



www.landuse.co.uk

Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2016-2036

Sustainability Appraisal Report to accompany the Eastleigh Borough Proposed Submission Local Plan at Regulation 19 consultation stage

Volume 2 of 2: Appendices
Prepared by LUC, in association with Eastleigh Borough Council
June 2018

Project Title: Eastleigh Borough Local Plan Sustainability Appraisal

Client: Eastleigh Borough Council

Version	Date	Version Details	Prepared by	Checked by	Approved
1.0	06 April 2018	Draft for Client comment	Sarah Smith Alex Martin Jonathan Pearson Calum McCulloch	Jonathan Pearson Helen Kent	Helen Kent
2.0	03 May 2018	Final Report	Sarah Smith Alex Martin	Jonathan Pearson	Helen Kent
3.0	14 June 2018	Updated Final Report	Sarah Smith	Jonathan Pearson	Helen Kent



www.landuse.co.uk

Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2016-2036

Sustainability Appraisal Report to accompany the Eastleigh Borough Proposed Submission
Local Plan at Regulation 19 consultation stage

Volume 2 of 2: Appendices
Prepared by LUC, in association with Eastleigh Borough Council
June 2018

Planning & EIA
Design
Landscape Planning
Landscape Management
Ecology
Mapping & Visualisation

LUC LONDON
2nd Floor
43 Chalton Street
NW1 1JD
T +44 (0)20 7383 5784
london@landuse.co.uk

Offices also in:
Bristol
Glasgow
Edinburgh
Lancaster
Manchester



Land Use Consultants Ltd
Registered in England
Registered number: 2549296
Registered Office:
43 Chalton Street
London NW1 1JD
LUC uses 100% recycled paper

Contents

Appendix 1	1
Consultation responses	1
Appendix 2	27
Review of plans, policies and programmes	27
Appendix 3	64
Baseline information	64
Community	65
Economy	71
Environment	78
Appendix 4	87
Assumptions used in the SA of site allocation options	87
Appendix 5	133
Strategic Location assessments (assessed December 2015)	133
Appendix 6	277
Detailed SA matrices for Strategic Growth Options and reasonable alternatives	277
Appendix 7	308
Detailed SA matrices for greenfield site allocations and reasonable alternatives	316
Appendix 8	501
Detailed SA matrices for sites allocated in Policy DM25	501
Appendix 9	527
Assessment of non-spatial policy options	527
Affordable housing	528
Specialised accommodation and providing for first time buyers and self-builders	531
Delivering sites for Travelling Communities	532
Houses in multiple occupation	534
Densities and building standards	534
Existing employment sites	536
Retail and other town centre uses	538
Environmental quality	540
Nature conservation	544
Heritage assets	545
Appendix 10	548
Reasons for selecting or not selecting options for inclusion in the Local Plan	548

Appendix 1

Consultation responses

Table A1.1: Draft SA Scoping Report Consultation Responses and Comments (consultation occurred between June and July 2015)

Note that the comments in the final column refer to actions that were taken to address consultation comments in the final version of the SA Scoping Report, published December 2015. The updated baseline information and review of plans, policies and programmes can be found in **Appendices 2 and 3** respectively of this full SA Report.

Consultee Comment	Response/comment and how it was addressed in the final SA Scoping Report (December 2015) (new text is <u>underlined</u> ; deleted text is shown as strikethrough)
Environment Agency	
Updated text to confirm the existence of Source Protection Zones within the borough	Noted. Paragraph 6.70 has been updated taking into account the point raised, see below: There are no SPZs in the borough, but several to There are a number of SPZ'S to the north of the borough. <u>The outer zone (subsurface activity only) of zone 2C extends into the northern part of Chandlers Ford</u> (see Fig. 6.17). <u>There are also a</u> are however a number of small private abstractions in the borough which do require a 50m source protection zone. These abstractions may be within private households and must be protected.
Request specific changes to paragraph 6.69 with regard to the Water Framework Directive.	Agreed. Paragraph 6.69 has been updated in accordance with the suggested changes: The Environment Agency has been monitoring the water quality/health of all receiving waters (watercourses receiving effluent discharges) for a number of years. When the monitoring regime change in 2007 it meant that previous results are <u>no longer not</u> directly comparable with the current regime. <u>The monitoring was changed to align more fully with the Water Framework Directive (WFD).</u> but it is the WFD standards <u>help that</u> drive future improvements to water quality. Under the WFD programme, water quality targets are set in the River Basin Management Plans (RBMP) ¹ , with the aim of reaching 'Good <u>Ecological Status</u> ' in all <u>natural water bodies</u> , or 'Good Ecological Potential' in all heavily modified water bodies. Good status is determined by the <u>biological Ecological</u> and <u>Chemical S</u> status of the water body.
Request specific changes to paragraph 6.70 with regard to the ecological potential of the River Itchen.	Agreed. The paragraph has been updated in accordance with the suggested changes: The <u>main</u> River Itchen is designated as a Heavily Modified Water Body due to <u>many historic</u> modifications made to allow for flood defence, urbanisation and water regulation (impoundment release). It is currently at ' <u>Good Ecological Potential</u> ', <u>but is subject to change (for example, annual monitoring results been both at Poor and Moderate Ecological Potential since 2009).</u> <u>Water chemistry, flow and habitat are the three areas that affect this Natura 2000 (N2K) site (Special Area of Conservation).</u> Furthermore, <u>the Itchen is subject to N2k targets (or objectives), which are more challenging than WFD ones.</u> Currently, <u>the Itchen does not meet all of its Protected Area N2K objectives.</u> poor overall potential, and is not predicted to improve by 2015 as it would not be technically feasible to do so. The overall ecological status is poor primarily as a result of the chemical phytobenthos. <u>This is most</u> <u>Water issues are</u> likely to arise from the historical phosphate loading into the river <u>via sewerage treatment works (such as from Chickenhall)</u> sewage treatment works at Eastleigh). Phosphate stripping has now been installed, and in time the chemical levels in the water should improve at the one site this classification is based on.
Information given which is suggested to be used to alter the text to ensure up to date information is	Noted. The paragraph (previously paragraph 6.71) has been updated in accordance with the advice given:

¹ <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/south-east-river-basin-management-plan>

Consultee Comment	Response/comment and how it was addressed in the final SA Scoping Report (December 2015) (new text is <u>underlined</u> ; deleted text is shown as strikethrough)
<p>given with regard to the status of the section of the River Hamble, north of Botley Mill.</p>	<p>The section of the River Hamble north of Botley Mill, <u>the Main River Hamble</u> is currently classified as '<u>moderate</u>' status poor, based on <u>phosphate and fish, and quantity and dynamics of flow</u>. It is predicted <u>that the fish element classification will improve by 2021 and the overall status will be to improve to moderate by 2015, and 'good' by 2027</u>. The reasons for not achieving good status for phosphates include rural diffuse pollution and discharge from sewerage treatment works. Farm compliance inspections and pollution prevention visits are currently being undertaken. Fish status is not achieving good because of barriers to migration and poor physical habitat. Fish passes will continue to be installed where possible and appropriate, and areas where habitat enhancement can take place have been identified. There is a new overflow pipe at Botley Mill, which provides a more consistent upstream water level and reduces the mill owner's workload in constantly adjusting the sluices. However, hatches still need to be operated to prevent flooding following any significant rainfall event. An automated hatch is still seen as the way forward to maintain sufficient water for the fish pass to operate correctly. This water body is at risk from combined source nutrients. It is also probably at risk from diffuse source pollution and water abstraction and flow regulation. However, the assessment of invertebrates passes as good, so it appears that the risk of pollution is not impacting on ecology. The impounding of flows by Botley mill is currently being investigated and if fish are shown to be the reason for this water body failing to meet the required standards as a result of this consideration will need to be given to a flow management regime.</p>
<p>Updated text relating to the status of the Monks Brook.</p>	<p>Agreed. The paragraph (previously paragraph 6.72) has been updated in accordance with the suggested changes: The Monks <u>Brook is a heavily modified water body designated for flood protection. It is currently at 'moderate' status and is not expected to improve by (as at 2015) and is not predicted to get to 'good' by the end of the Second Cycle (2021). This is primarily due to the fact that it's currently as this is not considered to be technically infeasibility and affordability. It is a heavily modified waterbody designated for flood protection.</u></p>
<p>General comments relating to the use of the use of the PUSH Integrated Water Management Strategy (IWMS). The EA recognise that this contains relevant information to inform the Plan, however the EA note that it was finalised in 2008, 7 years ago, and was produced to accompany the South East Plan which ran to 2026 whereas the emerging local Plan will run to 2036.</p> <p>This point is particularly noted for paragraph 6.73 relating to wastewater capacity in light of PUSH spatial strategy.</p>	<p>Noted. The paragraph (previously paragraph 6.73) has been updated in light of the comments received: Southern Water provides wastewater services in the borough, operating two waste water treatment works within the borough's boundary (Chickenhall, Eastleigh and Bursledon) along with three others which serve the borough but are located outside of the borough boundary. In relation to wastewater, the PUSH South Hampshire Integrated Water Management Strategy² suggests that there is tension between proposed growth in south Hampshire and the potential impact of existing and future wastewater discharges on the internationally designated river and coastal waters in the area. On this basis, there may be little or no "environmental capacity" left in the receiving waters for the consented loads of pollutants to be increased. <u>Wastewater capacity will be considered further at a sub-regional level as part of the updated to the PUSH Spatial strategy which will consider waste water treatment through to 2036.</u> Other minor amendments have been made throughout the document for consistency to reference the update of the Integrated Water Management Strategy to cover the period up to 2036 as part of the new PUSH Spatial Strategy.</p>
<p>Regarding the Key Environmental Issues table, the second from last bullet point refers to water quality status by 2015. The EA feel this should be altered to look further ahead and align more with the plan period.</p>	<p>Noted. This text has been updated in light of these comments as set out below: Significant improvements to Water quality in the borough are therefore required to meet the target of all watercourses to reach 'good' biological and chemical water quality status by 2015, as required by the Water Framework Directive. New development should not cause deterioration in water quality and schemes should be undertaken to enhance water quality</p>

² Atkins on behalf of the Partnership for Urban South Hampshire (2009) South Hampshire Integrated Water Management Strategy

Consultee Comment	Response/comment and how it was addressed in the final SA Scoping Report (December 2015) (new text is <u>underlined</u> ; deleted text is shown as strikethrough)
	wherever possible.
Historic England	
<p>Request the addition of the following in paragraph 2.22:</p> <p><i>"conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of this and future generations"</i></p>	<p>Agreed. This addition has been made to paragraph 2.22.</p>
<p>Request the addition of the following in paragraph 2.25:</p> <p><i>"In doing so, they should recognise that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource and conserve them in a manner appropriate to their significance"</i> after the first indent.</p> <p>It could also be noted that the NPPF has other requirements for local plans in respect of the historic environment. In addition to the requirement for a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment, local plans should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • include strategic policies to deliver the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment [156]; • contain a clear strategy for enhancing the natural, built and historic environment [157]; • identify land where development would be inappropriate, e.g. for its environmental or historic significance [157]; • be based on adequate, up-to-date and relevant evidence about the historic environment [158 and 169]. 	<p>Agreed in part. Paragraph 2.25 has been updated as set out below taking into account the points raised:</p> <p>Paragraphs under chapter 12, <i>Conserving and enhancing the historic environment</i> and <u>Plan-making pages 37-42</u>. Local Plans should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Recognise that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource and conserve them in a manner appropriate to their significance;</i> • <i>Set a clear, positive strategy for the conservation, enhancement and enjoyment of the historic environment, based on up to date evidence;</i> • <i>Identify land where development would be inappropriate e.g. for its historic significance;</i> • <i>Take into account opportunities for positive contribution to historic assets, their settings and wider local character and distinctiveness;</i> • <i>When considering the impact of potential development on a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the assets conservation. The more important the asset, the greater weight the conservation should be.</i>
<p>We welcome the reference to the Historic Environment Record but the National Heritage List has only ten scheduled monuments, albeit some of which include more than one feature.</p>	<p>Noted and an addition to paragraph 6.35 has been made and shown below:</p> <p><u><i>The National Heritage List for England has 183 214 Grade II listing entries ed buildings in for Eastleigh Borough, some of which are for multiple structures. Nine of these are Grade II* listed, and 205 are Grade II listed.—There are no</i></u></p>

Consultee Comment	Response/comment and how it was addressed in the final SA Scoping Report (December 2015) (new text is <u>underlined</u> ; deleted text is shown as strikethrough)
	<i>Grade I listed buildings in the Borough.</i>
The designated wreck of the <i>Grace Dieu</i> lies partly within the Borough	Noted and a new paragraph (6.40) has been added as shown below (new text is underlined): <u><i>The designated wreck of the Grace Dieu lies partly within the Borough.</i></u>
Has the Council undertaken a survey of the grade II buildings in the Borough to determine whether any are at risk?	In work undertaken and information available to Officers, one Grade II listed building has been identified as 'at risk'. The text in paragraph 6.41 has been updated to reflect this: <u><i>Since 2008, Historic England (previously named English Heritage) has released an annual Heritage at Risk Register. This highlights the Grade I and Grade II* listed buildings, and scheduled monuments, wreck sites and registered parks and gardens in England deemed to be 'at risk'. No Grade I or II* listings in Eastleigh borough have been identified as 'at risk' on the 2014³. data for Eastleigh is included on the 2014 register for Eastleigh Borough. Grade II buildings are not included in the Historic England Heritage at Risk Register, however the Council has identified one Grade II listed building, the Peach House in Bishopstoke which is considered to be at risk.</i></u>
We welcome the recognition of the importance of non-designated historic features. Is there a comprehensive list of locally important heritage assets in the Borough?	Yes, the Council keeps a 'Local List' of buildings which are considered to be locally important heritage assets. Text has been updated in paragraph 6.42 to recognise this: <u><i>Historic features which do not meet the criteria for national listing or other national designation Non-designated historic features can comprise a significant aspect of heritage experienced on a daily basis by many people, and many buildings and other neighbourhood features are of general historic interest and important to local communities. Much of Eastleigh's historic environment resource is not subject to statutory designations. Buildings within the borough which do not meet the criteria for national listing but are considered locally important can be considered by the Council for the 'Local List'. Buildings on the Local List are encouraged to be retained because loss of the building and its setting would be detrimental to the appearance, character and townscape quality of the Borough. The 38 buildings on the Local List, but includes parks and gardens and transport related historic environment features. Likewise, not all nationally important archaeological remains are scheduled.</i></u>
Request recognition that new development 'can also create opportunities for new uses in old buildings and the enhancement of heritage assets'.	Noted and new text is added to recognise this in paragraph 6.83 (box): <u><i>Elements of this borough's historic environment, including archaeological remains and historic landscapes, may be at risk from neglect, and from development pressures. Development can create opportunities for new uses in old buildings and the enhancement of heritage assets. A degree of commercial exploitation of these resources, e.g. by encouraging visitor and tourism activity, has the potential to benefit the local economy, and to generate the funds needed to maintain these resources. This would also have benefits in terms of helping to maintain local character and distinctiveness.</i></u>
Request to see a reference to the settings of the heritage assets in Objective 13 and suggest that the second question be "Conserve and enhance the significance of heritage assets and their settings".	Agreed and text is updated to reflect this in relation to SA Objective 13 as shown below: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conserve and enhance <u>the significance of heritage assets and their settings?</u>
Advice is given regarding out indicators or measures	Noted. These will be considered in the future progression of the SA work undertaken for the emerging Eastleigh Borough

³ Source: Heritage at Risk Register 2014, <http://risk.english-heritage.org.uk/>, [last accessed 2014]

Consultee Comment	Response/comment and how it was addressed in the final SA Scoping Report (December 2015) (new text is <u>underlined</u> ; deleted text is shown as strikethrough)
by which the Plan's policies and proposals can be assessed against the Sustainability Objectives and sub-objectives/questions.	Local Plan 2011-2036.
Natural England	
This paragraph (paragraph 5.30) explains that the potential to extend the existing runway is limited due to the constraints of the airport site which is bounded by the main railway line to London Waterloo to the north and west, a SSSI to the east and the M27 to the south. It would be good to also refer to the fact that the River Itchen is also a Special Area of Conservation (SAC) in this paragraph.	Agree and text (in paragraph 5.30) is updated to reflect this comment as shown below: <i>Potential to extend the existing runway is limited due to the constraints of the airport site which is bounded by the main railway line to London Waterloo to the North and West, <u>The River Itchen, a Special Area of Conservation and a site of Special Scientific Interest,</u> to the East and the M27 to the South. These constraints also restrict the amount of space for terminal expansion and additional aircraft stands, thus restricting the ability to realise the 2030 passenger numbers set out in the Southampton Airport Master Plan.</i>
NE suggest that the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) should recognise that some of the plan area is within the setting of the South Downs National Park. The SA should consider the protection given to protected landscapes and should refer to and/or reflect National Park management plan objectives as we would want to see the character of protected landscapes conserved and enhanced (both direct and indirect pressures can impact on character). We provide this advice as we would want to ensure that proposed developments close to the boundaries of protected landscapes (within their settings) take proper account of their impacts on the National Park.	Noted. A new paragraph has been added as shown below (paragraph 6.46): <i><u>The South Downs National Park adjoins Eastleigh Borough for a short stretch to the north east near Fair Oak and as such can be considered to be within the setting of the South Downs National Park. A Partnership Management Plan was prepared which sets out the objectives for managing the National Park between 2014 and 2019⁴. These objectives generally seek to conserve and enhance the special qualities of the South Downs National Park, for example, the character of the protected landscapes. A number of development pressures have been identified which include impacts from traffic on air quality and tranquillity, and impacts on the landscape from urbanisation. The South Downs National Park Authority is preparing a Local Plan for the National Park and this is currently in draft form. Parts of Eastleigh borough are within the setting of the South Downs National Park.</u></i>
NE suggest expanding objective 10 to set out criteria to firstly avoid, then mitigate and as a last resort compensate for adverse effects on biodiversity. The SA objectives should also recognise protection for biodiversity/geodiversity sites or landscape areas, distinguishing between international, national and local sites. Following on from this policy will need to set out that any proposal that adversely affects a European site, or causes significant harm to a SSSI will not normally be granted permission. In terms of European designations this will involve the	Agreed. The SA objective 10 is updated as follows : <i>10. Protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and geodiversity, improving its quality and range. <u>Avoid, mitigate or, at last resort, compensate for adverse effects on biodiversity.</u></i> The 'will the policy approach under consideration...' box is updated as follows : <i><u>Have an impact on biodiversity and geodiversity (including protected species, habitats, sites and landscapes at international, national and/or local levels of nature conservation designation)?</u></i> <i>Provide new creation, restoration and/or enhancement opportunities for habitats and species?</i>

⁴ South Downs National Park Partnership Management Plan 2014-2019 <https://www.southdowns.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/SDNP-Partnership-Management-Plan-2014-19.pdf>

Consultee Comment	Response/comment and how it was addressed in the final SA Scoping Report (December 2015) (new text is <u>underlined</u> ; deleted text is shown as strikethrough)
<p>precautionary principle as outlined in the Habitats Regulations.</p> <p>It would be desirable to see the SA setting out an objective for planning positively for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity.</p> <p>It is also not apparent that the objectives consider biodiversity at a landscape scale across local authority boundaries – a strategic approach for networks of biodiversity should support a similar approach for GI.</p>	<p><u>Prejudice future biodiversity restoration?</u></p> <p><u>Support creation, protection, enhancement and/or management of networks of biodiversity</u></p> <p>The SA objective 11 'will the policy under consideration..' is updated with the following addition:</p> <p><u>Support local and/or strategic Green Infrastructure networks?</u></p>
<p>The SA objectives should protect and enhance public rights of way (PROW) and access. The assessment should consider the value of local PROW to health and wellbeing, access to nature and the countryside.</p>	<p>Noted. The following text has been added to the 'will the policy under consideration...' box for SA Objectives 2 and 11 (new text is shown underlined):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Protect and enhance public rights of way?</u>
<p>NE suggest for the report to recognise that parts of the Eastleigh Borough Council area falls within the 5.6km zone of influence for the Solent and Southampton Water Special Protection Areas (SPA), which is covered by the Solent Recreation Mitigation Partnership (SRMP) strategic solution.</p>	<p>Agreed. A new paragraph has been added to reflect this (paragraph 6.10):</p> <p><u>In relation to development proposals across south Hampshire, particular concern was raised about the impact of migrating and over-wintering birds on the Solent shores from increases in recreational pressure on the coast. Increased recreational activity is likely to lead to increased disturbance of waders and wildfowl which reduce their opportunities to feed and mean they may have insufficient energy for the winter months, thus there could be a reduction in the bird population. The Solent Disturbance and Mitigation Project was established to conduct research into these concerns and provide advice on avoidance and mitigation. In response to this, local authorities and partner organisations in south Hampshire and the Solent area have established the Solent Recreation Mitigation Partnership, of which the Council is part of, which will coordinate implementation and monitoring of the interim strategy and, in due course, the definitive mitigation strategy. In principle, the interim strategy requires a contribution for every net additional dwelling toward the interim package of mitigation measures which include, for example, rangers, a project officer and monitoring scheme⁵.</u></p>
<p>Ancient woodland should be recognised as a resource in the area, and objectives established to protect ancient woodland and aged or veteran trees. (NPPF paragraph 118).</p>	<p>Agreed. A new paragraph (paragraph 6.17) and a new map (figure 6.4) have been added to reflect this. New is text shown below:</p> <p><u>There are pockets of ancient woodland throughout the borough and close to the borough boundary in neighbouring local authority areas. Ancient woodland is an irreplaceable resource and face a number of challenges including fragmentation and suitable management.</u></p>
<p>Hampshire County Council</p>	
<p>HCC suggests that paragraph 2.46 is reworded to indicate that the Flood and Water Management Act</p>	<p>Noted. Paragraph 2.46, page is updated as follows:</p>

⁵ <https://www.portsmouth.gov.uk/ext/documents-external/env-srmp-interim-mitigation-strategy.pdf>

Consultee Comment	Response/comment and how it was addressed in the final SA Scoping Report (December 2015) (new text is <u>underlined</u> ; deleted text is shown as strikethrough)
<p>2010 also requires the LLFA to undertake a Local Flood Risk Management Strategy (LFRMS). The strategy is available on the County Council's website http://www3.hants.gov.uk/flooding/hampshireflooding/floodriskstrategy.htm The LFRMS should be referred to as part of the evidence base. Also that nowhere in Hampshire had 'significant flood risk areas' identified within the Preliminary Flood Risk Assessment (PFRA) process, accordingly, there was no requirement to complete a Flood Risk Management Plan or hazard mapping.</p>	<p><i>The EU Floods Directive aims to provide a consistent approach to flood risk management across Europe. The approach is based on a 6 year cycle of planning which includes the publication of a Preliminary Flood Risk Assessments (PFRA). <u>Nowhere in Hampshire has 'significant flood risk areas' identified within the Preliminary Flood Risk Assessment (PFRA) process, accordingly, there was no requirement to complete a Flood Risk Management Plan or hazard mapping.</u> hazard and risk maps and flood risk management plans. The Flood and Water Management Act builds on the <u>Floods Directive</u> by clarifying who is responsible for managing different sources of flood risk <u>and encouraging more sustainable forms of drainage.</u> <u>County and Unitary authorities are designated Lead Local Flood Authorities required to put in place an asset register, investigate significant flood events, consenting powers on ordinary water courses</u> and encourages more sustainable forms of drainage in new developments by introducing new <u>and duties relating to the approval of Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SuDS).</u> <u>The LLFA also prepares a Local Flood Risk Management Strategy.</u></i></p>
<p>It should also be acknowledged that the PUSH Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) was completed some time ago in 2009 and that the other evidence documents such as the Surface Water Management Plan and the Groundwater Management Plan were completed before the flooding in 2013/2014 and so they would need to factor in any recent flooding when considering the appraisal – it is not clear how this will be undertaken.</p>	<p>Noted. Paragraph 2.47 is updated as follows: <i>The Environment Agency prepares Catchment Flood Management Plans and a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment has been carried out for the PUSH area <u>which is being updated</u>⁶. Other sources of flooding are covered in the Surface Water Management Plan and Groundwater Management Plan. The North Solent Shoreline Management Plan (SMP), which covers the coastline of Eastleigh, seeks to balance the management of coastal flooding and erosion risks with natural processes, and the consequences of climate change. <u>More recent flooding which has occurred after these documents were published will also be considered as part of the SA by using up to date data sets and through an update to the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment currently being undertaken.</u></i></p>
<p>Paragraph 6.81 refers to the NPPF and the Sequential Test and reproduces the four flood risk zone classifications. Whilst these refer to the annual probability of river or sea flooding in any year, when applying the sequential approach advocated in the NPPF to potential sites all sources of flooding must be considered. Consequently, any site specific Flood Risk Assessment has to include all sources of existing flood risk and the management of that risk.</p>	<p>Noted. New paragraph 6.82 is added: <i>6.82 <u>Site specific Flood Risk Assessments will need to consider and assess other sources of existing flood risk (ordinary water courses, surface and ground water) and the management of any risk.</u></i></p>

⁶ Atkins (2009): PUSH Strategic Flood Risk Assessment: <http://push.atkinsgeospatial.com/Default.aspx>

Table A1.2: SA of the Issues and Options document Consultation Responses and Comments (consultation occurred between December 2015 and February 2016)

Note that the comments in the final column refer to actions that were taken to address consultation comments in this report (SA of the Proposed Submission Local Plan). The updated baseline information and review of plans, policies and programmes can be found in **Appendices 2 and 3** respectively of this full SA Report.

