0	0	+	0	+	+	+	+	+	-	0	0	0	0	0	Conversion has the potential to meet housing needs, promote stronger communities, meet local needs and promote the wise use of resources through the conservation of building materials. Conversion could potentially affect the historical built environment.

Possible Effects

++ Highly Positive

+ Positive

0 Neutral

- Negative

-- Highly Negative

- 4.4 The assessment of the 'saved' Local Plan policies against the SA Framework identifies that although there are potentially some negative impacts of housing development – generally dependant on the type and location – the majority of policies promote development that is socially, economically and environmentally sustainable.
- 4.5 This initial assessment has identified that the polices in the Local Plan, relevant to the Housing Land Supply SPD, are in general conformity with the SA Framework in promoting sustainable development. Therefore, the SA of policy options supplementary to these 'saved' policies is likely to continue to promote sustainable development.

5.0 Stage B: Developing and Refining Options and Assessing Effects

5.1 During this stage the objective(s) of the Housing Land Supply SPD and options will be tested against the SA Framework. This assessment will initially identify whether the objective(s) of the SPD are commensurate with the Council's SA Framework objectives, and develop a preferred option for the SPD.

Task B1: Testing the SPD Objectives against the SA Framework

5.2 In terms of achieving sustainable development within the District, the objectives of each LDD and SPD should accord with the SA Framework objectives.

5.3 The overarching objective of the Housing Land Supply SPD is to 'Manage the supply of housing land within the District'. Table 4 illustrates, by the means of a compatibility matrix, whether this objective is broadly commensurate with the SA Framework objectives.

5.4 An explanation of why the SPD has been written is contained within the draft Managing Housing Land Supply in North Dorset SPD. The SPD sets out how the supply of housing land will be managed prior to the replacement of RSS / adoption of the Council's Core Strategy, which will set new housing provision figures for the period 2006 to 2026. The Core Strategy is likely to be adopted in 2009.

Table 4: Compatibility Matrix of SPD Objectives against the SA Framework

		SPD Objective	Manage the supply of housing land
SA Framework Objectives	1	Improve Health, reducing health inequalities and promoting healthy lifestyles, especially routine daily exercise	0
	2	Help make suitable housing available and affordable for everybody	x
	3	Give everyone access to learning, training, skills and knowledge	0
	4	Reduce crime and fear of crime	0
	5	Promote stronger, more vibrant communities	x
	6	Give everyone in the region access to satisfying work opportunities, paid and unpaid	x
	7	Reduce poverty and income inequality	x
	8	Reduce the need/desire to travel by car and make public transport, cycling and walking easier and more attractive	0
	9	Meet local needs locally, helping everyone access basic services easily, safely and affordably	0

10	Protect and enhance habitats and biodiversity	✓
11	Promote the conservation and wise use of land	✓
12	Protect North Dorset's local distinctiveness, including its cultural and historical assets, landscapes and townscapes	✓
13	Reduce vulnerability to flooding and adapt to the implications of climate change, harnessing opportunities that may arise	✓
14	Reduce consumption of non-renewable energy and emissions of greenhouse gases	0
15	Reduce waste production and the consumption of water and minerals	0
16	Minimise land, water, air, light, noise and genetic pollution	0

Compatibility	✓	Potentially compatible	0	Potentially neutral	×	Potentially conflicting	✓/×	Potentially compatible or conflicting
---------------	---	------------------------	---	---------------------	---	-------------------------	-----	---------------------------------------

5.5 The compatibility matrix above considers the potential impacts of the implementation of the SPD's objective. An explanation of where the SPD objective may conflict with the SA Framework is presented below. The options developed in the next stage will need to mitigate against these potentially negative impacts.

SA Objective 2: Help make suitable housing available and affordable for everybody

5.6 Potentially the management of housing supply will have an adverse effect on the availability and cost of dwellings in the District. Recommendation: Develop options that will assess how suitable housing may be supported including affordable homes managed by Registered Social Landlords.

SA Objective 5: Promote stronger, more vibrant communities

5.7 Managing housing land supply may have an adverse effect on the continued strength and vibrancy of communities. Recommendation: Different options will need to be tested in order to identify whether the preferred SPD option can promote stronger communities, i.e. through the continued provision of community facilities.

SA Objective 6: Give everyone in the region access to satisfying work opportunities, paid and unpaid

5.8 The location of new housing development would have an effect on people's ability to access work opportunities. However, in terms of housing provision, controlling the *level* of housing development in accordance with agreed

provision figures, through the management of supply, is unlikely to have any adverse effects on this.