Consultee Comment	Response/comment and how it was addressed in the SA of the Proposed Submission Local Plan
Hamble Parish Council	
The justification states that “the proportion of affordable housing which could be delivered in currently uncertain until further work is undertaken by the site promoter”. HPC suggest that in accordance with Annex 4 the scoring criterion should be 0 - Insufficient evidence is available to make a determination.	The assessment is in line with other assessments in that all Strategic Locations providing housing are expected to provide the typical proportion of affordable housing. Uncertainty is recognised in the scoring and justification text.
The assessment is in accordance with the criteria in Annex 4 however HPC would suggest that as there is no evidence to indicate the provision of specialised housing needs the criteria are inappropriate. It considers that that there should a means of indicating a neutral response based on lack of evidence as for 1.1.	The assumptions are considered appropriate. Provision of specialised housing is a key issue for the borough therefore the assumptions help highlight where this could be provided.
The facilities quoted as justification are minor, restricted to specific groups and not available at all times. The assessment is also dependent on where the housing would be located and no additional facilities are proposed. HPC considers that this marking should be 0.	The assessment is in line with the assumptions presented in Appendix 4 of the Issues and Options SA Report. SA is a strategic process, considering presence or absence of selected categories of existing facilities rather than a detailed review of local facilities.
The justification is incorrect and the score is wrong. Blackthorn healthcare facility has one site and it is further than 1km from the development site due to the railway line being between the two sites and this can only be crossed at two points. There are no dental facilities at Blackthorn and these would also be more than 1km from the development site. Hamble is located over 10 miles from the nearest major hospital and given the east-west nature of the transport links most journeys for outpatient appointments are by car. HPC considers that the score should be 0.	The site is within 1km of Blackthorn healthcare facility, taking into account available places to cross the railway line. Note that distance thresholds are measured from the edge of the site, although a significant portion of the site lies within 1km of this facility. Reference to both sites was due to a mapping symbology error, but does not affect the assessment. Reference to both sites will be removed in future iterations of the SA.
The development is on a site which is already in the Minerals Plan to be restored as an open site for public use. There are already a significant number of sports pitches in the parish and we are unaware of the need for additional facilities.	The EBC Playing Pitch Strategy Update 2014 indicates a deficit of 5 junior and 1 mini football pitches in Bursledon, Hamble-le-Rice and Hound (current at the time of SA assessment). The emerging EBC Sports Facility Needs Assessment & Playing Pitch Strategy Update suggests that current facilities are likely to meet existing demand

Consultee Comment	Response/comment and how it was addressed in the SA of the Proposed Submission Local Plan
HPC considers that the scoring should be '+’.	but are unlikely to be able to accommodate future demand due to population growth.
The site is already publicly accessible open space and included in the Minerals Plan to be restored for public use. The development would result in the loss of publicly accessible local space and should be scored '-’.	Hamble Airfield is not designated as publically accessible open space and as minerals extraction has not taken place, proposals to restore the site for public use have not been brought forward. The Council has informed us that the site is used informally for recreation, but this cannot be considered public open space in planning terms.
HPC considers that the benefits stated in the justification are doubtful due to the geographical constraints of crossing the railway line for cyclists and walkers.	The score is in line with the assumptions presented in Appendix 4 of the Issues and Options SA Report. There are routes for crossing the railway line via Hamble Lane and Satchell Lane for pedestrians.
The location is 8 miles from a major railway station and the only practical means of reaching it is by road thus increasing traffic on a route that is already severely congested.	Noted. The SA is in line with this.
The development is likely to be more than 400 m from Hamble Station and that this score should be '0’.	As stated in the SA report, Hamble railway station is immediately adjacent to the north western part of this location. The methodology is consistent throughout the SA in considering distance thresholds from the edge of the location boundary.
The information in the justification is incorrect as bus route 6 does not go to Hedge End but Southampton. There is no public transport for journeys to the north of Hamble. (See comment on 4.4).	Noted. We have verified that bus route 6 runs to Southampton via Netley and Woolston and will update this in future iterations of the SA. However, this does not alter the assessment result.
This justification depends on the location of the development Furthermore GE Aviation is a long established business in Hamble and the occupants on the proposed development would be unlikely to be employed there. HPC considers that the methodology is flawed.	The methodology is consistent throughout the SA in considering distance thresholds from the edge of the location boundary. The assessment is in line with the assumptions in Appendix 4 of the Issues and Options SA Report.
See comment on 3.1(a).	See above
See comment on 3.1(b)	See above
See comment on 3.1(c).	See above
See comment on 3.1(d). A consequence of the lack of public transport to the north of	See above

Consultee Comment	Response/comment and how it was addressed in the SA of the Proposed Submission Local Plan
Hamble results in most residents being dependent on a car which is then used for a variety of functions.	
See comments on 3.1(e). Unless all the employees of GE move house and then walk or cycle to work it is unclear how this score can be justified or why it should be the same as the answer to 3.1(e). The location close to GE Aviation is not relevant to reducing road traffic and congestion and does not reduce the need to travel by car/lorry.	See above. This objective is not directly related to reducing road traffic but about locating new housing close to employment opportunities (which may, as a secondary effect, reduce commuting, traffic, related emissions etc.). Both 4.5(a) and 3.1(e) assess the likelihood and potential benefits of locating development near to employment areas.
If there is employment development at this location it will increase road traffic and congestion. Hamble is a relatively expensive area to live and the employees in the development are likely to come from other areas.	This objective relates to providing employment near to major population centres, which would provide accessible employment opportunities. The SA acknowledges that employment provision at this location is not adjacent to a major population centre and therefore a minor negative score is identified. SA is a strategic process and does not consider the commuting habits likely to be associated with individual employers.
See comment on 2.2.	See above.
The justification describes Coronation Parade as a 'local centre'. In reality it is a very small row of shops with two small convenience stores, pharmacy and Post Office. The bulk of Hamble residents shop at Tesco or Hedge End retail park and HPC considers that the residents of the proposed development would behave in the same way. HPC considers there would be adverse effect on traffic and congestion. This is another example of a flawed methodology.	This objective uses local centre mapping data provided by EBC. In this objective, local centres refer to places where residents can access basic services, such as shops (including convenience shops), pharmacies and post offices. It does not necessarily relate to where the majority of residents are expected to do most of their shopping.
The scoring for this question depends on the location of the development. HPC considers that a score of '0' would be more realistic. No mention is made of capacity which is currently an issue with Hamble Primary School with some village children having to travel outside the village to school.	Consistent with other assessments, distance thresholds have been measured from the edge of the site. The assumptions in Appendix 4 of the Issues and Options SA Report explain that 'capacity of existing schools would need to be explored outside of the SA process'.
Agree with justification although HPC considers the impact of these barriers to be understated with consequential greater increase in traffic and congestion.	The issues of traffic and congestion are considered as part of SA Objective 3, other assessment questions for SA objective 4 and SA objective 6.
The simple answer is 'No'. However HPC agree with justification although they remain puzzled as to why this site was included for employment/residential development in the	Noted.

Consultee Comment	Response/comment and how it was addressed in the SA of the Proposed Submission Local Plan
revised Local Plan when it is already included in the approved Hampshire Mineral Plan and the plans are meant to be complementary.	
Agree with the justification but the provision of allotments is equally possible if the site were used for mineral extraction.	Noted.
HPC considers that the scoring is wrong and the justification incorrect.	The score and justification are in line with the SA framework and assumptions presented in Appendix 4 of the Issues and Options SA Report. It is not clear why HPC disagree with the SA score and justification.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There are no comments provided for Hamble 2 as the location of this site is unclear. Is it located to the west or east of Hamble Lane? - The appraisal methodology is noted, however there is concern over the approach taken and the questions posed. It is difficult for an overall view to be taken. - In the analysis of Hamble 1 there is a lack of consistency about the location of the development within the site. This affects the marking of the individual questions and is likely to result in an unintentional skewing of the results at best and, at worst, the accusation of 'cherry picking' the location to get the most positive answer. 	<p>As per Appendix 5, Hamble 2 is named 'West of Hamble Lane (south of Hamble Primary School).</p> <p>The SA framework was developed at scoping stage and subject to consultation for five weeks from June 2015. Updates were made in line with comments received. In addition, assumptions have been presented in Appendix 4 of the Issues and Options SA Report to ensure assessments are consistent.</p> <p>The assessment of Hamble 1, and all strategic location options, consistently uses the boundary of the site from which to measure distance thresholds. By treating the entire location as a site, the SA makes no assumptions about where within that location development will be located.</p>
SA1: Housing: Any housing development would, by definition, meet this objective however there is no indication that location Hamble 1 would provide special needs or affordable housing.	This objective focuses on the need to meeting the housing need in terms of affordable and specialist housing. In line with other Strategic Location assessments, residential development is expected to provide at least the typical proportion of affordable housing. The SA also recognises the scope for provision of other elements of identified housing need.
SA2: Safeguard and improve community health, safety and wellbeing: The methodology does not give any weight to activity that is not an organised team sport on playing fields. There is no recognition of water based sports or solitary land based leisure activity such as walking, running and cycling.	SA question 2.4 considers public open space, which provides opportunities for informal recreation, as well as consideration of cycle and footpath networks. Water-based activities have not been considered, due to the fact that these are generally less accessible to the general public as they require specialist equipment, instruction and often club membership.

Consultee Comment	Response/comment and how it was addressed in the SA of the Proposed Submission Local Plan
SA3: Develop a dynamic and diverse economy SA3: Develop a dynamic and diverse economy: The methodology does not enable the potential adverse effects on existing businesses to be assessed. There are already concerns about access with some smaller businesses considering relocation.	Relocation of small businesses was not identified as a key issue in the Borough and is not, therefore, considered a strategic issue to be considered through the SA. Question 3.3 of the SA framework considers loss of existing employment land.
SA4: Road traffic/congestion: For the residents of Hamble the conclusions of this section are difficult to comprehend given the current problems of Hamble Lane and the lack of appreciation of the geographical constraints of the peninsula and the railway line. The site location abuts Hamble Lane for a short distance immediately south of the railway bridge and it is extremely difficult to envisage that there could be safe access to the site from Hamble Lane. Access from other point of Hamble 1 would put pressure on other junctions and reduce the potential sustainability benefits of the scheme. HPC is also concerned that this section is based on the misunderstanding the Route 6 bus goes to Hedge End. There is no public transport access along the length of Hamble Lane resulting in car dependency for shopping, access to hospitals etc. and this is a route which currently has major congestion issues.	Impacts of development on congestion are difficult to predict, particularly for strategic growth sites, as this depends on behaviour of residents. As such, the SA assesses the presence of measures to reduce congestion, such as proximity or provision of sustainable transport links. Access would depend on the layout and design of development. Whilst access is not assessed through the SA, it has been assumed that safe access would be achievable in order for this to be considered as a reasonable alternative. We have verified that bus route 6 runs to Southampton via Netley and Woolston and will update this in future iterations of the SA. However, this does not alter the assessment result as the location is within 300m of a semi frequent bus service.
SA5: Protect and conserve natural resources: The methodology does not highlight the fact that this development would reduce natural resources compared to the approved Hampshire Mineral Plans under which the complete site would revert to open land after gravel extraction.	This is assessed through SA question 5.3. The location scored negative with regards to this question because it would lead to development on greenfield land.
SA6: Reduce air, soil, water, light and noise pollution: HPC considers that the assessment underestimates the additional pollution caused by the additional traffic on Hamble Lane and any mitigation is unlikely. The methodology does not address light pollution.	SA objective 6 considers pollution. The assessment recognises potential for decreases in air quality and states that 'A detailed air quality assessment would be required to determine impacts on existing air quality. Light pollution is considered as part of SA objective 6: Reduce air, soil, water, light and noise pollution.
SUMMARY: The benefits of this option are not agreed with.	Addressed via the points above.
Hampshire & Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust	
Acknowledge the constraints within the borough with regard to available space would like to see measures aimed at avoiding further fragmentation of habitats. Would like to see	Noted.

Consultee Comment	Response/comment and how it was addressed in the SA of the Proposed Submission Local Plan
development proposals located away from important ecological resources, identified through network mapping, and further investigations exploring the potential for the densification of existing developed areas or brownfield sites (that are not of high ecological value).	
Table identifies 21 BAP species found in Eastleigh, however, this is based on assessments made in 2006, 2007, and 2008 and therefore this information is significantly out-dated.	This data was drawn from the Hampshire Biodiversity Information Centre and was the most up to date available at the time of preparation of the SA Scoping Report. Updated baseline information to an appropriate level of detail will be included in future iterations of the SA Report, if available.
Makes reference to the damaging effects of air pollution on biodiversity, however it only seeks to mitigate the impact upon a subset of features of designated sites, rather than biodiversity as a whole. Requests that the Local Plan includes a policy requiring measures aimed at reducing the predicted adverse impacts on the environment as a whole, since this will benefit biodiversity and human health.	<p>The sustainability issues recognised by the SA include pressure on biodiversity from pollution, including poor air quality. As a strategic level assessment, the SA of strategic locations/strategic spatial options focuses on potential effects on internationally designated biodiversity sites and does not attempt to explicitly consider the sensitivities of all habitats that are potentially sensitive to air pollution. However, the assessment criteria under SA objective 4: Road traffic/ congestion will also help to identify the potential effects of Local Plan proposals in achieving reductions in road traffic and hence air pollution.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
Hampshire County Council	
<p>The County Council as Public Health Authority wishes to highlight that there is more up to date data on health areas available on the local Eastleigh Health Profiles 2015 – the links is: http://www.apho.org.uk/resource/view.aspx?RID=50215&SEARCH=Eastleigh&SPEAR=</p> <p>Similarly, the County Council wishes to point out that the Index of Multiple Deprivation data is out of date – there is now an IMD 2015 – the link is: https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/english-indices-of-deprivation-2015</p>	Updates to baseline information will be included in future iterations of the SA.
Dr Stephanie Merry	
Development of Hamble Airfield is described as providing large scale open space. This is an oxymoron, since the area in question (Hamble Airfield) is already public open space and the	Hamble Airfield is not designated as publically accessible open space and as minerals extraction has not taken place, proposals to restore the site for public use have not

Consultee Comment	Response/comment and how it was addressed in the SA of the Proposed Submission Local Plan
<p>proposal is to build on it.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SA 2.2 suggests that proximity to Blackthorn Health centre is a significant positive impact, but this does not take into consideration the fact that the Health Centre is already over-subscribed. SA2.3 addresses under-provision of sports facilities. Hamble is not under-provided with sports facilities. There is a sports college with swimming pool, gym, football pitches etc., community sports facilities, a tennis club, a squash club, football pitches on the GE Aviation site and a cricket pitch in Victoria CP. The proposed development would be in addition to these facilities already provided at good value to the community and do not constitute a significant positive impact. SA 2.4 Addresses provision of open space – see first bullet point 	<p>been brought forward.</p> <p>The Council has informed us that the site is used informally for recreation, but this cannot be considered public open space in planning terms.</p> <p>The assumptions presented in Appendix 4 of the Issues and Options SA Report acknowledge that 'Capacity of existing GP surgeries would need to be explored outside of the SA process'.</p> <p>The EBC Playing Pitch Strategy Update 2014 indicates a deficit of 5 junior and 1 mini football pitches in Bursledon, Hamble-le-Rice and Hound (current at the time of SA assessment). The emerging EBC Sports Facility Needs Assessment & Playing Pitch Strategy Update suggests that current facilities are likely to meet existing demand but are unlikely to be able to accommodate future demand due to population growth.</p>
Historic England	
<p>Comments regarding the Scoping Report only.</p> <p>In paragraph 1.6, "Heritage England" should be "Historic England". In paragraph 2.2 the National Planning Policy Framework is now nearly four years old, so it is inaccurate to describe it as "new". In paragraph 2.5 "principle" should be "principal" and reference could be made to the statement in paragraph 9 of the NPPF that "Pursuing sustainable development involves seeking positive improvements in the quality of the built, natural and historic environment".</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>In paragraph 2.22, it should be noted that the core planning principles include "conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of this and future generations".</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>In paragraph 2.25 it could be noted that the NPPF also requires local plans to "include strategic policies to deliver the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment" [156] and "contain a clear strategy for enhancing the natural, built and historic environment [157]. We welcome paragraph 2.33.</p>	<p>Noted. Updates to baseline information were presented in Appendix 3 and will be updated in future iterations of the SA, where relevant.</p>

Consultee Comment	Response/comment and how it was addressed in the SA of the Proposed Submission Local Plan
<p>We welcome the recognition of the Borough's railway, maritime and aviation history in paragraph 6.31. As regards paragraphs 6.33 and 6.35, the National Heritage List for England has 182 listing entries for Eastleigh Borough, although some of these may be for more than one property. The List also identifies ten Scheduled Monuments, one Registered Historic Park and Garden and currently one Protected Wreck. It is possible that some of the 500+ archaeological records for the Borough are of national importance, but not scheduled for one of a number of reasons (as recognised in paragraph 6.39).</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>In paragraph 6.34, the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 does more than give local authorities the power to designate Conservation Areas; it actually imposes a duty on local authorities to determine which parts of their area are areas of special architectural or historic interest the character or appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance (as conservation areas) and to review this function from time to time.</p>	<p>Noted. Future SA reports will be amended to reflect this.</p>
<p>Paragraph 6.38 should now refer to the 2015 Heritage at Risk Register. A survey of the borough's Grade II listed buildings should be included in the baseline evidence or identified as a data gap.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>Paragraphs 6.39, 6.45 and 6.82 are welcomed – although the historic environment might be under pressure generally from future development.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>SA objectives 12 and 13 are welcomed. Indicators should include % of Conservation Areas in Eastleigh Borough with an up-to-date character appraisal and the number and proportion of heritage assets at risk.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>Other indicators to consider are the number of local listed heritage assets; the number of major development projects that enhance the significance of heritage assets or historic landscape character; the number of major developments that detract from the significance of heritage assets; and the percentage of planning applications where archaeological mitigation strategies were developed and implemented.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>Natural England</p>	

Consultee Comment	Response/comment and how it was addressed in the SA of the Proposed Submission Local Plan
Concurs with the interim findings of the SA for the options proposed in the plan document.	Noted.
Helen Rees	
Mortimers Lane (B3037), which features in a number of the Local Plan Options, is not sufficiently identified as a flood risk area in the SA but is flooded on a regular basis at its lower end. To the North of Option C, and within this broad spatial area, there are domestic dwellings that have repeatedly suffered from flooding; the additional development will, due to removal of land that absorbs surface water, result in further flooding in these established properties.	The SA considers both surface water flooding and Environment Agency Flood Zones (risk of flooding from rivers and sea) through SA framework question 7.2. High risk of flooding is discussed in the SA of Strategic Spatial Option C and Strategic locations Fair Oak 1, Fair Oak 2, Fair Oak 3 and Fair Oak 7, which include/are next to Mortimers Lane.
Options B and C would increase the volume of traffic on Mortimers Lane with road safety risks	The issues of traffic and congestion are considered as part of SA Objective 3, SA objective 4 and SA objective 6. Detailed highways assessments are beyond the scope of the SA.
Mr M L Waterman	
Same points raised by Helen Rees (above)	See responses to Helen Rees' representation above.
Terence O'Rourke for consortium of developers Miller Homes; Gleeson Developments; Welbeck Land; Bovis Homes; Taylor Wimpey Strategic Land	
Council excluded land to the west and north-west of Boorley Green from the Issues & Options Local Plan as a reasonable alternative to be subject to SA on the basis that the planning merits of recently refused planning permission had already been considered and dismissed as inappropriate. Consultee challenges this because permission was refused by reference to out of date and unsound planning policies and because the NPPF's presumption in favour of sustainable development requires the Local Plan to meet OAN. Consultee has provided their own appraisal of the excluded site against the SA framework.	Whilst it is the role of the SA to assess all reasonable alternatives, this relies on the Council identifying those alternatives. The consultee states that 'the SA process has not been correctly undertaken' but provides no grounds for this. We have not reviewed the consultee's alternative SA in detail. However, it seems that the SA undertaken by Terence O'Rourke includes detail that was not available for other sites such as potential provision of or contributions to local services and facilities. LUC's SA of site options only considers information that was available for all site options to ensure that all options are considered on a consistent basis.
Persimmon Homes	
Objects to the omission of smaller sites (<200 homes) from the Issues and Options document and hence the SA; fails to describe a site size threshold filtering process in	At this stage the Council is considering strategic locations that could make the largest contributions to development in the Borough. Smaller sites will be considered

Consultee Comment	Response/comment and how it was addressed in the SA of the Proposed Submission Local Plan
reasons for selecting the alternatives dealt with, thereby implying small sites are not considered reasonable.	at a later stage in the process. The SA will assess these when they have been identified by the Council.
States that the SA assesses Gaps and setting but the evidence base is incomplete without a Borough-specific Gap review and landscape assessment.	The SA at the Issues and Options stage was based on the most up to date and relevant information available at the time - EBC officer judgements. EBC has since carried out a formal assessment of the potential effects of allocations on countryside gaps - this will form the basis of SA scores at the Proposed Submission stage.
Objects to the omission of smaller sites (<200 homes) from the Issues and Options document as per preceding representation. Specifically objects to the exclusion of site at Grange Road, Botley as a reasonable alternative within the Issues & Options and accompanying SA.	See above.
Questions the usefulness of assessing the housing numbers options as it is not the job of the SA the objectively assessed needs of the Borough and due to the need to make assumptions about how the different amounts could be achieved.	The SA is required to assess the sustainability implications of all reasonable alternatives being considered by the Council for Local Plan policies, including the total amount of housing to be provided.
States that the question mark (?) relating to the assessment of SA Objective 1 for quantum option D should be removed.	The question mark relates to the unknowns of aiming to deliver such a higher housing number than in previous years.
SA1.1: Persimmon anticipates this site making a fully policy compliant contribution to affordable homes therefore should be scored ++ not +?.	As per the assumptions in Appendix 4 of the Issues and Options SA Report, significant positive effects (++) are only identified where there is evidence that 40% or more of the housing offer will be affordable housing. As with other strategic locations, it has been assumed that a typical proportion (35%) of affordable housing will be provided but the uncertainty reflects that there was no evidence regarding this available from the site promoter.
SA1.2: Agree there is potential to provide for other elements of identified housing need. In particular, provision for a care facility would be most appropriate. Persimmon are more than willing to accommodate such needs if they are required as the proposals are refined. Therefore score should be ++ not +?.	This was not included in the proposal information that informed the SA.
SA2.1: Community facilities are provided locally - additional provision is also shown on the master plan but space is available for other facilities if required. Amend + score to ++.	This was not included in the proposal information that informed the SA.

Consultee Comment	Response/comment and how it was addressed in the SA of the Proposed Submission Local Plan
SA2.4: It can be confirmed that the large scale open space is to be transferred to public ownership for informal recreation, providing an asset and protection of the 'strategic gap'. Southern part of the site is adjacent to Hamble Recreation Ground and changing in Hamble Village - this is not a small open space and should be recognised. Score should be changed from +++? to ++.	Uncertainty relates to delivery of this open space.
SA2.5: There are excellent connections to the existing cycle network. The network is proposed to be further enhanced with a cycleway to Hamble Station. Score should be changed from + to ++.	This was not included in the proposal information that informed the SA of Strategic Location options.
SA4.5(b): The assessment wrongly refers to distance from an employment centre = needs to be reassessed. Score should be ? not +.	This is a typo in the assessment and should read 'The location is over 1.0km from a major population centre'. However, score should remain negative as the site is further than 1.0km from a major population centre.
SA4.11: Hamble Lane crosses the railway - we do not see the railway as a geographical barrier. It would be no different if there was agricultural land in between; Hamble Lane would still be the access route.	The assessment is in line with the assumptions in Appendix 4 of the Issues and Options SA Report. The potential to provide new or enhanced pedestrian access between a strategic site and nearby services and facilities is reduced by barrier features such as railway lines.
SA5.1: See main response - we are confident that prior extraction will be achieved. Indeed the potential for residential development will encourage the extraction of minerals and should be seen as positive. Score should be + not -.	The assessment is in line with the assumptions in Appendix 4 of the Issues and Options SA Report. There is no guarantee that minerals would be extracted prior to development.
SA5.2: Only a small part of the site is classified as higher quality (Grade 1) and this is in the area proposed to be retained as open land so is not affected; the rest is not classified as agricultural. The whole site is to be subject to an allocation for mineral extraction so the agricultural quality is irrelevant. Score should be 0 not --.	Consistent with other assessments and in line with the assumptions in Appendix 4 of the Issues and Options SA Report, the proportion of Grades 1 or 2 agricultural land has not influenced the SA score. The layout of the site is not certain and therefore cannot be taken into account in the SA. In addition, the allocation for minerals extraction is not relevant as there is no guarantee that this will take place.
SA5.3: Whilst technically greenfield the site is allocated for mineral extraction so the land would be degraded. Score should be + not -.	The allocation for minerals extraction is not relevant as there is no guarantee that this will take place.
SA5.4: There is scope within the areas for allotments or a community farm. These can be incorporated as the proposals are refined moving forward. Suggest + not +? score.	This was not included in the proposal information that informed the SA of Strategic Location options.

Consultee Comment	Response/comment and how it was addressed in the SA of the Proposed Submission Local Plan
<p>SA6.1: Master plan indicates development to the south and there is a good distance between the proposed housing and Hamble Lane so housing should not be assumed to be affected by noise in advance of detailed studies. Score should be 0 not -?.</p>	<p>The layout of the site is not certain and therefore cannot be taken into account in the SA. In addition, the role of the SA is to identify all potential issues, therefore in advance of detailed studies a precautionary approach has been taken, with the related uncertainty acknowledged.</p>
<p>SA6.2: Residential development would follow mineral extraction and any backfilling controlled to avoid land contamination.</p> <p>Submitted highway assessment concludes scheme will have only marginal impact on traffic and hence air quality and scheme will be well placed to contribute to planned improvements to Hamble Lane and the M27 junction.</p> <p>We find it incredulous that the assessment seeks to penalise a mixed use scheme because "the combination of employment and residential uses on site are likely to adversely impact on each other" but agree a noise assessment will be required to establish appropriate site layout.</p> <p>Score should be 0 not --?.</p>	<p>The assessment results discussed by Persimmon are all in line with the SA framework and assumptions presented in Appendix 4 of the Issues and Options SA Report. This helps to ensure that the SA assesses all options in the same level of detail. As such, the submitted highway assessment has not been taken into account in the SA.</p> <p>The allocation for minerals extraction is not relevant as there is no guarantee that this will take place. Presence of contaminated land and remediation of this is uncertain.</p>
<p>SA7.2: Only a very small part of the site is subject to intermediate surface water flood risk and not in an area proposed for development. In any case, whole site is subject to prior extraction of minerals so existing flood risk is irrelevant. Score should be 0 not --?.</p>	<p>Consistent with other assessments and in line with the assumptions in Appendix 4 of the Issues and Options SA Report, the proportion of the site that lies within an area of immediate surface water flood risk has not influenced the SA score. The layout of the site is not certain and therefore cannot be taken into account in the SA. In addition, the allocation for minerals extraction is not relevant as there is no guarantee that this will take place.</p>
<p>SA10.5: Although the site lies in the Solent Coast, Hamble Estuary and Ford Lake priority biodiversity area it does not provide any of the priority habitats identified. Furthermore, the site is subject to prior extraction of minerals so the existing tussock grassland and shrubs will already have been affected. Score should be 0 not -?.</p>	<p>The SA has identified the presence of tussock grassland and scrub, which have biodiversity value that could be lost to development. The allocation for minerals extraction is not relevant as there is no guarantee that this will take place.</p>
<p>SA10.6: It should be recognised that prior extraction of minerals is a requirement; there is more than enough room to provide mitigation. Score for both objectives should be 0 not -</p>	<p>The allocation for minerals extraction is not relevant as there is no guarantee that this will take place. SA assessments identify effects of development 'pre-mitigation', as mitigation</p>

Consultee Comment	Response/comment and how it was addressed in the SA of the Proposed Submission Local Plan
?.	measures have not been identified and cannot be certain at this stage.
SA12.1: Master plan submitted as part of call for sites and the revised scheme show housing development outside of the strategic gap. Score should be 0 not -?.	The layout of the site is not certain and therefore cannot be taken into account in the SA.
SA12.3: Master plan provides for open land between Hamble Lane and Satchell Lasner to remain open. Score should be 0 not -?.	The assessment is in line with the SA framework and assumptions in Appendix 4 of the Issues and Options SA Report.
Mr Geoff Matthey	
Concerns about existing traffic problems along Bishopstoke road and states that Bishopstoke is at its development capacity.	The comment does not directly link to any of the material in the Sustainability Appraisal. SA objective 4 considers road traffic/congestion in terms of easing this via sustainable modes of transport. As the SA is a strategic assessment, analysis of local traffic conditions across the borough is not within the scope of the SA.
Alison Farmer	
Provides comment on strategic location options Fair Oak 1 and Fair Oak 2 in relation to Park Hills Wood. Refers to sustainability objectives 6.2 - Pollution, 8 - Climate Change, 10.1 - HRA screening, 10.2 - SSSI, 10.4 - SINC, 10.5 - Biodiversity, 10.7 - biodiversity network, 10.8 - ancient woodland, 12.3 - character of the countryside. She believes that development in this area would have a negative impact on Park Hills Wood and Hall Lands Wood and would contravene the Eastleigh Borough Biodiversity Action Plan.	See responses to specific SA objectives below.
SA6.2: Proposed link road would adversely affect currently high tranquillity score (see CPRE tranquillity map 2007) and potentially the wildlife of Park Hills Wood due to noise pollution, air pollution (NOx emissions), and light pollution.	<p>The assessment is in line with the SA framework assumption in Appendix 4 of the Issues and Options SA Report. With regards to noise and light pollution, it is not considered that the development raises concerns that cannot be addressed by mitigation. Whilst noise impacts on wildlife are important, tranquillity relates to the experience of people and includes factors other than noise.</p> <p>Potential significant negative effects of development on air quality have been recognised in the SA.</p>
SA8: Construction of a new link road between B3354 and B3037 would encourage car use by relieving congestion, thereby increasing greenhouse gas emissions	As stated in the SA report, SA objective 8 will be used in the appraisal of development management policies. SA objective 4: Reduce road traffic/congestion

Consultee Comment	Response/comment and how it was addressed in the SA of the Proposed Submission Local Plan
	considers reduction of traffic through considering access to sustainable modes of transport.
SA10.1: Water from area of Park Hills Wood drains to River Itchen which is of high conservation value therefore vital to avoid pollution of water runoff from this area and to carry out HRA as River Itchen is a European site.	HRA is being undertaken alongside the SA process. The SA recognises that the locations are within the HRA screening zone.
SA10.2 & 10.3: Options A, B & C all include proposals for development within 200 m of Park Hills Wood SINC which should be assessed in addition to effects on SSSIs	Potential effects of development on SINC's are assessed via objective 10.4. The '200m' rule for assessments is only applied to statutory nature conservation sites (SINC's are non-statutory designations).
SA10.5: Options A and B would involve development either very close to or within Crowdhill Copse, which is a Priority Biodiversity Area.	SA objective 10.5 refers to protected species, whose presence is not necessarily linked to Priority Biodiversity Areas. Priority Biodiversity Areas are assessed against SA objective 10.6. The Stoke Park PBA will be acknowledged specifically in the next iteration of SA.
SA10.7: The land around Park Hills Wood is crossed by hedgerows and other corridors for species movement to and from it. Urban development is very likely to disrupt these corridors partially or completely, with consequent harmful effects on wildlife within Park Hills Wood SINC.	Potential loss of hedgerows has been acknowledged and assessed in relation to this objective.
SA10.8: Crowdhill Copse is an Eastleigh BAP priority habitat; Parks Hills Wood is a SINC and Ancient Woodland with characteristics of a BAP priority habitat and although it lies outside of Eastleigh Borough it is continuous with Crowdhill Copse; both are likely to be impacted by Options A, B & C. The consultee draws attention to the Forestry Commission and Natural England planning and development guidance 'Ancient Woodland and veteran trees: protecting them from development'. In particular, the consultee expresses concerns about potential damage to ancient woodland, particularly in terms of urban edge effects, including trespassing.	The SA acknowledges potential effects on ancient woodland, including Park Hills Wood, in the assessment against SA objective 10.8, resulting in a significant negative score with uncertainty, as layout and design of development may help mitigate this.
Bill Gibb	
Observations concerning Park Hills Wood in relation to the Eastleigh Local Plan 2011-2036, including the Sustainability Appraisal and the Habitats Regulation Assessment, and the Eastleigh Borough Biodiversity Action Plan 2012-2022: The current Options A, B and C in	See responses to specific SA objective below.

Consultee Comment	Response/comment and how it was addressed in the SA of the Proposed Submission Local Plan
<p>the Local Plan would have an irreversible impact on Park Hills Wood, Chestnut Gully Wood and Hall Lands Wood; and would not be compatible with the Biodiversity Action Plan. (similar points to representation from 7260 Alison Farmer)</p>	
<p>The area around Park Hills wood is currently unaffected by light, noise or excessive air pollution. The Strategic Location options Fair Oak 1 and Fair Oak 2 would affect these pollutants and conflict with the Sustainability Appraisal objectives/criteria 6.2 and 8.</p>	<p>The assessment is in line with the SA framework assumption in Appendix 4 of the Issues and Options SA Report. With regards to noise and light pollution, it is not considered that the development raises concerns that cannot be addressed by mitigation.</p> <p>Potential significant negative effects of development on air quality have been recognised in the SA.</p>
<p>In addition, SA objectives 10.2, 10.3 and 10.4 all seem as relevant to a SINC as to a site of special scientific interest or nature reserve; and in a semirural area this would suggest the need for an increased rather than diminished level of protection.</p>	<p>Potential effects of development on SINC are assessed via objective 10.4. The '200m' rule for assessments is only applied to statutory nature conservation sites (SINCs are non-statutory designations).</p>
<p>SA objective 10.7 refers to the importance of the wood owing to its interconnection with other wooded habitats providing corridors and important habitats for wildlife to move around the wider landscape. These woods are currently linked by fields and hedgerows allowing species to move across these habitats; and would need to be preserved to prevent loss of wildlife.</p>	<p>Potential loss of hedgerows has been acknowledged and assessed in relation to this objective.</p>
<p>SA objective 10.8 refers to the protection of ancient woodland. Such woodland would not be reinstated and erosion of the wood through pollutants and the effect of encroachment by human activity and pet animals would irreversibly destroy the area.</p>	<p>The SA acknowledges potential effects on ancient woodland, including Park Hills Wood, in the assessment against SA objective 10.8, resulting in a significant negative score with uncertainty, as layout and design of development may help mitigate this.</p>
<p>SA objective 12.4 refers to the irreversible destruction of surrounding countryside, which would no longer be used for recreational purposes. Fields would be replaced by housing estates. Little, if any, countryside would remain in the borough; with fewer parklands than in London.</p>	<p>SA objective 12.4 relates to local landscape character and views. SA objective 12.3 relates to the character of the countryside, against which significant negative effects were identified due to urbanisation of the area.</p> <p>Access to open space and footpaths are assessed through SA objective 2: Health.</p>
<p>Richard Shelly, Stokewood Surgery</p>	
<p>Despite the lengthy document(s), the amount of analysis relating to provision of</p>	<p>Noted. SA is a strategic process addressing all aspects of sustainability, therefore</p>

Consultee Comment	Response/comment and how it was addressed in the SA of the Proposed Submission Local Plan
<p>healthcare, including community/primary care or secondary care, is rudimentary. Would expect a dedicated detailed sustainability assessment of the impact of any potential development(s) on healthcare provision. Stokewood and Old Anchor surgeries would welcome the opportunity to engage positively with such an analysis.</p>	<p>any detailed analysis of healthcare provision would be outside the scope of the SA process.</p>
<p>Provides detailed comments re the SA Main Report page 58, section 6.65 and appendices on pg84-163. In summary with regard to the impact of Bishopstoke 1 & 2 and Fair Oak 1 -7 on health service provision, there will be no capacity at Old Anchor & Stokewood Surgeries to provide health services for the new population in these locations and this should be explicitly recognised here. The additional population would require the construction of a new building although no plans have been made at this stage. Notes that a '+' justification has been made as provision has been made for a remote consulting room at the development currently being built at Crowd Hill. This proposed provision does not comply with Health and Social Care Act 2008 (Regulated Activities) Regulations 2014: (Section 2, Standard 15: Premises and Equipment).</p>	<p>SA is a strategic process that must assess all alternatives in the same level of detail. As capacity of healthcare facilities across the borough is unknown, the assumptions for SA question 2.2 in Appendix 4 of the Issues and Options SA Report state 'Capacity of existing GP surgeries would need to be explored outside of the SA process'.</p> <p>With regards to Fair Oak 1 and 6 (those assessments where the consultee states "a '+' justification has been made for a remote consulting room..."), the minor positive effect is due to part of the site being within 1km of a GP surgery, not solely the consulting room. The SA also recognises that, for both of these locations, the majority of the location is more than 1000m from any existing health facilities and that 'There are recognised issues regarding capacity at the GP surgery, further work will need to be undertaken'.</p>
<p>Annick Wrampling</p>	
<p>Opposes development within the element of Strategic Location Fair Oak 1 and Strategic Spatial Option C immediately to the east of Winchester Road (SLAA-7-5-C Land East of Winchester Road) due to concerns that it will urbanise the area, be visually intrusive (losing privacy of back gardens) and alter the character of the settlement.</p>	<p>Decisions regarding selection of preferred options are not made through the SA; instead the SA is part of the evidence base informing these decisions. Impacts on landscape character are assessed through SA objective 12.</p>
<p>Dave Chessell</p>	
<p>Mortimers Lane (B3037), which resides within a number of the Local Plan Options, is not sufficiently identified as a flood risk area in the Sustainability Plan. The Sustainability Appraisal Report also identifies that Option B poses notable challenges with respect to flooding.</p>	<p>Response is almost identical to that of Helen Rees (ID: 6347). See response to comments from Helen Rees above.</p>
<p>Criticism that the SA does not adequately consider the impact of a road traffic accident which necessitates the closure of the M3 and / or M27- shows need for additional measures</p>	<p>Response is almost identical to that of Helen Rees (ID: 6347). See response to comments from Helen Rees above.</p>

Consultee Comment	Response/comment and how it was addressed in the SA of the Proposed Submission Local Plan
<p>proven to alleviate the current levels of congestion. Presently, whenever there is a closure or accident on the M3, which is a regular occurrence, traffic diverts through Fair Oak on the B3354, significantly increasing congestion which is ordinarily heavy during regular peak hours.</p> <p>Concerns about flow of traffic on the B2177 which would be adversely impacted; the flow of traffic on this road is already substantially affected by slower rural vehicles. Additional development will only serve to increase the traffic levels, leading to a higher risk of collision, added pollution, and subsequent reduction in air quality. Options B and C, on this basis alone, cannot be considered as viable options.</p>	
Sheelagh Cohen	
The views of Hamble Parish Council are supported.	Noted.
Richard Court	
<p>The consultee largely repeats the comments made by Southern Planning Practice (which were made on his behalf, among others).</p> <p>In addition, the consultee draws attention to Eastleigh's 2012-2022 Biodiversity Action Plan, which identifies the area in question as a priority area for biodiversity.</p>	Noted.
Mims Davies MP	
<p>Options- there is a strong feeling against plans that cause significant loss to greenspace. SA interim findings for option B are of concern (loss of gap and environmental harm). Suggests that options must be considered alongside the stated aims of the Council and incorporating principles with regards to environmental impact and infrastructure sustainability.</p>	<p>This representation does not directly address the SA. The SA considers loss of greenspace as part of SA objectives 2 and 11 and considers other environmental factors, such as biodiversity and landscape in SA objectives 10 and 12 respectively. It is not the role of the SA to assess the plan against the stated aims of the Council.</p>
Jo Moss	
<p>Not all potential sites are being put forward for consideration within the Issues and Options, whereas sites with significant potential for development have been excluded. Provides a list of such potential development locations all of which might be said to offer greater sustainability benefits in terms of their existing access to key public transport</p>	<p>Whilst it is the role of the SA to assess all reasonable alternatives, this relies on the Council identifying those alternatives.</p> <p>The Council will be able to comment further on how alternatives were identified and this will be included in future iterations of the SA.</p>

Consultee Comment	Response/comment and how it was addressed in the SA of the Proposed Submission Local Plan
infrastructure. Believes that the Council are fully aware of these sites.	
Southern Planning Practice on behalf of residents within the Bishopstoke area	
Critical of the process in that the Sustainability Appraisal Report is based on a number of specific sites but no plans were attached to that report to indicate the precise areas of land for which the appraisals have been undertaken.	Noted.
The consultee refers to the Sustainability Appraisal findings to support their arguments.	Noted.