SA Objective 7: Reduce poverty and income inequality

- 5.9 The management of new housing development would be likely to have an effect on the affordability of purchasing a dwelling within the District.
Recommendation: Develop options that will assess how certain types of housing may be supported including affordable homes managed by Registered Social Landlords.

Task B2: Developing the SPD Options

- 5.10 The management of housing land supply can be undertaken in a number of ways by the Council. The identification of options was undertaken by the Council in consultation with the community and relevant stakeholders. Four meetings were held during October and November 2006 to identify issues and options. Further detail of these meetings and the issues raised is provided in the consultation statement.
- 5.11 A morning meeting was held with agents and developers on the 18th October 2006. This meeting informed those attending of the Council's resolution to produce a Housing Land Supply SPD and invited those present to express their concerns about the potential impacts of managing oversupply locally. The event raised a number of issues with managing housing supply and identified options for future management.
- 5.12 Three further meetings were held, one with the District Councillors and two evening meetings where representatives of the District's Town and Parish Councils were invited. These meetings informed those attending of the SPD and asked for comments on how the management of housing would potentially affect communities within North Dorset.
- 5.13 A number of general comments were raised in the meetings, as follows:
- Restricting the supply of housing will have a negative effect on the local construction industry and other associated trades and retailers;
 - Restricting the supply of housing will result in increased house prices, which in turn will increase social inequality in the District;
 - The Council will not be able to secure as much affordable housing or community infrastructure if overall supply is restricted;
 - Less housing will make local communities less well balanced, less sustainable and may result in the loss of local services; and,
 - Management of housing land, especially in some villages, has not been adequate in the past and greater control would reduce some of the pressures for further development.

- 5.14 The options below have been developed following the informal consultation meetings and indicate a range of strategies that the Council could make to control the release of housing land through the SPD.
- 5.15 The main aim of developing and subsequently appraising SPD options is to identify a Preferred Option. The appraisal is an iterative process – i.e. repeated if significant effects are identified – which will ensure that the final Preferred Option meets the objective of the SPD in the most sustainable way.
- 5.16 The options below will be appraised in order to identify the significant likely effects of each option.
- **Option 1:** No SPD. Business as usual. Allocations will be phased as per Policy 2.9 of the Local Plan. Non-allocated sites will not be phased.
 - **Option 2:** Manage housing land supply through refusing all future residential planning applications until RSS is replaced or the Core Strategy has been submitted/adopted.
 - **Option 3:** Manage housing land supply through refusing all future residential planning applications on non-allocated sites only, until RSS is replaced or the Core Strategy has been submitted/adopted.
 - **Option 4:** Manage housing land supply through refusing all future residential planning applications on remaining allocated sites¹ only, until RSS is replaced or the Core Strategy has been submitted/adopted.
 - **Option 5:** Manage housing land supply through controlled release of remaining allocated and non-allocated sites, until RSS is replaced or the Core Strategy has been submitted/adopted.
- 5.17 Other Options which were identified through consultation with stakeholders included an Option which would prioritise those schemes with a considerable community benefit, such as affordable housing or brownfield regeneration. However, consultation between the Council and its legal advisors found that to be in conformity with the housing policies contained in the Local Plan, which the SPD must supplement, the SPD must be restricted to the issue of housing land supply only. It cannot include supplementary policies which prioritise schemes with ‘other planning benefits’ as this would go beyond the scope of the policies to which the SPD is supplementary to. Therefore, these Options were not tested in this SA Report.

¹ As identified in Policy 2.4 of the Local Plan and the 2006 Annual Monitoring Report

Task B3: Predicting the effects of the draft SPD options

- 5.18 The purpose of this task is to predict the social, environmental and economic effects of the SPD options that have been identified through officer, member and community/stakeholder involvement and, latterly, to evaluate the significance of any identified effects.
- 5.19 The anticipated effects of these options are illustrated in Table 5, below. An explanation of the potential effects of each option against the adopted objectives of the SA Framework follows this table. Where relevant, effects have been quantified in terms of whether the potential effect would be permanent/temporary, positive/negative, probable/improbable etc.