Appendix 2
Review of plans, policies and programmes

Table A2.1: Review of plans, policies and programmes relevant to the preparation of the Eastleigh Local Plan and the SA

Strategy, Plan or Programme	Key objectives relevant to Local Plan and SA	Key targets and indicators relevant to Local Plan and SA	Implications for the Local Plan	Implications for SA
INTERNATIONAL				
EU Directives				
<p><i>SEA Directive 2001</i></p> <p>Directive 2001/42/EC on the assessment of the effects of certain plans and programmes on the environment</p>	<p>Provide for a high level of protection of the environment and contribute to the integration of environmental considerations into the preparation and adoption of plans and programmes with a view to promoting sustainable development.</p>	<p>The Directive must be applied to plans or programmes whose formal preparation begins after 21 July 2004 and to those already in preparation by that date.</p>	<p>Allocate sites and develop policies that take account of the Directive as well as more detailed policies derived from the Directive at the national level.</p>	<p>Requirements of the Directive must be met in Sustainability Appraisals.</p>
<p><i>The Industrial Emissions Directive 2010</i></p> <p>Directive 2010/75/EU on industrial emissions (integrated pollution prevention and control)</p>	<p>This Directive lays down rules on integrated prevention and control of pollution arising from industrial activities. It also lays down rules designed to prevent or, where that is not practicable, to reduce emissions into air, water and land and to prevent the generation of waste, in order to achieve a high level of protection of the environment taken as a whole.</p>	<p>The Directive sets emission limit values for substances that are harmful to air or water.</p>	<p>Allocate sites and develop policies that take account of the Directive as well as more detailed policies derived from the Directive contained in the NPPF.</p>	<p>Include sustainability objective for reducing pollution.</p>
<p><i>Energy Performance of Buildings Directive 2010 on the energy performance of buildings 2010/31/EU</i></p>	<p>The Directive aims to promote the energy performance of buildings and building units.</p> <p>It requests that member states adopt either national or regional methodology for calculating energy performance and minimum requirements for energy performance.</p>	<p>No targets or indicators.</p>	<p>Policies and site allocations should take account of the Directive as well as more detailed policies derived from the Directive</p>	<p>Include SA objective relating to the energy performance/efficiency of existing and proposed buildings.</p>

Strategy, Plan or Programme	Key objectives relevant to Local Plan and SA	Key targets and indicators relevant to Local Plan and SA	Implications for the Local Plan	Implications for SA
			contained in the NPPF.	
<p><i>The Birds Directive 2009</i></p> <p>Directive 2009/147/EC is a codified version of Directive 79/409/EEC as amended</p>	<p>The preservation, maintenance, and re-establishment of biotopes and habitats shall include the following measures:</p> <p>Creation of protected areas.</p> <p>Upkeep and management in accordance with the ecological needs of habitats inside and outside the protected zones.</p> <p>Re-establishment of destroyed biotopes.</p> <p>Creation of biotopes.</p>	No targets or indicators.	<p>Allocated sites and develop policies should make sure that the upkeep of recognised habitats is maintained and not damaged from development.</p> <p>Avoid pollution or deterioration of habitats or any other disturbances effecting birds.</p>	Include sustainability objectives for the protection of birds.
<p><i>The Waste Framework Directive 2008</i></p> <p>Directive 2008/98/EC on waste</p>	<p>Prevention or reduction of waste production and its harmfulness. The recovery of waste by means of recycling, re-use or reclamation. Recovery or disposal of waste without endangering human health and without using processes that could harm the environment.</p>	Development of clean technology to process waste and promote recycling.	<p>Allocate sites and develop policies that take account of the Directive as well as more detailed policies derived from the Directive contained in the NPPF.</p>	Include sustainability objectives that minimise waste production as well as promote recycling.
<p><i>The Air Quality Directive 2008</i></p> <p>Directive 2008/50/EC on ambient air quality and cleaner air for Europe</p>	<p>Avoid, prevent and reduce harmful effects of ambient noise pollution on human health and the environment.</p>	No targets or indicators.	<p>Allocate sites and develop policies that take account of the Directive as well as more detailed policies derived from the Directive contained in the NPPF.</p>	Include sustainability objectives to maintain and enhance air quality.

Strategy, Plan or Programme	Key objectives relevant to Local Plan and SA	Key targets and indicators relevant to Local Plan and SA	Implications for the Local Plan	Implications for SA
<p><i>The Floods Directive 2007</i></p> <p>Directive 2007/60/EC on the assessment and management of flood risks</p>	<p>Establish a framework for the assessment and management of flood risks, aiming at the reduction of the adverse consequences for human health, the environment, cultural heritage and economic activity associated with floods.</p>	<p>Preliminary Flood Risk Assessments to be completed by December 2011. Flood Hazard Maps and Flood Risk Maps to be completed by December 2013. Flood Risk Management Plans to be completed by December 2015.</p>	<p>Allocate sites and develop policies that take account of the Directive as well as more detailed policies derived from the Directive contained in the NPPF.</p>	<p>Include sustainability objectives that relate to flood management and reduction of risk.</p>
<p><i>The Water Framework Directive 2000</i></p> <p>Directive 2000/60/EC establishing a framework for community action in the field of water policy</p>	<p>Protection of inland surface waters, transitional waters, coastal waters and groundwaters.</p>	<p>No targets or indicators.</p>	<p>Allocate sites and develop policies that take account of the Directive as well as more detailed policies derived from the Directive contained in the NPPF.</p>	<p>Include sustainability objectives to protect and minimise the impact on water quality.</p>
<p><i>The Landfill Directive 1999</i></p> <p>Directive 99/31/EC on the landfill of waste</p>	<p>Prevent or reduce negative effects on the environment from the landfilling of waste by introducing stringent technical requirements for waste and landfills.</p>	<p>Reduce the amount of biodegradable waste sent to landfill to 75% of the 1995 level by 2010. Reduce this to 50% in 2013 and 35% by 2020.</p>	<p>Allocate sites and develop policies that take account of the Directive as well as more detailed policies derived from the Directive contained in the NPPF.</p>	<p>Include sustainability objectives to increase recycling and reduce the amount of waste.</p>
<p><i>The Drinking Water Directive 1998</i></p> <p>Directive 98/83/EC on the quality of water intended for human</p>	<p>Protect human health from the adverse effects of any contamination of water intended for human consumption by ensuring that it is wholesome and clean.</p>	<p>Member States must set values for water intended for human consumption.</p>	<p>Allocate sites and develop policies that take account of the Directive as well as more detailed policies derived from the</p>	<p>Include sustainability objectives to protect and enhance water quality.</p>

Strategy, Plan or Programme	Key objectives relevant to Local Plan and SA	Key targets and indicators relevant to Local Plan and SA	Implications for the Local Plan	Implications for SA
consumption			Directive contained in the NPPF.	
<i>The Packaging and Packaging Waste Directive 1994</i> Directive 94/62/EC on packaging and packaging waste	Harmonise the packaging waste system of Member States. Reduce the environmental impact of packaging waste.	By June 2001 at least 50% by weight of packaging waste should have been recovered, at least 25% by weight of the totality of packaging materials contained in packaging waste to be recycled with a minimum of 15% by weight for each packaging material.	Allocate sites and develop policies that take account of the Directive as well as more detailed policies derived from the Directive contained in the NPPF.	Include sustainability objectives to minimise the environmental impact of waste and promote recycling.
<i>The Habitats Directive 1992</i> Directive 92/43/EEC on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora	Promote the maintenance of biodiversity taking account of economic, social, cultural and regional requirements. Conservation of natural habitats and maintain landscape features of importance to wildlife and fauna.	No targets or indicators.	Allocate sites and develop policies that take account of the Directive as well as more detailed policies derived from the Directive contained in the NPPF. The Plan must be subject to Habitats Regulations Assessment in line with the Directive.	Include sustainability objectives to protect and maintain the natural environment and important landscape features.
<i>The Nitrates Directive 1991</i> Directive 91/676/EEC on nitrates from agricultural sources.	Reduce water pollution caused or induced by nitrates from agricultural sources and prevent further such pollution.	Identification of vulnerable areas.	Allocate sites and develop policies that take account of the Directive as well as more detailed policies derived from the Directive contained in	Include sustainability objectives to reduce water pollution.

Strategy, Plan or Programme	Key objectives relevant to Local Plan and SA	Key targets and indicators relevant to Local Plan and SA	Implications for the Local Plan	Implications for SA
			the NPPF.	
<p><i>The Urban Waste Water Directive 1991</i></p> <p>Directive 91/271/EEC concerning urban waste water treatment</p>	<p>Protect the environment from the adverse effects of urban waste water collection, treatment and discharge, and discharge from certain industrial sectors.</p>	No targets or indicators.	<p>Allocate sites and develop policies that take account of the Directive as well as more detailed policies derived from the Directive contained in the NPPF.</p>	<p>Include sustainability objectives to reduce water pollution.</p>
<p>The Environmental Noise Directive 2002 Directive 2002/49/EC relating to the assessment and management of environmental noise</p>	<p>Defines a common approach to avoid, prevent and reduce the adverse effects due to the exposure to environmental noise.</p> <p>It also provides a basis for developing European wide measures to deal with noise emitted by road and rail vehicles, infrastructure, aircraft and outdoor, industrial and mobile machinery.</p> <p>Principles of the directive include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitoring the environmental problems. • Informing and consulting the public. • Addressing local noise issues <p>Developing a long-term EU strategy.</p>	No targets or indicators.	<p>Allocate sites and develop policies that take account of the Directive as well as more detailed policies derived from the Directive contained in the NPPF.</p>	<p>Include sustainability objectives to manage and reduce the impacts of noise.</p>
European				
<p>European Spatial Development Perspective (1999)</p>	<p>Economic and social cohesion across the community. Conservation of natural resources and cultural heritage. Balanced competitiveness between different tiers of government.</p>	No targets or indicators.	<p>Allocate sites and develop policies that take account of the Directive as well as more detailed policies derived from the</p>	<p>Include sustainability objectives to conserve natural resources and cultural heritage.</p>

Strategy, Plan or Programme	Key objectives relevant to Local Plan and SA	Key targets and indicators relevant to Local Plan and SA	Implications for the Local Plan	Implications for SA
			Directive contained in the NPPF.	
EU Seventh Environmental Action Plan	<p>The EU's objectives in implementing the programme are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) to protect, conserve and enhance the Union's natural capital; (b) to turn the Union into a resource-efficient, green and competitive low-carbon economy; (c) to safeguard the Union's citizens from environment-related pressures and risks to health and wellbeing; (d) to maximise the benefits of the Union's environment legislation; (e) to improve the evidence base for environment policy; (f) to secure investment for environment and climate policy and get the prices right; (g) to improve environmental integration and policy coherence; (h) to enhance the sustainability of the Union's cities; (i) to increase the Union's effectiveness in confronting regional and global environmental challenges. 	No targets or indicators.	Develop policies that take account of the Directive as well as more detailed policies derived from the Directive contained in the NPPF.	Include sustainability objectives to protect and enhance the natural environment and promote energy efficiency.
European Landscape Convention (Florence, 2002)	The convention promotes landscape protection, management and planning.	No indicators or targets.	Ensure that site allocations and policies take account of the	Include sustainability objectives to protect the archaeological heritage.

Strategy, Plan or Programme	Key objectives relevant to Local Plan and SA	Key targets and indicators relevant to Local Plan and SA	Implications for the Local Plan	Implications for SA
			Convention.	
<p>European Convention on the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage (Valletta, 1992)</p> <p><i>Revision of the 1985 Granada Convention</i></p>	<p>Protection of the archaeological heritage, including any physical evidence of the human past that can be investigated archaeologically both on land and underwater.</p> <p>Creation of archaeological reserves and conservation of excavated sites.</p>	No indicators or targets.	Ensure that site allocations and policies take account of the Convention.	Include sustainability objectives to protect the archaeological heritage.
International				
Johannesburg Declaration on Sustainable Development (2002)	<p>Commitment to building a humane, equitable and caring global society aware of the need for human dignity for all.</p> <p>Renewable energy and energy efficiency. Accelerate shift towards sustainable consumption and production.</p>	<p>Greater resource efficiency.</p> <p>New technology for renewable energy.</p> <p>Increase energy efficiency.</p>	Ensure that site allocations and policies take account of the Declaration.	Include sustainability objectives to enhance the natural environment and promote renewable energy and energy efficiency.
Aarhus Convention (1998)	<p>Established a number of rights of the public with regard to the environment. Local authorities should provide for:</p> <p>The right of everyone to receive environmental information</p> <p>The right to participate from an early stage in environmental decision making</p> <p>The right to challenge in a court of law public decisions that have been made without respecting the two rights above or environmental law in general.</p>	No targets or indicators.	Ensure that site allocations and policies take account of the Convention.	Ensure that public are involved and consulted at all relevant stages of SA production.

Strategy, Plan or Programme	Key objectives relevant to Local Plan and SA	Key targets and indicators relevant to Local Plan and SA	Implications for the Local Plan	Implications for SA
<p>United Nations Declaration on Forests (New York Declaration) (2014)</p>	<p>International commitment to cut natural forest loss by 2020 and end loss by 2030.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least halve the rate of loss of natural forests globally by 2020 and strive to end natural forest loss by 2030. • Support and help meet the private-sector goal of eliminating deforestation from the production of agricultural commodities such as palm oil, soy, paper and beef products by no later than 2020, recognizing that many companies have even more ambitious targets. • Significantly reduce deforestation derived from other economic sectors by 2020. • Support alternatives to deforestation driven by basic needs (such as subsistence farming and reliance on fuel wood for energy) in ways that alleviate poverty and promote sustainable and equitable development. • Restore 150 million hectares of degraded landscapes and forestlands by 2020 and significantly increase the 	<p>Ensure that site allocations and policies take account of the Declaration.</p>	<p>Include an SA objective to conserve enhance the natural environment, including green infrastructure.</p>

Strategy, Plan or Programme	Key objectives relevant to Local Plan and SA	Key targets and indicators relevant to Local Plan and SA	Implications for the Local Plan	Implications for SA
		<p>rate of global restoration thereafter, which would restore at least an additional 200 million hectares by 2030.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include ambitious, quantitative forest conservation and restoration targets for 2030 in the post-2015 global development framework, as part of new international sustainable development goals. • Agree in 2015 to reduce emissions from deforestation and forest degradation as part of a post-2020 global climate agreement, in accordance with internationally agreed rules and consistent with the goal of not exceeding 2°C warming. • Provide support for the development and implementation of strategies to reduce forest emissions. • Reward countries and jurisdictions that, by taking action, reduce forest emissions— particularly through public 		

Strategy, Plan or Programme	Key objectives relevant to Local Plan and SA	Key targets and indicators relevant to Local Plan and SA	Implications for the Local Plan	Implications for SA
		<p>policies to scale-up payments for verified emission reductions and private-sector sourcing of commodities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strengthen forest governance, transparency and the rule of law, while also empowering communities and recognizing the rights of indigenous peoples, especially those pertaining to their lands and resources. 		
United Nations Paris Climate Change Agreement (2015)	International agreement to keep global temperature rise this century well below 2 degrees Celsius above pre-industrial levels.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A long-term goal of keeping the increase in global average temperature to well below 2°C above pre-industrial levels; • To aim to limit the increase in 1.5°C, since this would significantly reduce risks and the impacts of climate change; • On the need for global emissions to peak as soon as possible, recognising that this will take longer for developing countries; • To undertake rapid reductions thereafter in 	Ensure that site allocations and policies take account of the Agreement.	Include an SA objective to mitigate climate change through project-level and strategic energy efficiency and renewable energy measures.

Strategy, Plan or Programme	Key objectives relevant to Local Plan and SA	Key targets and indicators relevant to Local Plan and SA	Implications for the Local Plan	Implications for SA
		accordance with the best available science.		
International Convention on Wetlands (Ramsar Convention) (1976)	International agreement with the aim of conserving and managing the use of wetlands and their resources.	No targets or indicators	The development plan should conserve, enhance and manage the use of wetlands and their resources.	Include an SA objective to conserve enhance the natural environment.
United Nations (UNESCO) World Heritage Convention (1972)	Promote cooperation among nations to protect heritage around the world that is of such outstanding universal value that its conservation is important for current and future generations.	No targets or indicators.	The development plan should conserve, enhance and encourage accessibility and understanding of World Heritage Sites.	Include an SA objective to conserve and enhance the historic environment.
NATIONAL				
National Planning Policy Framework	Presumption in favour of sustainable development. Delivering sustainable development by:	No targets or indicators.	Development plan has a statutory status as the starting point for decision making.	Sustainability appraisal should be an integral part of the plan preparation process, and should consider all the likely significant effects on the environment, economic and social factors.
	Building a strong, competitive economy.	No targets or indicators.	Set out clear economic visions for that particular area.	Include a sustainability objective relating to strengthening the economy.

Strategy, Plan or Programme	Key objectives relevant to Local Plan and SA	Key targets and indicators relevant to Local Plan and SA	Implications for the Local Plan	Implications for SA
	Ensuring vitality of town centres.	No targets or indicators.	Recognise town centres as the heart of their communities.	Include a sustainability objective relating to the vitality of town centres.
	Promoting sustainable transport	No targets or indicators.	To implement sustainable transport modes depending on nature/location of the site, to reduce the need for major transport infrastructure.	Include a sustainability objective relating to sustainable transport.
	Supporting high quality communications infrastructure.	No targets or indicators.	Enhance the provision of local community facilities and services by supporting the expansion of electronic communications networks.	Include a sustainability objective relating to improving communication.
	Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes.	No targets or indicators.	Identify size, type, tenure and range of housing that is required in particular locations.	Include a sustainability objective relating to housing availability and quality.
	Requiring good design.	No targets or indicators.	Establish a strong sense of place to live, work and visit.	Include a sustainability objective relating to good design.
	Promoting healthy communities.	No targets or indicators.	Promote safe and accessible environments with a high quality of life and	Include a sustainability objective relating to health and wellbeing.

Strategy, Plan or Programme	Key objectives relevant to Local Plan and SA	Key targets and indicators relevant to Local Plan and SA	Implications for the Local Plan	Implications for SA
			community cohesion.	
	Protecting Green Belt Land.	No targets or indicators.	To prevent the coalescence of neighbouring towns.	Include a sustainability objective relating to the coalescence of towns.
	Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding, and coastal change.	No targets or indicators.	Use opportunities offered by new development to reduce causes/impacts of flooding.	Include a sustainability objective relating to climate change mitigation and adaption.
	Conserving and enhancing the natural environment.	No targets or indicators.	Recognise the wider benefits of biodiversity.	Include a sustainability objective relating to the conservation and enhancement of the natural environment.
	Conserving and enhancing the historic environment	No targets or indicators.	Sustain and enhance heritage assets and put them to viable uses consistent with their conservation.	Include a sustainability objective relating to the conservation of historic features.
	Facilitating the use of sustainable materials.	No targets or indicators.	Encourage prior extraction of minerals where practicable and environmentally feasible.	Include a sustainability objective relating to sustainable mineral extraction.
National Planning Practice Guidance, DCLG, 2014	The NPPG sets out a range of social, economic and environmental considerations for the preparation of the Local Plan. It also includes information on undertaking sustainability appraisals which can be taken into	No targets or indicators.	Include policies that manage the range of issues addressed by the NPPG.	Include sustainability objectives which cover the range of issues addressed by the NPPG.

Strategy, Plan or Programme	Key objectives relevant to Local Plan and SA	Key targets and indicators relevant to Local Plan and SA	Implications for the Local Plan	Implications for SA
	<p>consideration.</p> <p>Provides further guidance to be read alongside the NPPF on a range of topics that link to the promotion of sustainable development including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Air quality • Climate change • Conserving and enhancing the historic environment • Flood risk • Health and well being • Housing and economic development • Natural environment • Minerals • Rural housing • Open space • Transport • Waste • Water supply, wastewater and water quality 			
National Planning Policy for Waste	Sets out the Government’s ambition to work towards a more sustainable and efficient approach to resource use and management. Replaces Planning Policy Statement 10.	<p>Delivery of sustainable development and resource efficiency, including provision of modern infrastructure, local employment opportunities and wider climate change benefits, by driving waste management up the waste hierarchy.</p> <p>Ensuring that waste management is considered alongside other spatial planning concerns, such as housing and transport,</p>	The Local Plan should be in conformity with national waste planning policy.	Include a sustainability objective relating to waste generation and management.

Strategy, Plan or Programme	Key objectives relevant to Local Plan and SA	Key targets and indicators relevant to Local Plan and SA	Implications for the Local Plan	Implications for SA
		<p>recognising the positive contribution that waste management can make to the development of sustainable communities.</p> <p>Providing a framework in which communities and businesses are engaged with and take more responsibility for their own waste, including by enabling waste to be disposed of or, in the case of mixed municipal waste from households, recovered, in line with the proximity principle.</p> <p>Helping to secure the re-use, recovery or disposal of waste without endangering human health and without harming the environment.</p> <p>Ensuring the design and layout of new residential and commercial development and other infrastructure (such as safe and reliable transport links) complements sustainable waste management, including the provision of appropriate storage and segregation facilities to facilitate high</p>		

Strategy, Plan or Programme	Key objectives relevant to Local Plan and SA	Key targets and indicators relevant to Local Plan and SA	Implications for the Local Plan	Implications for SA
		quality collections of waste.		
White Papers				
Natural Environment White Paper, 2011 <i>The Natural Choice: securing the value of nature</i>	Protecting and improving our natural environment; Growing a green economy; and Reconnecting people and nature.	No targets or indicators.	Ensure that site allocations and policies will protect the intrinsic value of nature and recognise the multiple benefits it could have for communities.	Include a sustainability objective relating to the enhancement of the natural environment.
Electricity Market Reform White Paper 2011, <i>Planning our Electric Future: A White Paper for Secure, Affordable and Low-Carbon Electricity</i>	This White Paper sets out the Government's commitment to transform the UK's electricity system to ensure that our future electricity supply is secure, low-carbon and affordable.	15 per cent renewable energy target by 2020 and 80 per cent carbon reduction target by 2050.	Ensure that site allocations and policies will support renewable energy generation and encourage greater energy efficiency.	Include sustainability objectives to reduce carbon emissions and increase proportion of energy generated from renewable sources.
Water White Paper, 2011 <i>Water for Life</i>	Objectives of the White Paper are to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paint a clear vision of the future and create the conditions which enable the water sector and water users to prepare for it; • Deliver benefits across society through an ambitious agenda for improving water quality, working with local communities to make early improvements in the health of our rivers by reducing pollution and tackling 	No targets or indicators.	Ensure that site allocations and policies will support the wise use of water, and improvement of water quality.	Include sustainability objectives that relate to water quality and quantity.

Strategy, Plan or Programme	Key objectives relevant to Local Plan and SA	Key targets and indicators relevant to Local Plan and SA	Implications for the Local Plan	Implications for SA
	<p>unsustainable abstraction;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Keep short and longer term affordability for customers at the centre of decision making in the water sector; • Protect the interests of taxpayers in the policy decisions that we take; • Ensure a stable framework for the water sector which remains attractive to investors; • Stimulate cultural change in the water sector by removing barriers to competition, fostering innovation and efficiency, and encouraging new entrants to the market to help improve the range and quality of services offered to customers and cut business costs; • Work with water companies, regulators and other stakeholders to build understanding of the impact personal choices have on the water environment, water resources and costs; and • Set out roles and responsibilities – including where Government will take a stronger role in strategic 			

Strategy, Plan or Programme	Key objectives relevant to Local Plan and SA	Key targets and indicators relevant to Local Plan and SA	Implications for the Local Plan	Implications for SA
	<p>direction setting and assessing resilience to future challenges, as well as clear expectations on the regulators.</p>			
<p>The Future of Transport White Paper 2004: A network for 2030</p>	<p>Ensure we can benefit from mobility and access while minimising the impact on other people and the environment, now and in the future.</p> <p>Get the best out of our transport system without damaging our overall quality of life.</p> <p>Develop strategies that recognise that demand for travel will increase in the future.</p> <p>Work towards a transport network that can meet the challenges of a growing economy and the increasing demand for travel but can also achieve the government's environmental objectives.</p>	<p>20% reduction in carbon dioxide emissions by 2010 and 60% reduction by 2050. Transport is currently responsible for about a quarter of total emissions.</p>	<p>Allocate sites that facilitate public transport use rather than increasing reliance on the car, and ensure that policies promote the use of non-car based modes of transport.</p>	<p>Include sustainability objectives to reduce the need to travel and improve choice and use of sustainable transport modes.</p>
<p>Urban White Paper 2000, <i>Our Towns and Cities: The Future – delivering an urban renaissance</i></p>	<p>New Sustainable homes that are attractive, safe and practical. Retaining people in urban areas and making them more desirable places to live. Improving quality of life, opportunity and economic success through tailored solutions in towns and cities.</p>	<p>3.8 million more homes needed by 2021. Local strategies needed to meet the needs of local people developed through partnerships. 60% of new homes on brownfield sites or through conversions of existing buildings.</p>	<p>Allocate sites that will effectively deliver better towns and cities taking into account the key aims of the White Paper.</p>	<p>Include sustainability objectives to ensure that the majority of new development will be built on brownfield sites and aim to improve the quality of life of residents.</p>
<p>Rural White Paper 2000, <i>Our Countryside:</i></p>	<p>Facilitate the development of dynamic, competitive and sustainable economies in the</p>	<p>No targets or indicators.</p>	<p>Allocate sites that will increase employment</p>	<p>Include sustainability objectives that aim to</p>

Strategy, Plan or Programme	Key objectives relevant to Local Plan and SA	Key targets and indicators relevant to Local Plan and SA	Implications for the Local Plan	Implications for SA
<i>The Future – a fair deal for rural England</i>	<p>countryside.</p> <p>Maintain and stimulate communities and secure access to services for those who live and work in the countryside.</p> <p>Conserve and enhance rural landscapes.</p> <p>Increase opportunities for people to get enjoyment from the countryside.</p>		and services in the rural parts of the District whilst conserving the landscape.	improve the economies of rural areas with minimal impact to the environment.
Heritage Protection for the 21 st Century: White Paper (2007)	<p>The proposals in this White Paper reflect the importance of the heritage protection system in preserving our heritage for people to enjoy now and in the future. They are based around three core principles:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developing a unified approach to the historic environment; • Maximising opportunities for inclusion and involvement; and • Supporting sustainable communities by putting the historic environment at the heart of an effective planning system. 	No targets or indicators.	The Local Plan policies will need to ensure that they protect the Borough's heritage assets.	Include a sustainability objective relating to the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment.
The Local Growth White Paper (2010)	Highlights the importance of economic policy that focusses on the delivery of strong, sustainable and balanced growth of income and employment over the long-term, growth which is broad-based industrially and geographically to provide equality of access and opportunity and build businesses that are competitive internationally.	No targets or indicators.	Ensure that site allocations and policies help deliver sustainable economic growth and employment opportunities.	Include sustainability objective that relates to the maintenance of a strong, diverse and flexible local economy.
Housing White Paper 2016, <i>Fixing our broken</i>	The White Paper sets out ways to address shortfall in affordable homes and boost	No targets or indicators.	Allocate sites that will fulfil the aims of the	Include sustainability objectives/appraisals that

Strategy, Plan or Programme	Key objectives relevant to Local Plan and SA	Key targets and indicators relevant to Local Plan and SA	Implications for the Local Plan	Implications for SA
<i>housing market</i>	<p>housing supply. The White Paper focuses on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning for the right homes in the right places – Higher densities in appropriate areas, protecting the green belt while making more land available for housing by maximising the contribution from brownfield and surplus public land, regenerating estates, releasing more small and medium-sized sites, allowing rural communities to grow and making it easier to build new settlements • Building homes faster – Improved speed of planning cases, ensuring infrastructure is provided and supporting developers to build out more quickly. • Diversifying the Market – Backing small and medium-sized house builders, custom-build, institutional investors, new contractors, housing associations. • Helping people now – supporting home ownership and providing affordable housing for all types of people, including the most vulnerable. 		White Paper, including development on smaller/medium sized sites, brownfield land and sites capable of achieving higher densities.	relate to providing the right mix of housing and recognise the sustainability advantages of development on brownfield land.
Policies and Strategies				
DCLG (2015) Planning Policy for Traveller Sites	<p>Government’s aims in respect of Traveller sites are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That local planning authorities should make their own assessment of need for the purposes of planning. 	No targets or indicators.	Ensure that the relevant considerations are taken into account when allocating sites.	Include relevant sustainability objectives relating to social inclusion and environmental protection.

Strategy, Plan or Programme	Key objectives relevant to Local Plan and SA	Key targets and indicators relevant to Local Plan and SA	Implications for the Local Plan	Implications for SA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To ensure that local planning authorities, working collaboratively, develop fair and effective strategies to meet need through the identification of land for sites. • To encourage local planning authorities to plan for sites over a reasonable timescale. • That plan-making and decision-taking should protect Green Belt from inappropriate development. • To promote more private Traveller site provision while recognising that there will always be those Travellers who cannot provide their own sites. • That plan-making and decision-taking should aim to reduce the number of unauthorised developments and encampments and make enforcement more effective for local planning authorities to ensure that their Local Plan includes fair, realistic and inclusive policies. • To increase the number of Traveller sites in appropriate locations with planning permission, to address under provision and maintain an appropriate level of supply. • To reduce tensions between settled and Traveller communities in plan-making and planning decisions. • To enable provision of suitable accommodation from which Travellers can access education, health, welfare and employment infrastructure. • For local planning authorities to have due 			

Strategy, Plan or Programme	Key objectives relevant to Local Plan and SA	Key targets and indicators relevant to Local Plan and SA	Implications for the Local Plan	Implications for SA
	regard to the protection of local amenity and local environment.			
DCLG (2011) <i>Laying the Foundations: A Housing Strategy for England</i>	Aims to provide support to deliver new homes and improve social mobility.	No targets or indicators	Make appropriate site allocations for the provision of an appropriate supply of new homes.	Include sustainability objective that assesses whether housing need is being met.
DEFRA (2011) <i>Securing the Future: Delivering UK Sustainable Development Strategy</i>	Enable all people throughout the world to satisfy their basic needs and enjoy a better quality of life without compromising the quality of life for future generations. There are 4 shared priorities: sustainable consumption and production; climate change and energy; natural resource protection and environmental enhancement; and sustainable communities.	Sets out indicators to give an overview of sustainable development and priority areas in the UK. They include 20 of the UK Framework indicators and a further 48 indicators related to the priority areas.	Ensure that site allocations and policies meet the aims of the Sustainable Development Strategy.	Include sustainability objectives to cover the shared priorities.
Department of Health (2010) <i>Healthy Lives, Healthy People: our Strategy for public health in England</i>	Protect the population from serious health threats; helping people live longer, healthier and more fulfilling lives; and improving the health of the poorest, fastest. Prioritise public health funding from within the overall NHS budget.	No targets or indicators.	Ensure that site allocations and policies reflect the objectives of the strategy.	Include a sustainability objective relating to health and wellbeing.
Building a Greener Future: Policy Statement (DCLG, 2007)	This Statement confirms the government's intention to achieve 25% more energy efficient homes by 2010, 44% more efficient homes by 2013 and zero carbon (net carbon emissions should be zero per annum) homes by 2016.	25% more energy efficient homes by 2010, 44% more efficient homes by 2013 and zero carbon (net carbon emissions should be zero per	Policies should seek to promote zero carbon residential development.	Include SA objectives which seek to improve the energy efficiency of proposed developments and encourage uptake of

Strategy, Plan or Programme	Key objectives relevant to Local Plan and SA	Key targets and indicators relevant to Local Plan and SA	Implications for the Local Plan	Implications for SA
		annum) homes by 2016.		renewable energy.
DECC (2009) <i>The UK Renewable Energy Strategy</i>	Increase our use of renewable electricity, heat and transport, and help tackle climate change. Build the UK low-carbon economy, promote energy security and take action against climate change.	15% of energy from renewable sources by 2020. Reducing UK CO2 emissions by 750 million tonnes by 2030.	Ensure that site allocations and policies will support renewable energy provision including electricity, heat and transport.	Include a sustainability objective relating to increasing energy provided from decentralised community renewable sources.
DECC (2011) UK Renewable Energy Roadmap (updates setting out progress and changes to the strategy dated 2013 and 2013).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make the UK more energy secure. • Help protect consumers from fossil fuel price fluctuations. • Help drive investment in new jobs and businesses in the renewable energy sector. • Keep the UK on track to meet carbon reduction objectives. 	No targets or indicators.	Ensure that site allocations and policies will support renewable energy provision including electricity, heat and transport.	Include sustainability objectives/appraisal questions relating to renewable energy generation and energy efficiency.
Community Energy Strategy (DECC, 2014)	Sets out plans to promote and facilitate the planning and development of decentralised community energy initiatives in four main types of energy activity: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generating energy (electricity or heat) • Reducing energy use (saving energy through energy efficiency and behaviour change) • Managing energy (balancing supply and demand) • Purchasing energy (collective purchasing or switching to save money on energy) 	No targets or indicators.	Ensure that site allocations and policies will support community low carbon and renewable energy provision including electricity, heat and transport.	Include a sustainability objective relating to increasing energy provided from decentralised low carbon and renewable sources.
The Energy Efficiency	This is an Energy Efficiency Strategy aiming to realise the wider energy efficiency potential	No targets or indicators.	Policies should seek to	Include SA objectives

Strategy, Plan or Programme	Key objectives relevant to Local Plan and SA	Key targets and indicators relevant to Local Plan and SA	Implications for the Local Plan	Implications for SA
Opportunity in the UK (DECC, 2012)	<p>that is available in the UK economy. The Strategy identifies four barriers to energy efficiency which need to be overcome which include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Embryonic markets. • Information. • Misaligned financial incentives. • Undervaluing energy efficiency. <p>The Strategy draws attention to maximising the potential of existing dwellings by implementing 21st century energy management initiatives on 19th century homes.</p>		address the barriers identified within the Strategy and improve the existing building stock through appropriate adaptation measures.	relating to energy efficiency and adaptation of the existing building stock.
The National Adaptation Programme – Making the Country Resilient to a Changing Climate (Defra, 2013)	<p>The report sets out visions for the following sectors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Built Environment – “buildings and places and the people who live and work in them are resilient to a changing climate and extreme weather and organisations in the built environment sector have an increased capacity to address the risks and take the opportunities from climate change”. • Infrastructure – “an infrastructure network that is resilient to today’s natural hazards and prepared for the future changing climate”. • Healthy and resilient communities – “a health service, a public health and social care system which are resilient and adapted to a changing climate. Communities and individuals, including the most vulnerable, are better prepared to cope with severe weather events and other impacts of climate change. Emergency services and local resilience capability take account of 	No targets or indicators.	Policies should take account of the aims of the Programme.	Include SA objectives which seek to promote the implementation of adaptation measures to make the area more resilient to a changing climate.

Strategy, Plan or Programme	Key objectives relevant to Local Plan and SA	Key targets and indicators relevant to Local Plan and SA	Implications for the Local Plan	Implications for SA
	<p>and are resilient to, a changing climate”.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agriculture and Forestry – “profitable and productive agriculture and forestry sectors that take the opportunities from climate change, are resilient to its threats and contribute to the resilience of the natural environment by helping maintain ecosystem services and protect and enhance biodiversity”. • Natural Environment – “the natural environment, with diverse and healthy ecosystems, is resilient to climate change, able to accommodate change and valued for the adaptation services it provides”. • Business – “UK businesses are resilient to extreme weather and prepared for future risks and opportunities from climate change”. • Local Government – “Local government plays a central in leading and supporting local places to become more resilient to a range of future risk and to be prepared for the opportunities from a changing climate”. 			
<p>The National Flood and Coastal Erosion Risk Management Strategy for England (Environment Agency, 2011)</p>	<p>This Strategy sets out the national framework for managing the risk of flooding and coastal erosion. It sets out the roles for risk management authorities and communities to help them understand their responsibilities.</p> <p>The strategic aims and objectives of the Strategy are to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “manage the risk to people and their property; • Facilitate decision-making and action at the 	<p>No targets or indicators.</p>	<p>Policies should seek to reduce and manage the risk of all types of flooding.</p>	<p>The SA framework should include objectives which seek to reduce the risk and manage flooding sustainably.</p>

Strategy, Plan or Programme	Key objectives relevant to Local Plan and SA	Key targets and indicators relevant to Local Plan and SA	Implications for the Local Plan	Implications for SA
	<p>appropriate level – individual, community or local authority, river catchment, coastal cell or national;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Achieve environmental, social and economic benefits, consistent with the principles of sustainable development”. 			
<p>DEFRA (2007) <i>The Air Quality Strategy for England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland</i></p>	<p>Make sure that everyone can enjoy a level of ambient air quality in public spaces, which poses no significant risk to health or quality of life.</p> <p>Render polluting emissions harmless.</p>	<p>Sets air quality standards for 13 air pollutants.</p>	<p>Ensure that site allocations and policies will contribute to maintaining and improving air quality.</p>	<p>Include sustainability objectives to protect and improve air quality.</p>
<p>Waste prevention programme for England: Prevention is better than cure – The role of waste prevention in moving to a more resource efficient economy (HM Government, 2013)</p>	<p>The aim of the Programme is to improve the environment and protect human health by supporting a resource efficient economy, reducing the quantity and impact of waste produced whilst promoting sustainable economic growth:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • encourage businesses to contribute to a more sustainable economy by building waste reduction into design, offering alternative business models and delivering new and improved products and services; • encourage a culture of valuing resources by making it easier for people and businesses to find out how to reduce their waste, to use products for longer, repair broken items, and enable reuse of items by others; • help businesses recognise and act upon potential savings through better resource efficiency and preventing waste, to realise 	<p>No targets or indicators.</p>	<p>Policies should take account of the strategic measures in the Programme.</p>	<p>Include SA objectives which seek to promote waste prevention.</p>

Strategy, Plan or Programme	Key objectives relevant to Local Plan and SA	Key targets and indicators relevant to Local Plan and SA	Implications for the Local Plan	Implications for SA
	<p>opportunities for growth; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> support action by central and local government, businesses and civil society to capitalise on these opportunities. 			
<p>Future Water: The Government's Water Strategy for England (DEFRA, 2008)</p>	<p>Sets out how the Government want the water sector to look by 2030 and an outline of the steps which need to be taken to get there.</p> <p>The vision for 2030 is one where we, as a country have:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> "improved the quality of our water environment and the ecology it supports, and continue to maintain high standards of drinking water quality from taps; Sustainably managed risks from flooding and coastal erosion, with greater understanding and more effective management of surface water; Ensure a sustainable use of water resources, and implement fair, affordable and cost-reflective water charges; Cut greenhouse gas emissions; and Embed continuous adaptation to climate change and other pressures across the water industry and water users". 	<p>No targets or indicators.</p>	<p>Policies should aim to contribute to the vision set out in this Strategy.</p>	<p>Include SA objectives which seek to protect, manage and enhance the water environment.</p>
<p>Water for People and the Environment: Water Resources Strategy for England and Wales (Environment Agency, 2009)</p>	<p>The Strategy vision for water resource "is for there to be enough water for people and the environment, meeting legitimate needs".</p> <p>Its aims include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To manage water resource and protect the water environment from climate change. Restore, protect, improve and value species 	<p>No targets or indicators.</p>	<p>Policies should reflect the aims of the strategy where relevant.</p>	<p>Include SA objective which seeks to promote water management and efficiency.</p>

Strategy, Plan or Programme	Key objectives relevant to Local Plan and SA	Key targets and indicators relevant to Local Plan and SA	Implications for the Local Plan	Implications for SA
	<p>and habitats that depend on water.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To contribute to sustainable development through good water management. <p>People to understand how water and the water environment contribute to their quality of life.</p>			
<p>Safeguarding our Soils: A Strategy for England (DEFRA, 2009)</p>	<p>The vision is “by 2030, all England’s soils will be managed sustainability and degradation threats tackled successfully. This will improve the quality of England’s soils and safeguard their ability to provide essential services for future generations”.</p> <p>The Strategy highlights the areas for priority including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Better protection for agricultural soils. Protecting and enhancing stores of soil carbon. Building the resilience of soils to a changing climate. Preventing soil pollution. Effective soil protection during construction and development. Dealing with our legacy of contaminated land. 	<p>No targets or indicators.</p>	<p>Ensure that site allocations and policies will help protect and enhance the quality of soils and seek to sustainably manage their quality for future generations.</p>	<p>Include SA objective which seeks to safeguard and enhance the quality of soil.</p>
<p>DEFRA (2011) <i>Biodiversity 2020: A strategy for England’s wildlife and ecosystem services</i></p>	<p>The strategy aims to guide conservation efforts in England up to 2020, and move from a net biodiversity loss to gain. The strategy includes 22 priorities which include actions for the following sectors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agriculture; 	<p>The strategy develops ambitious yet achievable goals for 2020 and 2050, based on Aichi Targets set at the Nagoya UN Biodiversity Summit in October 2010.</p>	<p>Develop policies that promote conservation and enhancements of biodiversity and ensure that site allocations take account of the</p>	<p>Include sustainability objective that relates to biodiversity.</p>

Strategy, Plan or Programme	Key objectives relevant to Local Plan and SA	Key targets and indicators relevant to Local Plan and SA	Implications for the Local Plan	Implications for SA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Forestry; • Planning and Development; • Water Management; • Marine Management; • Fisheries; • Air Pollution; and <p>Invasive Non-Native Species.</p>		aims of the strategy.	
DfT (2013) <i>Door to Door: A strategy for improving sustainable transport integration</i>	<p>The strategy's vision is for an inclusive, integrated and innovative transport system that works for everyone, and where making door-to-door journeys by sustainable means is an attractive and convenient option. Four key areas to address are highlighted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • improving availability of information; • simplifying ticketing; • making connections between different steps in the journey, and different modes of transport, easier; and <p>providing better interchange facilities.</p>	No targets or indicators.	Ensure that site allocations and policies will enhance public transport provision and encourage active modes of travel such as walking and cycling.	Include a relevant sustainability objective relating to sustainable transport.
A Green Future: Our 25 Year Plan to Improve the Environment (2018)	<p>The 25 year Plan sets out goals for improving the environment within the next 25 years. It details how the Government will work with communities and businesses to leave the environment in a better state than it is presently. Identifies ten key goals areas around which action will be focused:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Clean air. 2. Clean and plentiful water. 3. Thriving plants and wildlife. 4. A reduced risk of harm from environmental 	Key goals listed.	Ensure that site allocations and policies conserve and enhance the natural environment.	Include an SA objective to conserve and enhance the natural environment, including green infrastructure.

Strategy, Plan or Programme	Key objectives relevant to Local Plan and SA	Key targets and indicators relevant to Local Plan and SA	Implications for the Local Plan	Implications for SA
	<p>hazards such as flooding and drought.</p> <p>5. Using resources from nature more sustainably and efficiently.</p> <p>6. Enhanced beauty, heritage and engagement with the natural environment.</p> <p>7. Mitigating and adapting to climate change.</p> <p>8. Minimising waste.</p> <p>9. Managing exposure to chemicals.</p> <p>10. Enhancing biosecurity.</p>			
Lifetime Neighbourhoods (2011)	<p>This document is a national strategy for housing in an ageing society. It seeks to support residents to develop lifetime neighbourhoods in terms of resident empowerment, access, services and amenities, built and natural environment, social networks/well-being and housing.</p>	No indicators or targets.	The policies and site allocations will need to reflect the requirements set out within the national strategy.	Include a sustainability objective relating to the creation of sustainable communities.
UK Bioenergy Strategy (2012)	<p>The UK Government has a responsibility to ensure that its policies only support bioenergy use in the right circumstances. This strategy is based on four principles which will act as a framework for future government policy on bioenergy.</p> <p>In summary the four principles state that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policies that support bioenergy should deliver genuine carbon reductions that help meet UK carbon emissions objectives to 2050 and beyond. • Support for bioenergy should make a cost effective contribution to UK carbon emission objectives in the context of the overall energy goals. • Support for bioenergy should aim to maximise the overall benefits and minimise costs (quantifiable and non-quantifiable) 	No indicators or targets.	The principles of the Bioenergy Strategy 2012 will need to be reflected within the Local Plan policies.	Include a sustainability objective relating to energy efficiency and climate change.