Table 5: Appraisal of Options

SA Framework			Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	Option 5
Social	1	Improve Health, reducing health inequalities and promoting healthy lifestyles, especially routine daily exercise	0	0	0	0	0
	2	Help make suitable housing available and affordable for everybody	+	--	+	+	+
	3	Give everyone access to learning, training, skills and knowledge	0	0	0	0	0
	4	Reduce crime and fear of crime	0	0	0	0	0
	5	Promote stronger, more vibrant communities	++	-	++	-	+
Economic	6	Give everyone in the District access to satisfying work opportunities, paid and unpaid	0	0	0	0	0
	7	Reduce poverty and income inequality	+	--	+	+	+
	8	Reduce the need/desire to travel by car and make public transport, cycling and walking easier and more attractive	+	0	+	+	+
	9	Meet local needs locally, helping everyone access basic services easily, safely and affordably	0	0	0	0	0
Environmental	10	Protect and enhance habitats and biodiversity	-	+	-	-	-
	11	Promote the conservation and wise use of land	-	0	-	+	-
	12	Protect North Dorset's local distinctiveness, including its cultural and historical assets, landscapes and townscapes	-	+	-	-	-
	13	Reduce vulnerability to flooding and adapt to the implications of climate change, harnessing opportunities that may arise	0	0	0	0	0
	14	Reduce consumption of non-renewable energy and emissions of greenhouse gases	-	0	-	-	-
	15	Reduce waste production and the consumption of water and minerals	-	0	-	-	-
	16	Minimise land, water, air, light, noise and genetic pollution	-	0	-	-	-

Possible Effects ++ Highly Positive + Positive 0 Neutral - Negative -- Highly Negative

SA Objective 1: Improve Health reducing health inequalities and promoting healthy lifestyles especially routine daily exercise

5.20 All of the options are anticipated to have a neutral effect on the improvement of people's health and the promotion of healthier lifestyles. The *location* of new housing development would be likely to have an effect on people's health. However, in terms of housing provision, controlling the *level* of housing development, through the management of supply, is unlikely to have any adverse effects on this.

SA Objective 2: Help make suitable housing available and affordable for everybody

5.21 The objective of providing 'suitable housing' will be dependant on the type, location, size, quality, accessibility, etc. of dwellings completed in the District. Again, controlling the *level* of housing development, through the management of supply, will not affect this objective.

5.22 In terms of providing 'affordable homes' the level of housing delivered in the District will have a direct and potentially significant effect. Option 1 would be anticipated to have a positive effect on the provision of affordable housing, through both allocated and non-allocated schemes (which meet the threshold requiring affordable housing provision - Policy 2.12 of the Local Plan). Options 3, 4 and 5 would also provide affordable homes at varying levels. The Local Plan indicates that affordable housing on allocations over the plan period would average 26% (Policy 2.4), while predictions for non-allocated sites, by their very nature, are harder to predict.

5.23 Option 2 would be likely to be highly negative as no affordable housing would be delivered until the replacement of RSS or the submission/adoption of the Core Strategy.

SA Objective 3: Give everyone access to learning, training, skills and knowledge

5.24 All of the options are anticipated to have a neutral effect as controlling the *level* of housing, through the management of supply, would be unlikely to affect current residents' ability to access services and facilities for improved training. The location of any future development would have a more direct effect on people's ability to access services and facilities.

SA Objective 4: Reduce crime and fear of crime

5.25 All of the options are anticipated to have a neutral effect as controlling the level of housing, through the management of supply, would be unlikely to affect the reduction of crime or the fear of crime. The location, type, density,

etc. of any future development would have a more direct effect on reducing crime and the perception of crime, in particular through good design.

SA Objective 5: Promote stronger more vibrant communities

5.26 Options 1, 3 and 5 would be likely to have a highly positive effect on the promotion of stronger communities, through delivering community benefits from developers' contributions through Section 106 agreements. Option 4 would be likely to have a negative contribution as non-allocated sites are less likely to provide community benefits than allocated sites.

5.27 Option 2 would be likely to have a negative effect as restricting all development would result in few community benefits being delivered until the replacement of RSS or submission/adoption of the Core Strategy.

SA Objective 6: Give everyone in the District access to satisfying work opportunities, paid and unpaid

5.28 All of the options are anticipated to have a neutral effect as controlling the level of housing, through the management of supply, would be unlikely to affect residents' ability to access satisfying work.

SA Objective 7: Reduce poverty and income inequality

5.29 Options 1, 3, 4 and 5 would be likely to have a positive effect on the reduction of poverty, through the delivery of both market and affordable housing.