Strategy, Plan or Programme	Key objectives relevant to Local Plan and SA	Key targets and indicators relevant to Local Plan and SA	Implications for the Local Plan	Implications for SA
	<p>across the economy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> At regular time intervals and when policies promote significant additional demand for bioenergy in the UK, beyond that envisaged by current use, policy makers should assess and respond to the impacts of this increased deployment on other areas, such as food security and biodiversity. 			
National Policy Statement EN1: Overarching Energy Policy Statement (2011)	This policy document sets out government policy for the delivery of major planning applications for energy development. These will be dealt with by the Planning Inspectorate, rather than local authorities in which the development occurs. The document also specifies the criteria for waste management, traffic and transport, water quality and quantity, noise and vibration, open spaces and green infrastructure, the landscape, visual impact, dust flood risk, historic environment, odour, light, smoke/steam, insects, coastal change, aviation, biodiversity and geodiversity.	No indicators or targets.	The Local Plan will need to be consistent with the National Policy Statement.	Include a sustainability objective relating to energy efficiency.
The Carbon Plan: Delivering our Local Carbon Future (2011)	The Carbon Plan sets out the government's plans for achieving the emissions reductions it committed to in the first four carbon budgets. Emissions in the UK must, by law, be cut by at least 80% of 1990 by 2050. The UK was first to set its ambition in law and the Plan sets out progress to date.	No indicators or targets.	The Local Plan will need to include policies that reflect the targets within the Carbon Plan.	Include a sustainability objective relating to greenhouse gas emissions.
National Infrastructure Plan 2016 - 2021	The Infrastructure Plan allows for long term public funding certainty for key infrastructure areas such as: roads, rail, flood defences and science. All elements highlighted in the Plan represent firm commitment by government to supply the funding levels stipulated. The Plan	No indicators or targets.	The Local Plan objectives and policies should support the delivery of infrastructure to support new	To ensure that infrastructure delivery is embedded within the SA framework.

Strategy, Plan or Programme	Key objectives relevant to Local Plan and SA	Key targets and indicators relevant to Local Plan and SA	Implications for the Local Plan	Implications for SA
	also highlights hat steps the government will take to ensure effective delivery of its key projects.		development.	
Legislation				
Housing Act 2004	Protect the most vulnerable in society and help create a fairer and better housing market. Strengthen the Government's drive to meet its 2010 decent homes target.	No indicators or targets.	Ensure that site allocations and policies will help to create a fairer and better housing market.	Include sustainability objectives to improve access to good quality and affordable housing.
Housing and Planning Act (2016)	The Act makes widespread changes to housing policy at the national level. Measures introduced in the Act relate to starter homes, and permitting the sale of higher value local authority homes. Starter homes are the new affordable housing product designed by the government to specifically meet the housing needs of younger generations and to allow them to access home-ownership. The overarching aim of the Act is to promote home ownership and increase levels of house building.	No indicators or targets.	The Local Plan will need to take account of the provisions of the Act in relation to housing provision.	Ensure the delivery of housing is included in the SA Framework.
Localism Act (2011)	The Localism Act introduces a number of measures to decentralise decision making process to the local level, creating space for Local Authorities to lead and innovate, and giving people the opportunity to take control of decisions that matter to them. The Localism Act includes a number of important packages. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The new act makes it easier for local people to take over the amenities they love and keep them part of local life; • The act makes sure that local social 	No indicators or targets.	The Local Plan will need to reflect the principles of Localism as identified in the document, including Neighbourhood Planning.	N/A

Strategy, Plan or Programme	Key objectives relevant to Local Plan and SA	Key targets and indicators relevant to Local Plan and SA	Implications for the Local Plan	Implications for SA
	<p>enterprises, volunteers and community groups with a bright idea for improving local services get a chance to change how things are done.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The act places significantly more influence in the hands of local people over issues that make a big difference to their lives. • The act provides appropriate support and recognition to communities who welcome new development. • The act reduces red tape, making it easier for authorities to get on with the job of working with local people to draw up a vision for their area’s future. • The act reinforces the democratic nature of the planning system passing power from bodies not directly to the public, to democratically accountable ministers. • The act enables Local Authorities to make their own decisions to adapt housing provision to local needs, and make the system fairer and more effective. • The act gives Local Authorities more control over the funding of social housing, helping them plan for the long- term. <p>In relation to planning, the Localism Act enables the Government to abolish regional spatial strategies, introduce Neighbourhood Plans and Local Referendums.</p>			
The Climate Change Act (2008)	The Climate Change Act was passed in 2008 and established a framework to develop an economically credible emissions reduction	No indicators or targets.	The Local Plan policies must reflect the objectives of The	Ensure that there is an SA objective which considers climate change mitigation

Strategy, Plan or Programme	Key objectives relevant to Local Plan and SA	Key targets and indicators relevant to Local Plan and SA	Implications for the Local Plan	Implications for SA
	<p>path. It also strengthened the UK's leadership internationally by highlighting the role it would take in contributing to urgent collective action to tackle climate change under the Kyoto Protocol.</p> <p>The Climate Change Act includes the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2050 target. The act commits the UK to reducing emissions by at least 80% in 2050 from 1990 levels. This target was based on advice from the CCC report: Building a Low- carbon Economy. The 80% target includes GHG emissions from the devolved administrations, which currently accounts for around 20% of the UK's total emissions. • Carbon Budgets. The Act requires the Government to set legally binding 'carbon budgets'. A carbon budget is a cap on the amount of greenhouse gases emitted in the UK over a five-year period. The first four carbon budgets have been put into legislation and run up to 2027. 		Climate Change Act, in order to contribute to reducing UK carbon emissions.	and adaptation.
Energy Act (2008)	<p>The Act works towards a number of policy objectives including carbon emissions reduction, security of supply, and competitive energy markets. Objectives: Electricity from Renewable Sources: changes to Renewables Obligation (RO), designed to increase renewables generation, as well as the effectiveness of the RO.</p> <p>Feed in tariffs for small scale, low carbon generators of electricity. Smart meters: the Act mandates a roll-out of smart meters to medium sized businesses over the next five years.</p>	No indicators or targets.	Policies and site allocations will have to ensure a positive contribution in meeting the climate change challenge by capitalising on renewable and low carbon energy opportunities and adaptation measures which reduce the threat	Ensure that there is an SA objective that encourages the deliver energy efficiency, low carbon and renewable energy measures.

Strategy, Plan or Programme	Key objectives relevant to Local Plan and SA	Key targets and indicators relevant to Local Plan and SA	Implications for the Local Plan	Implications for SA
	Renewable heat incentives: the establishment of a financial support mechanism for those generating heat from renewable sources.		of climate change.	
Flood and Water Management Act (2010)	The Act aims to reduce the flood risk associated with extreme weather. It provides for better, more comprehensive management of flood risk for people, homes and businesses, helps safeguard community groups from unaffordable rises in surface water drainage charges, and protects water supplies to the consumer.	No indicators or targets.	The Local Plan should protect existing and future development as well as residents from flood risk.	Ensure that there is an SA objective that encourages flood risk and water management.
Town and country planning legislation	<p>A range of legislation published in 2017 is of relevance to the Local Plan. This includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Neighbourhood Planning Act 2017 – Act aims to strengthen neighbourhood planning by ensuring that planning decision- makers take account of well-advanced neighbourhood development plans and by giving these plans full legal effect at an earlier stage. - The Town and Country Planning (Brownfield Land Register) Regulations 2017 - The regulations require local authorities to prepare and maintain registers of brownfield land that is suitable for residential development. - The Town and Country Planning (Permission in Principle) Order 2017 the Order provides that sites entered on Part 2 of the new brownfield 	No indicators or targets.	<p>The Local Plan policies should take into account well-advanced neighbourhood plans.</p> <p>The Local Plan should promote and prioritise development of brownfield land.</p>	Ensure that there is an SA objective that encourages development of brownfield land.

Strategy, Plan or Programme	Key objectives relevant to Local Plan and SA	Key targets and indicators relevant to Local Plan and SA	Implications for the Local Plan	Implications for SA
	<p>registers will be granted permission in principle.</p> <p>The regulations and order above aim to improve the quality and consistency of data held by local planning authorities, which will provide certainty for developers and communities, encouraging investment in local areas.</p>			

Appendix 3

Baseline information

Community

Population

Population size and migration

- 1.1 The UK mid-2016 population estimates⁷ suggest that Eastleigh Borough has a population of 129,635 people. The population has increased by 7.8% in a decade between the 2001 and 2011 census and by over a third (37%) in the three decades between 1981 and 2011 (the Borough's current boundaries were established in 1974). The Office for National Statistics Subnational Population Projections 2014 (which are based on recent demographic trends)⁸, anticipate a steady increase in the population in Eastleigh Borough in the 25 year period between 2014 and 2039, with the population growing by approximately 20%.

Population density

- 1.2 According to the 2011 Census 9.4% of Eastleigh Borough's residents live in rural areas and the Borough has a population density of about 15.7 persons per hectare. This is higher than in neighbouring authorities, including Fareham (15.0), Test Valley (1.9) and Winchester (1.8).

Age structure

- 1.3 Eastleigh Borough had more births than deaths in 2015. The total number of births was 1,468 and the total number of deaths 1,042⁹. The age profile of Eastleigh Borough is similar to the county, regional and national averages, with a slightly larger proportion of the population being of working age than for Hampshire as a whole.
- 1.4 The Office for National Statistics Subnational Population Projections 2014¹⁰ anticipate that the proportion of people aged 65 and over will increase more than other age groups, from 18.3% in 2014 to 24.8% in 2039. The proportion of people aged 14 or under is expected to decrease a little from 17.9% to 17.5% over the same period. Despite this decrease, the dependency ratio is forecast to rise as there will be more 'dependents', mainly older adults, being supported by relatively fewer people of working age.¹¹

Ethnicity

- 1.5 Data from the 2011 census show that 91.8% of the Borough's population was 'White British', with 3.0% 'Asian', 2.9% 'White Other' and 1.4% 'Mixed'. Ethnic minorities (i.e. ethnic groups other than 'White British') increased from 4.6% to 8.2% of the population between the 2001 and 2011 Censuses. Amongst the 'White Other' ethnic group, there was a range of backgrounds including many European nationalities.¹²

Housing

House prices and affordability

- 1.6 Eastleigh Borough is part of the wider Southampton Housing Market Area (HMA). House prices in Eastleigh Borough are lower than the neighbouring adjacent locations of Winchester, Fareham and Test Valley, but higher than in Southampton and the nearby authorities in the neighbouring

⁷ ONS (2016) Population Estimates for UK, England and Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland.
<https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/populationandmigration/populationestimates/datasets/populationestimatesforukenglandandwalesandscotlandandnorthernireland>

⁸ ONS (2016) Subnational population projections for England Statistical bulletins: 2014-based projections.
<https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/populationandmigration/populationprojections/bulletins/subnationalpopulationprojectionsforengland/2014basedprojections>

⁹ Hampshire County Council Facts and Figures (2016) Eastleigh Births and Deaths Factsheet.
<http://documents.hants.gov.uk/population/TrendBDFactsheet-Eastleigh2015.pdf>

¹⁰ ONS (2016) Subnational population projections for England Statistical bulletins: 2014-based projections.
<https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/populationandmigration/populationprojections/bulletins/subnationalpopulationprojectionsforengland/2014basedprojections>

¹¹ ONS (2016) Subnational population projections for England Statistical bulletins: 2014-based projections.
<https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/populationandmigration/populationprojections/bulletins/subnationalpopulationprojectionsforengland/2014basedprojections>

¹² Hampshire County Council Facts and Figures (2016) Eastleigh 2011 Census Factsheet.
http://www3.hants.gov.uk/2011_census_eastleigh_summary_factsheet.pdf

Portsmouth HMA, Gosport, Havant and Portsmouth¹³. The median house price in Eastleigh Borough between February 2017 and February 2018 was £275,170.¹⁴

- 1.7 The South Hampshire Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) 2014 and Objectively-Assessed Housing Need Update 2016 were commissioned by the Partnership for Urban South Hampshire (PUSH) in order to support on-going work on local plans. There are four distinct local housing markets in Eastleigh Borough: Chandler's Ford; the town of Eastleigh; Hedge End which is north east of the M27; and the area south of the M27 which borders Southampton Water.
- 1.8 Eastleigh Borough has a broad mix of housing types including flats, terraced, semi-detached and detached housing. Owner occupation is higher than the HMA average, in part influenced by a housing generally focused toward family homes. The Borough has a requirement that new market housing provision should focus on two, three and four bed properties, whilst affordable housing delivery should consist of one and two bedroom properties.
- 1.9 Affordability of housing is a significant issue in the Borough of Eastleigh, as it is elsewhere. This is reflected in the ratio between average house prices and average salaries. In 2016, house prices in Eastleigh Borough were 9.3 times earnings¹⁵. The shortage in affordable housing is reflected in the continuing increase in the number of households in the Borough on the Local Authority Housing Register. The Hampshire Home Choice (HHC) Register is used for the allocation of social housing for the Borough of Eastleigh. The number of applicants registered with Eastleigh Borough Council on the HHC register on 1st April 2017 was 1,845.¹⁶
- 1.10 According to the Objectively-Assessed Housing Need Update¹⁷, trend-based demographic projections using the latest data indicate a need for 546 dwellings per annum. The economic evidence does not provide an upside to this, showing a need for 527 homes per annum.
- 1.11 The affordable housing evidence points to a need for between 360 and 453 affordable homes per year, representing 66-83% of the demographic-led need. Market signals provide evidence of moderate affordability pressures.
- 1.12 Altogether, the Objectively-Assessed Housing Need Update¹⁸ suggests that, taking account of the market signals and the need to boost affordable housing provision, there is a need for 580 homes per annum during 2011-2036. However, Eastleigh Borough Council has since undertaken an update (taking account of the Inspector's appeal decisions) which identified the need for 630 dwellings per annum.

Health

Health indicators

- 1.13 The health of people in Eastleigh Borough is generally better than the England average. Average life expectancy for the period 2015-2015 at birth was 81.9 years for men and 84.3 years for women, which was slightly higher than the averages for England (79.5 and 83.1).¹⁹
- 1.14 In Year 6, 17.7% (238) of children are classified as obese, which is better than the England average. However, estimated levels of adult excess weight are worse than the England average. Despite this, estimated levels of adult smoking and physical activity are better than the England average. Rates of sexually transmitted infections and TB are better than average. Rates of long term unemployment, early deaths from cardiovascular diseases and early deaths from cancer are also better than average. Therefore, on most measures of health, the Borough does significantly better than England as a whole.²⁰

¹³ Land Registry (2017) UK House Price Index. <http://landregistry.data.gov.uk/app/ukhpi>

¹⁴ UK House Price Index (2018) <http://landregistry.data.gov.uk/app/ukhpi>

¹⁵ ONS (2017) Housing affordability in England and Wales: 1997 to 2016.

<https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/housing/bulletins/housingaffordabilityinenglandandwales/1997to2016>

¹⁶ Hampshire Home Choice (2017) Hampshire Home Choice Annual Report April 2017.

<https://www.hampshirehomechoice.org.uk/Data/Pub/PublicWebsite/ImageLibrary/HHC%20Annual%20Report%202017.pdf>

¹⁷ GL Hearn (2016) Objectively-Assessed Housing Need. http://www.push.gov.uk/2c_objectively_assessed_housing_need_update.pdf

¹⁸ GL Hearn (2016) Objectively-Assessed Housing Need. http://www.push.gov.uk/2c_objectively_assessed_housing_need_update.pdf

¹⁹ Public Health England (2017) Eastleigh District Health Profile 2017. <http://fingertipsreports.phe.org.uk/health-profiles/2017/e07000086.pdf>

²⁰ Public Health England (2017) Eastleigh District Health Profile 2017. <http://fingertipsreports.phe.org.uk/health-profiles/2017/e07000086.pdf>

Health inequalities

- 1.15 While the Borough's health levels are generally good, there remain a number of health inequalities across the Borough, which is closely linked to overall deprivation levels. Pockets of health deprivation exist in the wards of Eastleigh South, Eastleigh Central, Bursledon and Old Netley, Bishopstoke West, and Netley Abbey²¹. Life expectancy is 4.2 years lower for men and 6.6 years lower for women in the most deprived areas of Eastleigh Borough than in the least deprived.²²

Quality of life

Indices of Multiple Deprivation

- 1.16 Overall, the levels of relative deprivation in Eastleigh Borough are low. According to the Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD), in 2015 the Borough ranked 298 out of England's 326 districts (where 1 is the most deprived), placing it in the least deprived quartile of districts in England. The average multiple deprivation score for Eastleigh Borough was 10.02 compared with the Hampshire score of 11.92 (where a higher score means a greater level of deprivation).
- 1.17 Whilst deprivation is generally low within Eastleigh Borough, about 10% (2,400) of children live in low income families²³. Pockets of deprivation can be found across the Borough, within Eastleigh South, Eastleigh Central, Bursledon and Old Netley, Netley Abbey and Bishopstoke West areas.²⁴

Health

- 1.18 In the 2011 Census, 84.5% of people in the Borough reported that they were in good or very good health, while 3.9% reported that they were of bad or very bad health. The 2001 Census also found that 15.3% of the people in the Borough said they had a long-term illness or disability that limited their day-to-day activities, which was lower than the South East and English averages. Indicators of child health are relatively good. The percentage of children classified as obese in Year 6 is much lower than the England average (17.7%), while rates of alcohol-specific stays in hospital for those under 18 are significantly lower than the England average.²⁵
- 1.19 In line with national and regional trends, estimated levels of obesity are high²⁶. According to Public Health England estimates for 2013-2015, 67.7% of adults in the Borough had excess weight, which compared with 65.8% for Hampshire, 63.3% for the SE Region, and 64.8% for England. An estimated 19.1% of adults in the Borough were classed as obese compared with 21.1% for Hampshire, 20.3% for SE Region, and 21.9% for England.
- 1.20 According to Sport England's Active People Survey 2016²⁷, levels of physical activity within the Borough have increased over time. The percentage of physically active adults (those achieving at least 150 minutes of physical activity per week in accordance with the UK Chief Medical Officer's recommended guidelines) in the Borough has increased from 56.4% in 2012/13 to 63.7% in 2017. The English average in 2017 was 57%.
- 1.21 There are nine venues in Eastleigh Borough with gyms of 20 stations or larger that offer pay as you train access to the public. All of these venues also have exercise studio spaces and offer class programmes in addition to those available at stand alone parish, church and community halls.
- 1.22 Other than the Council's flagship Fleming Park Leisure Centre gym, the rest of the nine gyms are on education sites and most have restricted access to the public during the day in term time. The existing Fleming Park Leisure Centre has circa 100 stations and is extremely busy during peak hours. The Borough Council appointed developers in March 2016 to build a replacement for the exiting Fleming Park Leisure Centre on land adjacent to the existing centre. As such, the gym will

²¹ Open Data Communities (2010)

²² Public Health England (2017) Eastleigh District Health Profile 2017. <http://fingertipsreports.phe.org.uk/health-profiles/2017/e07000086.pdf>

²³ Public Health England (2017) Eastleigh District Health Profile 2017. <http://fingertipsreports.phe.org.uk/health-profiles/2017/e07000086.pdf>

²⁴ Eastleigh Borough Council Authority (2017) Annual Monitoring Report 2016-2017. <https://www.eastleigh.gov.uk/media/2862/annual-monitoring-report-2016-17-fv.pdf>

²⁵ Public Health England (2017) Eastleigh District Health Profile 2017. <http://fingertipsreports.phe.org.uk/health-profiles/2017/e07000086.pdf>

²⁶ Eastleigh Borough Council Authority (2017) Annual Monitoring Report 2016-2017. <https://www.eastleigh.gov.uk/media/2862/annual-monitoring-report-2016-17-fv.pdf>

²⁷ Sport England, Active People Survey 2014/15 via Public Health England's Health Profiles

increased by approximately 50% from 2018. In addition, a further eight commercial gyms have been identified that offer more than 20 station gyms. There is also good supply of large-scale gym and fitness facilities within the drive time catchment of the Borough.

- 1.23 The assessment of need findings for gyms in Eastleigh Borough concludes that once the larger gym is available at Fleming Park Leisure Centre, there will be no need for further pay and play provision to serve community demand in the north of the Borough in the short (1-3yrs) or medium term (3-5yrs).
- 1.24 According to EBC's Sports Facility Needs Assessment & Playing Pitch Strategy Update²⁸, there are three public swimming pools in the Borough at Fleming Park Leisure Centre, Hamble Sport Complex and Wildern School Leisure Centre. These three municipal and school pools are supplemented by private members club pools at four commercial health club sites. Additionally, ten community pools in neighbouring Boroughs are located within the Council's existing accessibility standard (i.e. an approximate 15 minute drive time). The new Fleming Park Leisure Centre will include a 25m eight lane pool and 20m (x10m) learner pool, increasing the water space available by approximately 180m² from 420m² to 600m².
- 1.25 The assessment of need findings for swimming pools shows that, at current population levels, demand for swimming space in Eastleigh Borough in the peak hours exceeds the current available supply. However, the current supply shortfall should be largely addressed by the opening of the new Fleming Park Leisure Centre and the opening of Holy Hill Leisure Centre in Sarisbury Green in Test Valley District. This venue is accessible to residents in the south and east of Eastleigh Borough.
- 1.26 As in the case for the rest of England, obesity is a key issue for the Borough, as it will have a substantial impact on the future health of many individuals and increase their risk of suffering a range of diseases, including heart disease. In addition, the trend towards an ageing population will have significant implications for health and social care services in the Borough. It will also increase the dependency ratio, so that in the future there are likely to be more retired people, relative to the number of people in work.²⁹

Crime

- 1.27 Figures from 2016-2017 indicate that the overall distribution of recorded crimes within the Borough was relatively consistent with the distribution for the whole of England and Wales. However, a slightly smaller proportion of the locally recorded crimes were for criminal damage and arson, domestic burglary, drug offences, robbery, shoplifting and vehicle offences. A slightly larger proportion was recorded for non-domestic burglary, public order offences and violent offences. Violent crime with or without injury and criminal damage including arson are the main forms of crime within the Borough³⁰. The overall crime rate for the Borough from 2013-2017 has been consistently lower than the average rate for Hampshire.
- 1.28 A strategic assessment carried out in 2007 indicated that anti-social behaviour, often associated with alcohol or drugs is a particular problem, particularly with respect to the town of Eastleigh. Over half of offenders in the town of Eastleigh were under the influence of alcohol and/or drugs, and both offenders and victims are likely to be males aged 18-30.³¹ A Community Safety Partnership Strategic Assessment was conducted for the year 2015/2016. Large increases were reported in violence (+70%) and public order offences (+93%). Although, it should be noted that increases in these offences is in part due to Hampshire Police's greater focus on accurately recording crime³². Antisocial Behaviour and Violent Crime account for 34% and 17% of all crime consecutively.
- 1.29 Within the Borough of Eastleigh, there are three areas which had comparatively higher numbers of recorded crime in 2015. These areas are Fair Oak & Bishopstoke; Hedge End, West End & Botley;

²⁸ Continuum Sport and Leisure (2017) Sport Facility Needs Assessment & Playing Pitch Strategy Update. <https://www.eastleigh.gov.uk/media/1655/draft-eastleigh-sports-facility-and-playing-pitches-report.pdf>

²⁹ Eastleigh Borough Council (2015) Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011-2036 Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report, June 2015.