5.30 Option 2 would be likely to have a highly negative effect as reducing supply of housing is likely to increase the cost of home ownership as demand outstrips supply and no new affordable homes would be provided.

SA Objective 8: Reduce the need/desire to travel by car and make public transport cycling and walking easier and more attractive

5.31 The level of housing development is unlikely to have an effect on reducing the need/desire to travel; this would be affected typically by the location of future housing. However, Options 1, 3, 4 and 5 would be likely to have a positive effect on making cycling and walking easier as developers' contributions can be used to improve the public accessibility infrastructure (e.g. new pavements, cycleways, etc.).

5.32 Option 2 would have a neutral effect on the provision of relevant infrastructure as no development would result in a no new developers' contributions.

SA Objective 9: Meet local needs locally, helping everyone access basic services easily, safely and affordably

5.33 All of the options are anticipated to have a neutral effect as controlling the level of housing, through the management of supply, would be unlikely to affect people's ability to access basic services and facilities.

SA Objective 10: Protect and enhance habitats and biodiversity

5.34 Any development has the potential to impact on habitats and biodiversity. Options 1, 3, 4 and 5, which would result in further development, would therefore be likely to have some negative impact on habitats and biodiversity. While Option 2 would be likely to have a positive effect on protecting habitats and biodiversity.

SA Objective 11: Promote the conservation and wise use of land

5.35 In PPS3 states that "the priority for development should be previously developed land", in order to conserve undeveloped land.

5.36 Options 1, 3 and 5 would therefore be likely to have a negative effect on the conservation of land, due to the inclusion of the greenfield allocations. Option 4 would be likely to be more positive as only non-allocated sites would be permitted, which are typically brownfield. Option 2 would have a neutral effect on promoting the conservation and wise use of land.

SA Objective 12: Protect North Dorset's local distinctiveness, including its cultural and historical assets, landscapes and townscapes

5.37 Development can add to the character of settlements and can result in environmental improvements which can significantly improve a place. However, all options apart from option 2 would potentially have some negative impact, through continued development, on the local distinctiveness and assets of both the District's landscapes and townscapes. Option 2 would be likely to protect the District's character from continued new-build.

SA Objective 13: Reduce vulnerability to flooding and adapt to the implications of climate change, harnessing opportunities that may arise

5.38 All of the options are anticipated to have a neutral effect as controlling the level of housing, through the management of supply, would be unlikely to affect the vulnerability to flooding. The location of new development would be relevant to this objective; it is unlikely that future development would be supported in areas of high flood risk.

SA Objective 14: Reduce consumption of non-renewable energy and emissions of greenhouse gases

5.39 Development is likely to increase the consumption of non-renewable energy and greenhouse emissions. However, new development has to conform to Building Regulations which require acceptable levels of insulation/energy efficiency, etc. Options 1, 3, 4 and 5 will be likely to have some negative impact, as consumption of energy will increase, especially during the construction phase. Option 2 would be likely to have a neutral effect, as it would neither reduce nor increase the consumption of energy or greenhouse gas emissions.

SA Objective 15: Reduce waste production and the consumption of water and minerals

5.40 Development is likely to increase the production of waste and the consumption of water and minerals. Options 1, 3, 4 and 5 will be likely to have some negative impacts. Option 2 would be likely to have a neutral effect, as it would neither reduce nor increase the production of waste or consumption of water and minerals.

SA Objective 16: Minimise land, water, air, light, noise and genetic pollution

5.41 Development is likely to increase the production of pollutants, both during the construction phase and throughout the life of the building. However, new development has to accord with the development plan, which aims to reduce the impact of such development to the environment. Options 1, 3, 4 and 5 will be likely to have some negative impacts. Option 2 would be likely to have a neutral effect, as it would neither reduce nor increase the potential for pollutants to be released.

Task B4: Evaluating the effects of the draft SPD

5.42 The identified likely effects need to be evaluated in order that the level of significant impact can be identified. This evaluation will need to consider the probability, duration, frequency, reversibility and spatial extent of the effects, as well as the potential for secondary, cumulative and synergistic effects.

5.43 Paragraph 4.3.10 of the guidance on producing a SA Report identifies that it may be possible to 'drop some alternatives' from further consideration due to the findings of the SA. Option 2 has been identified in the assessment as having the potential to create some positive effects but also a number of highly negative impacts/effects. The social and economic impacts of restricting all housing development, until the replacement of RSS or

adoption of the Council's Core Strategy, is viewed by the Council as being wholly unsustainable. Therefore, this option has been eliminated from the remainder of the SA process.

5.44 All of the remaining options would be likely to fulfil the Council's need to deliver 5,900 dwellings in the period from 1994 to 2011, continuing the supply of residential development until the replacement of RSS or production of the Core Strategy. An assessment of each remaining option is made below in order to identify the option(s) which are the most sustainable.

Option 1	Characteristics of the Effects	Implications for SPD & Recommendation
Likelihood/Certainty of Effects	High	<p>Option 1, the business as usual option, would be unlikely to adequately control the provision of housing land in the District. This option would therefore not be a sustainable option.</p> <p>Recommendation: This option would be unlikely to allow the Council to adequately manage housing land supply and therefore should not be considered as a sustainable option.</p>
Duration of Effects	Policy is Temporary	
Frequency of Effects	High	
Reversibility of Effects	Development is irreversible in the short, medium and long term	
Cumulative nature	Business as usual: development at a predicted high rate will be likely to create a significant cumulative effect of impacts	
Transboundary Nature of Effects	None	
Significant risks to human health	None	
Significant risks to the environment	None	
Spatial Extent of Effects	District-Wide	

Option 3	Characteristics of the Effects	Implications for SPD & Recommendation
Likelihood/Certainty of Effects	High	<p>Option 3 would promote mostly greenfield sites therefore having a potentially negative effect on the conservation and wise use of land. In terms of promoting stronger communities, this option would be more likely to provide community benefits, through greater developers' contributions and relatively high levels of affordable housing.</p> <p>Recommendation: This option would be likely to deliver housing that would provide considerable community benefits, within the housing target of the development plan. However, it would promote greenfield rather</p>
Duration of Effects	Policy is Temporary	
Frequency of Effects	High	
Reversibility of Effects	Development is irreversible in the short, medium and long term	
Cumulative nature	Continued development of allocated sites at a managed rate will be likely to create a cumulative environmental impact	
Transboundary Nature of Effects	None	
Significant risks to human health	None	
Significant risks to the	None	

environment		than brownfield development, which is not as wise a use of land.
Spatial Extent of Effects	District-Wide	

Option 4	Characteristics of the Effects	Implications for SPD & Recommendation
Likelihood/Certainty of Effects	High	<p>Option 4 would promote non-allocated sites - particularly infill sites - therefore having a potentially positive effect on the conservation and wise use of land. In terms of promoting stronger communities, this option would be unlikely to provide considerable community benefits, due to the majority of non-allocated sites falling below affordable housing thresholds contained in the Local Plan.</p> <p>Recommendation: This option performs well in the protection of greenfield land; however, it would be unlikely to meet certain needs, especially in terms of affordable housing, which is a priority of this Council.</p>
Duration of Effects	Policy is Temporary	
Frequency of Effects	High	
Reversibility of Effects	Development is irreversible in the short, medium and long term	
Cumulative nature	Continued development - of non-allocated sites - at a predicted high rate will be likely to create a cumulative environmental impact	
Transboundary Nature of Effects	None	
Significant risks to human health	None	
Significant risks to the environment	None	
Spatial Extent of Effects	District-Wide	

Option 5	Characteristics of the Effects	Implications for SPD & Recommendation
Likelihood/Certainty of Effects	Policy is Temporary	<p>Option 5 promotes a managed response to housing land management, through controlling the release of both allocated and non-allocated sites.</p> <p>Recommendation: This option would be likely to provide a mix of allocated and non-allocated development, with the potential to promote stronger communities. This option generally performs well in relation to the other options.</p>
Duration of Effects	Temporary	
Frequency of Effects	High	
Reversibility of Effects	Development is irreversible in the short, medium and long term	
Cumulative nature	Continued development, with greater management will be likely to create a cumulative environmental impact	
Transboundary Nature of Effects	None	
Significant risks to human health	None	
Significant risks to the environment	None	
Spatial Extent of Effects	District-Wide	

5.45 In General:

- The likelihood/certainty and frequency of effects would be high as all the options seek to manage the continued release of housing land supply rather than stopping future development.
- The SPD will be temporary in nature, as the policy contained within it will be replaced once RSS is replaced or the Council's Core Strategy is submitted/adopted.
- There are no identified transboundary effects, significant risks to human health or to the environment arising from any of the SPD options. Proposals will still need to meet the policies and objectives of the development plan, which will control risks to human health and the environment.
- The SPD will affect the entire District; however, development will still only be approved in acceptable locations as determined by national and regional guidance and the current development plan.