³⁰ Eastleigh Borough Council Authority (2017) Annual Monitoring Report 2016-2017. <https://www.eastleigh.gov.uk/media/2862/annual-monitoring-report-2016-17-fv.pdf>

³¹ Eastleigh Borough Council (2008) Evidence Base for the Borough of Eastleigh.

³² Community Safety Partnership (2016) Eastleigh Community Safety Partnership Strategic Assessment 2016. <http://meetings.eastleigh.gov.uk/documents/s50015496/2016%20Strategic%20assessment%20FINAL.pdf>

and Bursledon, Hamble & Hound. The areas of Chandler's Ford & Hittingbury and Eastleigh have fewer numbers of recorded crime.³³

Arts and culture

- 1.30 Eastleigh Borough has a rich aviation, railway and maritime heritage, significant historic monuments, international cricket at the Ageas Bowl ground and a number of local museums and libraries.
- 1.31 Eastleigh Town Centre is the home of The Point, a centre for the development of contemporary performance. In the north of the Borough, there is a 400 seat Thornden Concert hall and the nationally recognized jazz venue, The Concorde Club. There is a lack of cultural facilities in the south of the Borough, although this was partly addressed with the building of a 300+ seat theatre at Wildern School, the Berry Theatre.
- 1.32 There are currently over 60 public artworks located within the Borough, ranging from mosaic, to sculpture, metalwork, glasswork and murals. Public art in Eastleigh Borough is promoted through the Borough Council's Public Arts Strategy and delivered through the Council's Community Investment Programme.

Recreation and amenity (including open space and green infrastructure)

- 1.33 The Borough contains an extensive array of recreation facilities³⁴ including:
- Places Leisure Eastleigh;
 - The Point (Eastleigh) and the Berry Theatre (Hedge End)– theatre, art gallery and dance centre;
 - Country parks at Manor Farm (Botley/ Bursledon), Itchen Valley (West End), Lakeside (Eastleigh) and Royal Victoria (Netley);
 - The Itchen Way footpath;
 - Strawberry Trail;
 - Hamble Rail Trail;
 - Parts of the Solent Way along the coast;
 - Parts of the national cycle network including between Hamble and the eastern boundary of Southampton;
 - River Hamble – major centre for marinas and sailing activities;
 - The Ageas Bowl – international cricket venue and home to Hampshire Cricket;
 - Community schools with enhanced facilities;
 - Golf Courses; and
 - Allotments.
- 1.34 According to the most recent Open Space Assessment conducted in 2017³⁵, there is approximately 956 hectares of open space including Amenity Space, Country Parks, Green routes and Allotments. The Borough of Eastleigh is also within easy reach of other regional recreational facilities such as those within Southampton, the New Forest and Winchester.
- 1.35 Most Local Areas have good access to a range of open space types; further detail is provided below.
- 1.36 The majority of residents are within 300 m of an amenity open space of fair or good quality, however, there are some deficiencies, particularly at:
- Chandler's Ford (north and west).

³³ Community Safety Partnership (2016) Eastleigh Community Safety Partnership Strategic Assessment 2016. <http://meetings.eastleigh.gov.uk/documents/s50015496/2016%20Strategic%20assessment%20FINAL.pdf>

³⁴ Eastleigh (2015) Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011-2036, Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report, June 2015..

³⁵ LUC (2017) Eastleigh Borough Open Space Needs Assessment 2017: A needs assessment to inform the Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011-2036

- Hedge End (north east and south west).
 - Botley (north).
 - Netley (east).
- 1.37 There is consistent indication across the quantity and accessibility indicators that Hedge End is an area where deficiencies in access to open space exist. This open space deficiency overlaps with parts of the Borough which experience relative deprivation in terms of health, including at Eastleigh, Shamblehurst and West End.
- 1.38 In terms of quality, the majority of open spaces have been assessed to be of fair or good quality. Those poorer quality sites which are located within areas of general deficiency should be improved as a priority. Both Bishopstoke and Netley have many open spaces which are currently only fair quality, and the quality of these sites should be enhanced, particularly Mount Pleasant Recreation Ground at Bishopstoke, which in light of its size, should offer a wider range of facilities.
- 1.39 There is good provision of country parks, which are well dispersed to serve the whole population of Eastleigh Borough.
- 1.40 There is generally good provision of play space for children in the Borough, although deficiencies exist with some residential areas having poor access to local children's play space, including within:
- Hamble-le-Rice, particularly the southern and eastern areas.
 - Horton Heath.
 - The eastern part of Hiltingbury.
 - Millers Dale South to the west of Hursley Road.
 - Some parts of Hedge End.
 - Boorley Green.
- 1.41 Provision of allotments in Eastleigh Borough is generally good, with all Local Areas except Hiltingbury and Chandler's Ford meeting the national quantity standard at present.
- 1.42 Taking into account the projected population change for 2036, the provision of Allotments per 1,000 population does decrease across all the Local Areas, and in addition to Chandler's Ford and Hiltingbury, Bishopstoke, Fair Oak and Horton Heath also fall below the recommended quantity standard.
- 1.43 Accessibility to allotments is more varied with notable differences between settlements. Areas of deficiency of allotments within the recommended 900 metre accessibility standard include:
- Hedge End.
 - West End.
 - The southern part of Horton Heath.
 - The northern and central areas of Chandler's Ford.
 - The southern part of Hamble-le-Rice.
- 1.44 Multi-functional areas of open space and links between them deliver a wide range of environmental and quality of life benefits for local communities. These include biodiversity, landscape and culture, recreation, health and wellbeing and natural resources. The Borough's country parks, countryside, the rivers, in particular the Rivers Itchen and Hamble, and the coast are key green infrastructure (GI) assets.
- 1.45 The Open Space Study sets out a number of recommendations to ensure adequate open space provision in the period up to 2036. Key recommendations include:
- A need for open space sites to be more accessible and provided and maintained to a higher quality.
 - Ensure that appropriate, good quality provision of open space is incorporated within planned development.

- Development contributions to the enhancement and maintenance of existing facilities where quantity is sufficient to accommodate the population increase.
- Development should create new local amenity open spaces, play facilities and allotments within the strategic development area, to address identified deficiency.
- Better connectivity between residential areas and employment areas, leisure destinations and open spaces can help to reduce traffic congestion and improve air quality in the Borough.
- Green routes should be created or upgraded to provide access to a variety of users including people with disabilities, pushchairs and bicycles as well as those on foot.

Economy

Economy

Economic sectors

- 1.46 In 2016, the total number of businesses within the Borough stood at 6,735. This is a year on year consecutive increase since 2011. Business births have also risen year on year since then. Business deaths in 2016 have also increased since the previous year of 2015. However, overall this is positive as there is a much lower level of increase in business deaths (10.6%) compared to the level of increase in business births (64.2%) when compared to the previous monitoring period. This rate of business survival is slightly below the County level but is high compared to the regional and national rates.³⁶
- 1.47 There is a higher proportion of jobs in the following sectors, when compared to the national averages: manufacturing; construction; wholesale and retail trade; repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles; transportation and storage; information and communication; financial and insurance activities; real estate activities; and professional, scientific and technical activities. The largest broad sector employer is distribution, transport, accommodation and food³⁷.
- 1.48 2016 data provided by the ONS relating to GVA per employee shows that the productivity of the Borough is very similar to the national level and lower than the South East³⁸. One of the aims of the Solent LEP strategy is to close the gap in productivity with the South East. In relation to GVA per head of resident population the Borough has a large workforce relative to its economic output, compared to the UK and the South East. This is due to the relative importance of certain sectors, such as retail, construction and manufacturing.

Employment and unemployment

- 1.49 Overall, the Borough is a reasonably prosperous area, with approximately 64,000 jobs in 2016³⁹. Prysmian Cables, Southampton Airport, B&Q and Ageas Insurance are the largest employers.⁴⁰
- 1.50 Unemployment is low in the Borough, and although it increased and stabilised at a higher level after the financial crisis, the most recent figures for 2017 suggest that it has fallen back to pre-recession levels of approximately 3.2% of the economically active population. This compares with an unemployment rate of 4.4% nationally (for Great Britain).⁴¹
- 1.51 In January 2018, the figure for Jobseeker Allowance claimants as a % of working-age population (16-64 years old) was 1%, which is less than the figure for the South East (1.2%)⁴². Between October 2016 and September 2017, 86.8% of the traditional working age population (16-64 years

³⁶ Eastleigh Borough Council Authority (2017) Annual Monitoring Report 2016-2017. <https://www.eastleigh.gov.uk/media/2862/annual-monitoring-report-2016-17-fv.pdf>

³⁷ EBIS at Hampshire County Council (2017) Eastleigh Local Economy 2016

³⁸ Eastleigh Borough Council Authority (2016) Annual Monitoring Report 2015-2016. <https://www.eastleigh.gov.uk/media/1631/amr-2015-16-final-version.pdf>

³⁹ Eastleigh Borough Council Authority (2016) Annual Monitoring Report 2015-2016. <https://www.eastleigh.gov.uk/media/1631/amr-2015-16-final-version.pdf>

⁴⁰ Hampshire County Council (2015) Eastleigh Borough Economic Profile 2013/14

⁴¹ NOMIS (2018) Labour Market Profile – Eastleigh. <https://www.nomisweb.co.uk/reports/lmp/la/1946157302/report.aspx>

⁴² NOMIS (2018) Labour Market Profile – Eastleigh. <https://www.nomisweb.co.uk/reports/lmp/la/1946157302/report.aspx>

old) was economically active. This compares to economic activity levels of 81.2% for the South East and 78.1% for the UK.⁴³

- 1.52 Levels of economically active persons within the Borough have often been slightly higher than regional and national levels since June 2012.

Education and skills

- 1.53 Skill levels have some scope for improvement within the Borough relative to levels elsewhere within the South East, however Eastleigh Borough compares favourably with the UK as a whole. The Borough has higher proportions of residents with qualifications at all NVQ levels 1-3 (more complex work activities down to the attainment of five or more GCSEs at grades A-C or equivalent) than for the UK and the South East. However, the Borough has slightly lower levels of residents with the highest level qualifications (NVQ4 and above) than the UK and the South East⁴⁴. In 2015 there was a reduction of around 4,600 residents in Eastleigh Borough with a degree qualification or higher. This is most likely due to the decision to increase tuition fees in 2010.
- 1.54 According to the Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings 2017, the median gross weekly earnings within the Borough for full time workers (resident) was £531.70 compared to £552.30 for Great Britain.⁴⁵
- 1.55 The ONS Annual Population Survey (Oct 2016-Sep 2017) suggests that 43% of residents are employed in occupations associated with the knowledge economy (Managers, Directors and Senior Officials; Professional Occupations; and Associate Professional & Technical Occupations)⁴⁶. The decline in numbers of residents with formal qualifications such as university degrees, as highlighted above, has the potential to result in a significant decline in residents in professional occupations and an increase in residents with occupation in skilled, semi-skilled and unskilled occupations.

Sites and premises

- 1.56 The Borough includes major industrial estates at Eastleigh, Chandler's Ford, Hedge End, Hamble and several office campuses in Eastleigh and Hedge End. Statistics published by the Department for Communities and Local Government showed that in 2008, Eastleigh had approximately 2,200 office and industrial premises amounting to 1,100,000 m² of floor space, of which the vast majority (86%) was for industrial or storage and distribution use (Use Classes B2 and B8).⁴⁷
- 1.57 There have been decreases in industrial floor space and increases in office floor space within the Borough between 2002 and 2012. Whilst this appears concerning, given the reliance on the transport and storage and manufacturing sectors to provide jobs within the Borough, it is likely to reflect economic restructuring as manufacturers seek to occupy smaller units and sites. Since 2006, land monitoring data suggests that industrial and warehousing development in the Borough has typically involved less than 5,000m² of new floorspace per annum.⁴⁸
- 1.58 Although there was an overall decrease in industrial floorspace between 2002 and 2012, there was an overall increase in the number of industrial properties, which implies that there has not been a reduction in industrial activity that has been in proportion with the loss of floorspace. This conclusion is supported by the fact that the manufacturing sector still provides a relatively high proportion of local jobs⁴⁹. Data on recent (April 2011-March 2014) additional floorspace completions for retail and other town centre uses show that retail development largely took place within the defined town and district centres (Eastleigh, Hedge End, and Chandler's Ford). Since then, 8,310m² of new retail floor space was also developed at Hedge End Retail Park. Since 2013, there have also been a number of planning permissions that relax restrictions on the types of goods that can be sold in out-of-centre locations at Channon Retail Park (Eastleigh) and by the M27

⁴³ NOMIS (2018) Labour Market Profile – Eastleigh. <https://www.nomisweb.co.uk/reports/lmp/la/1946157302/report.aspx>

⁴⁴ NOMIS (2018) Labour Market Profile – Eastleigh. <https://www.nomisweb.co.uk/reports/lmp/la/1946157302/report.aspx>

⁴⁵ NOMIS (2018) Labour Market Profile – Eastleigh. <https://www.nomisweb.co.uk/reports/lmp/la/1946157302/report.aspx>

⁴⁶ NOMIS (2018) Labour Market Profile – Eastleigh. <https://www.nomisweb.co.uk/reports/lmp/la/1946157302/report.aspx>

⁴⁷ Eastleigh Borough Employment Land Review Part 3 (2014)

⁴⁸ Hampshire County Council (2014) Land Monitoring data, 2006-2014.

⁴⁹ NOMIS (2018) Labour Market Profile – Eastleigh. <https://www.nomisweb.co.uk/reports/lmp/la/1946157302/report.aspx>

at Hedge End. This is a clear indication of pressure for out-of-centre retail development within the Borough.⁵⁰

- 1.59 At March 2014, 7.5% of total units or 15.4% of total floor space was available for industrial uses (including warehousing and storage) and 10.0% of total units or 11.7% of total floorspace were available for office premises uses. The relatively low rate for available industrial premises indicates that there may be an undersupply of industrial property within the Borough⁵¹. The higher rate of available floorspace reflects the existence of a number of large sites for industrial/storage use at Eastleigh River Side. With regard to office floorspace, these availability rates provide no evidence of oversupply.
- 1.60 According to Eastleigh Borough's Council's Retail and Leisure Needs Assessment⁵² the main commitments and new store developments in the area include:
- Eastleigh: A new retail unit (Coles Close, Twyford Road) comprising a gross floor area of 1,489 sqm comparison goods retail.
 - Eastleigh: A ground and first floor unit (within the Mall Atrium, Swan Centre) of 1,845 sqm comparison foods retail.
 - Hedge End (Out of Centre): A new 'goods online' loading bay, replacement management suite, additional sales area, educational facility, dentist unit and new customer lobby (extension to Sainsbury's, Tollbar Way). The increase in the retail sales area equates to 120 sqm for which is assumed to be the sale of convenience goods.
 - Hedge End (Out of Centre): A new retail unit (Hedge End Retail Park) with a gross floor area of 929 sqm for sale of pet related products with associated veterinary services facility, and alterations to car park and vehicle access point.
 - Hedge End (Out of Centre): An extension to Unit 1a (Bradbeers Retail Park) to create additional gross floorspace of 1,437 sqm.
 - Fair Oak: Redevelopment of a garden centre to create an additional retail floor area of 214 sqm gross.
 - West End: Construction of a single storey unit with associated car parking and altered access, yard and bin store and landscaping, to create an additional gross floorspace of 373 sqm.
 - Chandler's Ford: Subdivision of a vacant retail unit to create two A1 retail units, 1,747 sqm floorspace for Aldi and 1,348 sqm floorspace for Poundstretcher.
- 1.61 In addition to the above, retail floorspace is also identified as part of new local centres planned to serve two strategic housing sites in the Borough, in Eastleigh and Botley.
- 1.62 According to the Retail and Leisure Needs Assessment⁵³, there is no capacity in Eastleigh Borough for a new superstore-format floorspace until 2027 (454 sqm net). This capacity is then forecast to increase to 1,500 sqm net by 2032 and to 2,345 sqm net by 2036. The results indicate that the Borough could: (1) deliver a new foodstore towards the end of the study period; (2) deliver a number of smaller format stores; or (3) build extensions to existing stores.
- 1.63 In the town of Eastleigh, there is no forecast capacity to support new convenience floorspace after taking account of planned convenience floorspace in the town centre and surrounding out-of-centre locations (including a new local centre). For Chandler's Ford there is limited forecast capacity for some 357 sqm net by 2036. This could support an extension to an existing store, or a smaller convenience store format. For Hedge End, there is potential need of 873 sqm net by 2036. This provides potential scope for a supermarket, or possibly a deep discounter (i.e. Aldi or Lidl), or a number of smaller convenience stores.

⁵⁰ Eastleigh (2015), Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011-2036, Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report, June 2015.

⁵¹ Eastleigh Borough Council (2014) Eastleigh Borough Employment Land Review Part 1, Background Paper: EC1a , Economic & Employment Land Baseline Report, July 2014.

⁵² Carter Jonas (2017) Retail and Leisure Needs Assessment 2017. <https://www.eastleigh.gov.uk/media/1649/retail-and-leisure-needs-assessment-july-2017.pdf>

⁵³ Carter Jonas (2017) Retail and Leisure Needs Assessment 2017. <https://www.eastleigh.gov.uk/media/1649/retail-and-leisure-needs-assessment-july-2017.pdf>

- 1.64 For local centres, there is forecast capacity for 301 sqm net by 2036. This would support one or two smaller convenience stores in some of the centres, subject to market demand. The more limited capacity generated by the local centres reflects the scale of their retail offer, their market shares and their role and function in the hierarchy and network of centre; principally serving the day-to-day needs of their local catchment populations. For the rest of the Borough, there is total forecast capacity for up to 857 sqm net by 2036. This is mainly being generated by the Tesco at Bursledon and would support either an extension to this store, or a new deep discounter or a number of smaller convenience stores.
- 1.65 Additionally, should development proceed in the strategic housing growth areas this will further absorb convenience need of up to 725 sqm net.
- 1.66 There is limited Borough-wide need for comparison goods (clothing, footwear, household and recreational goods) over the short term (up to 2022), but need increases thereafter to 6,360 sqm net by 2027, 12,935 sqm net by 2032 and 18,564 sqm net by 2036.
- 1.67 For the town of Eastleigh, there is no forecast capacity over the short term (up to 2022) after taking account of all known commitments. There is some need in 2027 for 1,023 sqm net, increasing to 2,809 sqm net by 2032 and 4,365 sqm net by the end of the study period (2036). For Chandler's Ford, there is forecast capacity for 258 sqm net in 2022, increasing to 1,857 sqm net by 2036.
- 1.68 For the Borough's Local Centres there is limited forecast capacity for 321 sqm net by 2027, increasing to 966 sqm net in 2036. These forecasts are expected and reflect the limited provision of comparison goods in smaller centres and their role and function within the Borough's retail hierarchy. Finally, for the rest of the Borough, there is limited forecast capacity for 342 sqm net in 2027, increasing to 894 sqm net by 2036.
- 1.69 Additionally, should development proceed in the strategic housing growth areas this will further absorb comparison goods need of up to 1,177 sqm net. This would be met from the comparison goods capacity already identified.
- 1.70 Overall, the majority of the forecast capacity for new retail floorspace occurs towards the end of the study/plan period (i.e. between 2032 and 2036). This forecast capacity over the long term should, according to the Retail and Leisure Needs Assessment be directed to Eastleigh Town Centre and the Borough's District Centres first, in accordance with national and local plan policy objectives. The distribution of the forecast capacity for new retail floorspace should reflect the network and hierarchy of centres, and the relative role and function of the Council's centres.
- 1.71 In terms of accommodating needs in full over the plan period in accordance with the NPPF, the Council has identified that the Barton Park site, located close to Eastleigh Town Centre, could represent the key strategic development opportunity at the present time.