5.46 The assessment of the remaining 4 options indicates that Option 5 is likely to be the most sustainable option. All of these options will deliver continued housing development in the District, therefore all of the options will be likely to have some effect on the environment, during both the development stages and during the life of the dwellings built. However, none of the options are likely to cause significant impact to biodiversity, human health, fauna, flora, soil, water, air, climatic factors, cultural heritage and landscape factors.

5.47 Increased management of housing land supply in Options 3 to 5 would be most likely to help reduce the impact of unsustainable 'over development' in the District, in relation to the preferred level of housing target in the Structure Plan.

5.48 By managing the release of both allocated and non-allocated sites, Option 5 would be likely to deliver more sustainable development than Options 3 or 4. Managing housing development on all sites rather than outright refusing schemes either on non-allocated or allocated sites, as Options 3 and 4 propose, may allow the most sustainable schemes to be delivered.

Task B5: Considering ways of mitigating adverse effects and maximising beneficial effects

5.49 This SPD is supplementary to a number of 'saved' policies, which have been appraised in this Report (Appendix A). As the SPD is required to be supplementary to these 'saved' policies, the SPD cannot reinterpret the

Local Plan policies, therefore the potential to maximise the benefits of the SPD are limited. However, options were developed and refined in order to test the options identified by the community, stakeholders and the Council, in order to maximise the benefits of greater housing land supply management.

5.50 Mitigation leading to the final preferred option in the SPD included:

- The testing of a 'business as usual' option in response to community and stakeholder consultation;
- Appreciation that the limited potential for further housing in the period up to 2011 may impact on housing costs and therefore options which allowed controlled development were tested
- The removal of SPD Option 2 as it was identified as being unsustainable, especially concerning the social impacts of holding back all residential development;
- The appreciation that planning schemes will still be required to be tested against the policies of the Local Plan, including the production of Environmental Impact Assessments (EIAs) where relevant, in order to mitigate against any specific risks to human health and the environment.

Task B6: Proposing measures to monitor the significant effects of implementing the SPD

5.51 The significant outcomes of implementing the SPD will be monitored by the Council in order to identify any adverse effects and to assess whether any remedial action(s) need to be taken. Existing sources of information will be used to identify any adverse effects, such as the National Core Output Indicators (NCOIs). NCOIs relevant to the monitoring of the Housing Land Supply SPD include:

- NCOI 2a – Housing trajectory showing net additional dwellings and projected net additional dwellings;
- NCOI 2d – Affordable housing completions; and,
- NCOI 8 – Change in areas and populations of biodiversity importance including change in priority habitats and species; including permissions granted which conflict with environmental designations.

5.52 Additionally, consultation with the community and stakeholders identified issues that will need to be monitored, such as the risk of local house prices and social deprivation increasing, and the level of overall employment decreasing. Monitoring will be undertaken to identify if any adverse effects occur, whether they are directly attributable to the SPD and whether any identified effects are within acceptable limits.

5.53 Data collated in the Baseline at Stage A2 of the Scoping Report will be used and updated to inform the outcome of this SPD. Relevant indicators, include:

- Average house price;
- House price to income ratio for working households aged 20-39: average 2/3 bedroom home;
- Percentage of people unemployed;
- Percentage of residents who think that for their local area, over the past three years, that job prospects have got better or stayed the same;
- Index of multiple deprivation;
- Total number of business firms (broken down into small firms and micro-firms);
- Percentage of overcrowded households; and,
- Percentage of new housing on brownfield/greenfield land.

5.54 If monitoring reveals any adverse effects have occurred as a result of the policies contained in the Housing Land Supply SPD, action may be required on the part of the Council, especially if the effects are deemed not to be within acceptable limits.

Glossary

Core Strategy		The main DPD that sets out the long-term spatial vision and strategic objectives for the local planning authority's area, with core policies to implement that vision.
Development Plan Document	DPD	A spatial planning document prepared by the local planning authority and subject to extensive public consultation and independent examination, which forms part of the LDF.
Local Development Document	LDD	Any adopted document making up part of the LDF.
Local Development Framework	LDF	Comprises the portfolio of documents prepared by the local planning authority. It sets out a framework for the spatial strategy of the area. It will consist of a LDS, a SCI and a number of LDDs.
Local Development Scheme	LDS	Sets out a 3 year time table for the preparation of the LDF.
Local Plan		The adopted North Dorset District-Wide Local Plan forms part of the development plan for the District and provides the framework for development to the year 2011.
Preferred Option		The preparation of preferred options, in consultation with the community, is undertaken by the Council before the DPD is formally submitted for consultation.
Regional Spatial Strategy	RSS	Regional policy prepared by the Regional Assembly which is the regional planning body.
Registered Social Landlord	RSL	An independent housing organisation registered with the Housing Corporation under the Housing Act 1996
SA Framework Objectives		Consists of 16 sustainability objectives which provide a way of identifying whether the DPD objectives and subsequent options are sustainable.
'Saved' Policies		Relevant policies in the Local Plan will be saved until they are replaced by an adopted DPD.
Scoping		The process of deciding the scope and level of detail of a SA
Scoping Report		Sets out how the evidence base, objectives and framework for all SA reports will be developed.
Statement of Community Involvement	SCI	Is a requirement of the new Act and sets out the standards by which the community will be involved. In addition a consultation statement will need to be included in all DPDs.
Strategic Environmental Assessment	SEA	All documents must be prepared with a view to contributing to development which is sustainable. The SEA is a European Union Directive (2001/42/EC). The requirements of this Directive are incorporated into the SA.

Structure Plan		The Bournemouth, Dorset and Poole Structure Plan forms part of the development plan for North Dorset and establishes the broad context for planning in the area to the year 2011.
Supplementary Planning Document	SPD	Cover a wide range of issues where the local planning authority wishes to provide additional policy guidance on policies in the DPDs. They will not be part of the Development Plan or be subject to independent examination. They will be material considerations in determining planning applications.
Sustainability Appraisal	SA	A systematic and iterative process which seeks to appraise the social, environmental and economic effects of the policies contained within a LDD prepared from the outset of the process.

Appendix A: Summary of Relevant Local Plan ‘saved’ policies

LP Policy 1.1: Sustainable Development Strategy

Development will be permitted where it is compatible with the aims of the Sustainable Development Strategy:

- Improve the quality of life through sound economic and social developments for all sections of the community.
- Meet the development targets identified in Regional Planning Guidance and the Structure Plan.
- Meet local needs locally by providing sufficient housing, employment and services for the District to become more self-contained, therefore reducing the need to travel.
- Contain the spread of development through the promotion of the re-use of previously developed land, and through realistic restraint on greenfield development.
- Promote transport efficiency and reduce the number of trips by integrating the transport network and through the concentration of development around that network and by restraining the provision of car parking.
- Promote energy efficiency, conserve resources and avoid pollution by encouraging the generation of renewable energy and promoting good conservation practice in disposing of wastes which cannot be recycled.
- Conserve the built and the natural heritage character by identifying those areas where restraint and sensitive control of development are required.
- Conserve wildlife and improve biodiversity by protecting important habitats and by the creation of new and varied vegetations and tree planting.

And also:

- Larger development above the threshold of ‘major’ should be located in the four larger towns (Blandford, Gillingham, Shaftesbury, Sturminster Newton) and should be close to the public transport network.
- Major developments should incorporate initiatives for reducing the need to travel.
- Development should make the best possible use of resources to avoid excessive environmental impact.
- Development should not cause demonstrable harm to areas of high amenity, ecological or historic interest.

LP Policy 1.2: Towns for Major Growth

The towns of Blandford, Gillingham and Shaftesbury will act as the main centres for housing and employment growth and the development of major community services. Growth levels, development rates, land allocations and environmental capacity are defined in the settlement policies for each town individually.

LP Policy 1.3: Towns for Moderate Growth

Sturminster Newton will act as the main centre for the Stalbridge/Sturminster area, receiving the majority of population, housing and employment growth.

Moderate and a limited number of major development proposals will be permitted within the settlement boundary. Stalbridge will act as a local centre, receiving limited housing and employment growth with the development of local community services.

LP Policy 1.4: Village Development

Villages with settlement boundaries will be sustained by accommodating new economic activity and modest housing development. 52 villages were drawn with settlement boundaries, illustrated on the proposals map.

LP Policy 1.5: Small Villages and Hamlets in the Countryside

Around 50 small settlements have not been allocated settlement boundaries in the Local Plan. Development outside of settlement boundaries will only be permitted if at least one of the criteria in Policy 1.6 is adequately met.

LP Policy 1.6: Development in the Countryside

Development in areas outside of the defined settlement boundaries is strictly controlled. Certain uses may be granted permission if they meet one of the nine assessment criteria. For example rural housing exception sites and agriculture and forestry worker's dwellings and the re-use and adaption of rural buildings.

LP Policy 1.8: Standard Assessment Criteria

Assessment criteria which will be used to determine the acceptability of development proposals within the District including assessment of; character, amenity, design, cultural and environmental heritage, accessibility, parking, provision of infrastructure, crime prevention, noise and disabled access.

LP Policy 1.10: Re-use and Adaptation of Buildings (including Modern Buildings) in the Countryside

The redevelopment of buildings in the countryside must meet the criteria set out in this policy, which includes development for residential use.

LP Policy 1.11: Farmyards within Village Settlement Boundaries

The change of use and redevelopment (including residential) of farmyards will be granted if an application meets a number of assessment criteria.

LP Policy 1.24: Character of Conservation Areas

Development within conservation areas will be considered against the need to preserve and enhance the character and appearance of these areas. Proposals which would be deemed to have an adverse effect on the character or appearance of these areas will not be permitted.

LP Policy 2.1: Housing Provision 1994-2011

The general level of development in the District should be of about 5,900 dwellings (gross) in the period April 1994-March 2011. About 3,470 were built or committed at 31st March 2000. Planned development for the remainder of the

period comprises of around 680 dwellings on non-allocated sites and about 1,750 in sites allocated under Policy 2.4.

LP Policy 2.2: Making Best use of Housing Land

The sequential test, as described in PPG3, will be used to assess the suitability of sites for development of housing. The re-use of brownfield land should be undertaken in preference to the development of greenfield land.

LP Policy 2.3: Distribution of Development

Sets the approximate scale and rate of development for the four main towns, Stalbridge and the rural settlements over the 17 year development plan period 1994-2011.

LP Policy 2.4: Settlement Allocations

Identifies the minimum provision of housing on allocated sites throughout the District and includes a figure for the potential number of affordable dwellings that could be provided.

LP Policy 2.6: Infill/Windfall Development within Defined Settlement Boundaries

Identifies that infilling and small scale development or redevelopment will be allowed within the defined settlement boundaries, providing other criteria in the Local Plan are met.

LP Policy 2.8: Monitoring the Availability of Land for Housing

The development of land for housing will be monitored to ensure that there remains an adequate amount of general supply and brownfield and affordable housing targets are being achieved.

Policy 2.9: Phasing the Release of Land for Housing

In order to manage the controlled release of housing land (both allocations and non-allocations) planning permission for any site may be withheld or be subject to phasing restrictions if:

- Planned construction rates are being significantly exceeded,
- The planned proportion of development on previously developed land or windfall sites is not being achieved, or
- Necessary infrastructure provision or affordable housing targets related to that site cannot be achieved.

LP Policy 2.12: Size of Site on which Affordable Housing will be sought

In order to achieve an element of affordable housing on both allocated and non-allocated sites, negotiations concerning the proportion of a development to be affordable (typically through a section 106 agreement) will be entered with the Council. For Gillingham and Shaftesbury developments for 25 or more dwellings or 1ha, for Blandford and Sturminster Newton developments for 15 or more dwellings or 0.5ha and in Stalbridge and the villages for 8 or more or 0.25ha will require a proportion of affordable housing.

LP Policy 2.13: Affordable housing within defined Settlement Boundaries

Development on suitable sites, as identified in Policy 2.12, will need to meet the criteria set out in this policy for rent and shared ownership properties.

LP Policy 2.14: Rural “Exceptions” sites for Affordable Housing

Sites for affordable housing may be permitted within or directly adjacent to settlement boundaries that would not normally be permitted for general market housing if the proposal meets a number of assessment criteria.

LP Policy 2.15: Replacement dwellings in the countryside

The replacement of dwellings in the countryside will be permitted provided that the property has not been abandoned, the original structure is permanent in nature and there is no net gain in dwellings.

LP Policy 2.16: Agricultural and Forestry Workers Dwellings

Proposals for new permanent dwellings for agricultural or forestry workers will be permitted in the countryside if a proposal meets a number of criteria including evidence to support the need for new development in the countryside.

LP Policy 2.19: Conversion of property to multiple units

The conversion of non-residential buildings and the sub-division of large dwellings can be acceptable provided a number of criteria concerning the character and amenity of the locality can be met.