Accessibility and transport

Transportation infrastructure

- 1.72 The main roads through Eastleigh Borough are the M3, A27, M27, A334, A335, A3024 and A3026. A network of lower category (A/B/C/unclassified) roads also serve the urban and rural areas. In addition, several rail lines pass through the Borough, which carry both passenger and freight traffic. These are:
- The South Western Mainline railway from London to Weymouth, with stations at Eastleigh and Southampton Airport Parkway;
 - The Botley line which runs from Eastleigh to Fareham with stations at Hedge End and Botley;
 - The Southampton-Fareham line which crosses the south of the Borough, with stations at Netley, Hamble and Bursledon; and
 - The Eastleigh to Romsey Line which serves Chandlers Ford.
- 1.73 The modal share of freight by rail at Southampton docks has grown in recent years so that 35% of all new containers now arrive or depart by rail following a series of upgrades to rail freight capability on the line in recent years. The Eastleigh Station area also acts as a significant terminal

for railway construction/aggregates traffic, railway infrastructure traffic and as a freight marshalling yard.⁵⁴

- 1.74 Southampton Airport is also situated within the Borough, and is linked to the rail network by Southampton Airport Parkway and to the strategic road network by the M27 at Junction 5. The airport serves 39 destinations, and is used by 1.8 million passengers per year. Southampton Airport Ltd's 2006 masterplan for the airport indicates that they wish to increase passenger numbers to 6 million passengers per annum by 2030. This may involve building a new terminal⁵⁵. Passenger numbers increased from 1.84 million passengers in 2005 to 1.95 million passengers in 2008 but then fell between 2008 and 2012 to 1.69 million passengers, but are gradually recovering towards their previous peak. Southampton Airport is almost totally reliant on one airline operator, Flybe, who operate 92% of all flights⁵⁶. The airport has a single runway which is just over 1,700 metres long. The length of the runway as well as the topography of the area surrounding the airport means that the routes which are economically viable to serve and the size of aircraft which can be used are limited.
- 1.75 2011 Census data shows that 3% of all journeys to work in the Borough are made by bus. The bus network in the Borough connects local centres as well as areas of employment, schools, colleges and areas outside of Eastleigh Borough. Most bus usage is primarily for shorter local journeys as the reasonably comprehensive rail network serves medium length and longer journeys.⁵⁷
- 1.76 Bluestar, First and Xelabus are the primary bus operators in Eastleigh Borough, with some of routes covered by Wheelers and Stagecoach. The bus industry is unstable with regular changes to some of the more peripheral routes, and some new operators entering the market whilst others have exited the market. This has created confusion amongst residents about the offer of bus services in some areas.⁵⁸
- 1.77 2011 Census data shows that 3% of all journeys to work are made by bicycle. There is variable provision in the Borough of off road/shared use cycle routes to support recreational and leisure cycling, in addition to the use of the road network⁵⁹. Cycle facility provision is relatively good in northern parts of Hedge End as well as from Bishopstoke to Eastleigh Town and from Southampton Airport to Chandlers Ford Business Parks. However, numerous gaps exist in the network of strategic routes, most notably along the A27 corridor and from Chandlers Ford to Southampton and to Winchester along Winchester Road. These larger gaps are also accompanied by gaps in the local network⁶⁰. There are now approximately 27km of cycleways in the borough centred mainly on the areas of Eastleigh and Hedge End.⁶¹
- 1.78 Eastleigh town centre has a relatively high proportion of residents cycling to work, as do areas across Chandler's Ford, Bishopstoke and Fair Oak. There are also patches of higher relative levels of cycling to work in Hamble, Bursledon and Netley. Despite the relatively good provision of cycle infrastructure in Hedge End the proportion of residents cycling to work is relatively low, likely due to the proximity to the M27 and car-based commuting patterns here.⁶²
- 1.79 Eastleigh Borough also has extensive walking routes consisting of non-designated footpaths and designation Public Rights of Way, including bridleways. Eastleigh as a Borough has a high proportion of residents walking to work, which is highest in Eastleigh town central area at up to 18%. The lowest percentage of walking occurs in the Hedge End area and northern Botley.⁶³

⁵⁴ Eastleigh (2015) Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011-2036, Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report, June 2015.

⁵⁵ Eastleigh Borough Council (2015) Transport Background Paper, December 2015.

⁵⁶ Centre for Aviation (2015) Flybe SWOT Analysis: strengths as an airline do not necessarily convert to sustainable profits <http://centreforaviation.com/analysis/flybe-swot-analysis-strengths-as-an-airline-do-not-necessarily-convert-to-sustainable-profits-208471>

⁵⁷ Eastleigh Borough Council (2015) Eastleigh Borough Council 2015, Bus Passenger Survey.

⁵⁸ Eastleigh (2015) Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011-2036, Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report, June 2015.

⁵⁹ UE Associates (2009) Partnership for Urban South Hampshire: Green Infrastructure Strategy, http://www.push.gov.uk/what_we_do/sustainability/documents/PUSH_GI_Strategy_Final_4_281009NDnp.pdf

⁶⁰ Eastleigh Borough Council (2015) Transport Background Paper, December 2015

⁶¹ Eastleigh Borough Council (2015) Background Paper T1: Transport, December 2015.

⁶² Eastleigh Borough Council (2006) Cycle Strategy 2006-2011, Eastleigh Borough Council

⁶³ Hampshire County Council (2015) Eastleigh Strategic Transport Study Interim Report, December 2015.

1.80 According to the PUSH Green Infrastructure Strategy, whilst pedestrian paths and public rights of way are widespread in the Borough, they sometimes lack connectivity.⁶⁴

Traffic flows

1.81 The highway and rail networks support a large amount of movement into the Borough from commuters who live elsewhere but work in Eastleigh Borough. In particular, over 10,000 commuters travel from Southampton to Eastleigh Borough each day⁶⁵; there is a similarly large out-commuting flow from Eastleigh Borough to Southampton. In addition, there are significant commuting flows from Eastleigh Borough to Winchester and from New Forest District into Eastleigh Borough.⁶⁶

1.82 There are substantial numbers of commuting trips which start and end within the Borough in the Hedge End, West End and central areas in Eastleigh Town. In Bursledon, Hamble and Hound, fewer commuting trips are to destinations within the Borough. Many "self-contained" commuting trips (i.e. with a start and end point within the Borough) may still cross the Borough boundary as part of their routes. Prime examples would be Hedge End and Bursledon/Hamble/Netley Hamble to Eastleigh or Chandlers Ford journeys, which are likely to use the M27, passing out of the Borough en route (and also using a strategic link for short/medium distance commuting journeys).⁶⁷

1.83 Across the South Hampshire area, highway trips are projected to grow by around 16% by 2036⁶⁸ with traffic flows likely to increase on all sections of the M3 and M27 within the Borough. Significant congestion occurs in Eastleigh Town when restrictions and incidents occur on the southbound links between the M3 and M27, where traffic intending to travel eastbound on the M27 is routed through the town to Junction 5 of the M27⁶⁹. Traffic congestion affects both the strategic and local road network in the Borough. Congestion on the strategic road network in the Borough is a significant issue. Most of the main roads (including motorways) through the Borough are congested or close to capacity during peak hours. Projected increases in traffic flows on the M3, M27 and local roads could worsen this. Congestion is an issue at the following locations in the Borough:⁷⁰

- B3037 Bishopstoke Road, Eastleigh, as it joins the Twyford Road roundabout
- A335 Twyford Road between Allbrook Hill and the Twyford Road roundabout
- A335 Southampton Road, Eastleigh towards junction 5 of the M27
- Passfield Avenue, Eastleigh · Stoneham Lane, Eastleigh Approach roads to Junction 7 of the M27
- B3397 Hamble Lane including the approaches to the Windhover roundabout

Travel to work

1.84 According to 2011 Census data, a higher proportion of Borough residents travel to work by car (76%) than the regional (66%) and national averages (62%). The areas with the highest proportions of residents who make single occupancy vehicle journeys to work include northern parts of Hedge End; Bursledon; parts of Chandler's Ford and Hiltingbury; and Fair Oak and Horton Heath. Eastleigh town centre has a comparatively low proportion of residents driving to work, as do some small parts of central Chandler's Ford, Netley, central Hedge End and Hamble.

1.85 According to 2011 Census, single occupancy vehicle journeys are the most popular mode of travel for journeys to work by a considerable margin. There are relatively few people who travel as a passenger by car. Those travelling on foot make up the second largest proportion at 7.5%,

⁶⁴ UE Associates (2010) Green Infrastructure Strategy, Partnership for Urban South Hampshire. http://www.push.gov.uk/push_gi_strategy_adopted_june_10-2.pdf

⁶⁵ ONS (2011) Census: Origin- Destination. https://www.nomisweb.co.uk/census/2011/origin_destination

⁶⁶ Eastleigh (2015) Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011-2036, Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report, June 2015.

⁶⁷ Eastleigh (2015) Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011-2036, Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report, June 2015.

⁶⁸ MVA Consultancy (2011) Transport for South Hampshire 2011, Evidence Base Model Development Report 2, <http://www3.hants.gov.uk/2011-tfsh-model-development-report-version-2.pdf>

⁶⁹ Hampshire County Council (2007) Appendix C-Solent Transport Strategy http://old-iwight.onthewight.com/living_here/environment/Transport_strategies/apr/images/2SolentTransportStrategy.pdf

⁷⁰ Eastleigh Borough Council (2015) Transport Background Paper, December 2015.

followed by those working from home at 5% and those travelling by train at 4%⁷¹. Residents living in less densely populated areas and further from the main employment sites are most likely to travel to work by single occupancy car; there is also often a positive correlation between the areas with high levels of car commuting and decreased accessibility to good bus services or local rail stations.

- 1.86 Travel to work mode shares have remained largely the same between the 2001 and 2011 censuses, with a slight increase in the proportion driving a car/ van to work and also those travelling by train and on foot. The proportion of Eastleigh Borough residents travelling to work by bus has declined. Across the Borough, very few commuters use the bus (3%), even in areas where there is currently relatively good bus service provision. However, areas with a larger proportion of bus commuting can be found in Netley, Chandler's Ford, Bishopstoke and parts of Fair Oak.⁷²

Public transport accessibility

- 1.87 The busiest railway lines for passenger services are the South Western Mainline and the Southampton-Fareham Line. Passenger rail usage has increased significantly in Eastleigh Borough over the last two decades. Improvements to provide additional capacity and enable additional services (both passenger and freight) are planned in the medium and longer term for both the mainline and some connecting routes as detailed in Network Rail's Wessex and Sussex area route studies. The studies highlight a requirement to increase capacity on peak services into and out of London and as such, ways to provide for additional fast services from Southampton and Winchester to London have been identified. The Sussex Area Route Study⁷³ includes service between Southampton and Barnham and onwards to Brighton and the route to London Victoria. Some proposals in the strategy could have benefits for connectivity in the Borough and surrounding areas.
- 1.88 The busiest stations in the Borough are Southampton Airport Parkway and Eastleigh, each serving around 1.6 million passengers during 2013-14. Southampton Airport Parkway station serves both a local catchment covering southern parts of the town centre, and northern parts of Southampton, but also draws passengers from a significantly wider catchment due to its good road connectivity via the M27. Local stations such as Hedge End and Chandler's Ford have also seen increasing passenger numbers. Eastleigh Town Centre and Northern parts of Hedge End have the highest levels of rail commuting.⁷⁴
- 1.89 Rail journey times are generally competitive with/ better than driving for journeys between areas with good access to rail stations, especially in the peak hours where road journey times are slower. However, in some areas (e.g. Bursledon, Eastleigh and Netley where passenger numbers have decreased) the low frequency of trains, or limited range of destinations served, hinders the railway as a realistic alternative to car commuting. Aside from Eastleigh and Southampton Airport Parkway, the Borough's stations are only served by a basic frequency of a single hourly train in each direction with some additional peak hour services in the direction of the busiest commuting flow. Furthermore, Hedge End and Botley do not have a direct connection to Southampton, the most popular destination in the area, and also have sparse later evening services. Other stations also have limitations, such as limited connectivity and interchange particularly near the M27 and connecting roads.⁷⁵
- 1.90 There has been a 0.47% increase in the estimates of station usage numbers in the last year across the stations located in the Borough, and an increase in passenger numbers at all but three of the stations. The 0.47% increase is significantly lower than the increase recorded in the previous monitoring period (4.41%) which may suggest that reliance on the car could be increasing. The bus routes in Eastleigh Borough have relatively low frequency (typically hourly or half-hourly during the daytime Monday to Saturday, with limited or no service on weekday evenings or on Sundays), however some routes offer better daytime frequency and a more comprehensive service, including:

⁷¹ Eastleigh (2015) Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011-2036, Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report, June 2015.

⁷² Eastleigh (2015) Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011-2036, Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report, June 2015.

⁷³ Network Rail (2015) South East Route: Sussex Area Route Study. <https://cdn.networkrail.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/South-East-Route-Sussex-Area-Route-Study-FINAL.pdf>

⁷⁴ Eastleigh (2015) Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011-2036, Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report, June 2015.

⁷⁵ ONS (2011) Census 2011, Rail travel mode share from Datashine

- Bluestar 1 Southampton-Chandlers Ford-Winchester (every 20 minutes).
 - Bluestar 2 Southampton-Eastleigh-Fair Oak (every 20 minutes).
 - First X4/X5 Southampton-Bursledon- Fareham/Gosport/Portsmouth (every 15 minutes).
 - Unilink U1 Southampton Airport-University-City Centre (every 10-15 minutes).
- 1.91 However, in recent years, the bus network has generally contracted both in terms of frequency of service and the number of non-core routes served. This contraction has not been helped by cuts in bus service subsidies provided by Local Authorities, the unstable nature of the local bus market and the unreliability that traffic congestion imposes on many bus services.⁷⁶
- 1.92 However some key “core” routes have prospered such as:
- Bluestar 1 (Winchester- Chandler’s Ford- Southampton).
 - Bluestar 2 (Fair Oak- Bishopstoke- Eastleigh- Southampton).
 - First X4/X5 (Southampton- Bursledon- Fareham/ Portsmouth/ Gosport).
 - Uni-link U1 (Southampton Airport-University-City Centre).
- 1.93 Bus operators are not obliged to publish their passenger figures, however from the limited data that is available to the Council, bus passenger numbers have broadly stagnated overall for some years.
- 1.94 Bus passenger surveys conducted in the Borough during 2014 highlighted that over a third of bus users make more than five trips on the bus per week, and that 45% of passengers use the bus to go on shopping trips. The bus is a more important mode for shopping and access to services than for travel to work. The survey results also found that the lack of frequency of bus services was the biggest concern for bus users with 20% of respondents citing this, followed by 17% of passengers raising concerns about buses not running on time.⁷⁷

Environment

Air quality

- 1.95 The Council has declared four AQMAs in the Borough due to exceedance of the annual mean objective for nitrogen dioxide⁷⁸. They are as follows:
- AQMA No. 1 – A335
 - AQMA No. 2 – M3
 - AQMA No. 3 – Hamble Lane
 - AQMA No. 4 – High Street Botley
- 1.96 All AQMAs are associated with nitrogen dioxide from traffic. Properties alongside the motorways, main roads and main-line rail routes are also affected by traffic noise, and the airport also gives rise to air concerns. Developments proposed within the Local Plan could have an effect on these AQMAs.⁷⁹

Biodiversity and geodiversity

Biodiversity

- 1.97 The Borough has a range of international, national and local nature designations, which accounts for approximately 25% of the Borough’s total area.
- 1.98 There are three internationally designated sites within the Borough; the River Itchen SAC, Solent & Southampton Water SPA and Ramsar site and the Solent Maritime SAC. The River Itchen is a

⁷⁶ Eastleigh (2015) Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011-2036, Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report, June 2015.

⁷⁷ Eastleigh Borough Council (2015) Bus Passenger Survey

⁷⁸ DEFRA (2018) List of Local Authorities with AQMAs. <https://uk-air.defra.gov.uk/aqma/list>

⁷⁹ Eastleigh Borough Council (2015) Transport Background Paper, December 2015.

resource for water supply and wastewater disposal for Eastleigh Borough as well as an international wildlife site. There is concern about the impact on migrating and other wintering birds if there is increased development within the Borough.⁸⁰ There are also a number of European sites in the wider area, including those on the other side of Southampton Water.

- 1.99 The Council is currently working with Test Valley Borough Council, New Forest National Park Authority, New Forest district Council, Southampton City Council, Wiltshire County Council and Natural England to consider ways in which cumulative recreational impacts could be mitigated with regards to the New Forest⁸¹.
- 1.100 The Borough of Eastleigh also contains five nationally designated nature sites: Lee-on-the-Solent to Itchen SSSI; Lincegrove and Hackett's Marshes SSSI; Moorgreen Meadows SSSI; River Itchen SSSI and Upper Hamble Estuary and Woods SSSI. According to Hampshire Biodiversity Information Centre's Annual Monitoring Report, November 2016, 46.19% of Eastleigh Borough's SSSI area was classified as 'favourable', 46.71% 'unfavourable recovering', 6.89% 'unfavourable no change' and 0.22% 'destroyed'⁸². The proportion SSSI land area within the Borough in a favourable or recovering condition has improved since 2007.
- 1.101 The largest area of SSSIs assessed as remaining in an unfavourable condition is within the River Itchen SSSI. This is due to inappropriate water levels, inappropriate weirs and dams, invasive freshwater species, siltation, water abstraction and water pollution (agricultural run-off and discharges).⁸³
- 1.102 The Borough's six Local Nature Reserves (LNR) are Hackett's Marsh LNR (Bursledon); Hocombe Mead LNR (Chandler's Ford); Manor Farm LNR (Botley/ Bursledon); Mercury Marshes LNR (Bursledon); Netley Common LNR (near Thornhill); and Westwood Woodland Park LNR (Netley Abbey).
- 1.103 Sites which are important for nature conservation at the county and Borough level are called Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINCs); 146 of these are designated within the Borough. Many support UK Biodiversity Action Plan priority habitats and species. These sites are not statutorily protected.
- 1.104 There are pockets of ancient woodland throughout the Borough and close to the Borough boundary in neighbouring local authority areas. Ancient woodland is an irreplaceable resource and faces a number of challenges including fragmentation and suitable management.
- 1.105 Biodiversity Opportunity Areas (BOAs) are geographical areas identifying the best opportunities to restore and create habitats of regional importance. They are part of a 'landscape-scale approach' to nature conservation. BOAs do not include all the BAP habitats in a region but are areas where conservation action is likely to have the most benefit for biodiversity, based on existing biodiversity interest and opportunities for enhancement. There are five BOAs present in or adjacent to Eastleigh Borough: Hamble Valley; The Forest of Bere; The Solent; Itchen Valley; and Ampfield-Baddesley-Chilworth-Lordswood.
- 1.106 Eastleigh Borough contains 18 recognised national Biodiversity Action Plan Priority Habitats, which cover approximately 20% of the Borough's land area. Hampshire BAP Habitat Action Plans have been prepared for the following habitats.⁸⁴
- Ancient and/or species-rich hedgerows.
 - Chalk rivers.
 - Coastal saltmarsh.
 - Coastal vegetated shingle.
 - Coastal and Floodplain Grazing Woodland
 - Hedgerows

⁸⁰ Atkins (2008) South Hampshire: Integrated Water Management Strategy. http://www.push.gov.uk/081223_-_iwms_final.pdf

⁸¹ <https://www.testvalley.gov.uk/news/2018/mar/government-grant-awarded-to-local-organisations?displaypref=large-contrast>

⁸² Natural England (2016) SSSI Condition Statistics

⁸³ Eastleigh (2015) Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011-2036, Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report, June 2015.

⁸⁴ Eastleigh Borough Council (2012) Biodiversity Action Plan for Eastleigh Borough

- Lagoons
- Lowland Dry Acid Grassland
- Lowland heathland.
- Lowland meadows.
- Lowland Mixed Deciduous Woodland
- Maritime cliff and slopes.
- Mudflats.
- Purple Moor Grass and Rush Pastures
- Ponds
- Rivers
- Reedbeds.
- Wet Woodland

1.107 The Eastleigh Biodiversity Action Plan⁸⁵ lists 582 Priority Species. Of the 582 Priority Species, 50 species representative of the various habitat types present in Hampshire are regularly reported on to understand the overall change in the priority species status in a regular and consistent way.

Geological features

1.108 The basic geology of the Borough is characterised by the overlay of Tertiary and Quaternary deposits over chalk bedrock. The Tertiary deposits are referred to as the Reading Beds, the London Clay, the Bracklesham Group and the Barton Group. The Quaternary deposits are generally river terrace deposits and alluvium, all of which are predominantly sands, silts and clays. At the southern end of the Borough, the London Clay and Bracklesham Group deposits reach thicknesses of up to 400m.⁸⁶

1.109 Whilst there are no Local Geological Sites (LGS) in the Borough, the Lee-on-the-Solent to Itchen Estuary SSSI has also been designated as a Geological SSSI. Its geological importance is based on the significance of exposures of terrace gravels of the former Solent River system found at the cliffs north of Hillhead, which allow the study of gravel sedimentology over a large continuous exposure and, in conjunction with other sites along the Solent coast, provide a cross-section through the 'staircase' of Solent terraces. The site is also known for its fossil remains.⁸⁷

Climate change (including flood risk)

Greenhouse gas emissions by source

1.110 According to the Department for Energy and Climate Change (DECC), Eastleigh Borough has slightly lower per capita carbon dioxide (CO₂) emissions than for Hampshire as a whole, which decreased by around 29.2% between 2005 and 2014. The total estimated carbon dioxide emissions decreased within Eastleigh Borough over the same period by approximately 32.1%.

1.111 In 2014, the proportion of CO₂ emissions from industrial/commercial, domestic and road transport sources as a percentage of total emissions in the Borough were 35%, 40.4% and 24.7% respectively, domestic being the largest source.⁸⁸

Greenhouse gas emissions trends

1.112 In June 2009, the outcome of research on the probable effects of climate change in the UK was released by the UK Climate Projections (UKCP09) team⁸⁹. The research predicts the effects of climate change for the south east England by 2050. In summary, climatic changes are likely to include increases in the mean temperature in the winter and summer months alongside changes in

⁸⁵ Eastleigh Borough Council (2012) Biodiversity Action Plan for Eastleigh Borough.

⁸⁶ Eastleigh (2002) Contaminated Land Inspection Strategy

⁸⁷ Natural England (2015) SSSI citation: <https://ukfossils.files.wordpress.com/2011/02/brownwich.pdf>

⁸⁸ Department of Energy and Climate Change (2016) UK local authority and regional carbon dioxide emissions national statistics <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/uk-local-authority-and-regional-carbon-dioxide-emissions-national-statistics-2005-2014>

⁸⁹ Met Office (2009) UK Climate Projections 2009 (UKCP09), <http://www.metoffice.gov.uk/services/climate-services/uk/ukcp>

the annual winter and summer precipitation levels. These changes result in potential risks to Eastleigh Borough, which might include:

- Increased incidence of health risks including heat related illnesses and deaths due to changing weather patterns (e.g. skin cancer, cataracts, salmonella and deaths during storm events).
- Effects on water resources (e.g. Reduction in availability of surface water, low river levels, turbulent river flow).
- Flood related risks (e.g. increased risk of flooding, changes in insurance provisions for flood damage, higher cost premiums for local business).
- A need to increase the capacity for effective water management (e.g. at wastewater treatment plants and sewers, flood defences, increased irrigation during summer droughts and soil and water deficits).
- Effects on natural resources (e.g. Soil erosion due to flash flooding, soil shrinkages and subsidence).
- Effects on biodiversity (e.g. loss of species, Spread of species at the northern edge of their distribution, reduced availability of grassland habitats and changes in groundwater recharge on the reliability and flows in the River Itchen for people and wildlife).
- Deterioration in working conditions due to increased temperatures and changes to global supply chain.
- Risk to transport (e.g. rail tracks buckling due to increased temperature, road surfaces melting and flooding of roads and railways).
- Effects on food production (e.g. handling and storage).

Climate change

Flood risk

- 1.113 According to the 2016 PUSH Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA)⁹⁰ and Catchment Flood Management Plans, the four main types of flood risk which exist in Eastleigh Borough are fluvial (river) flooding, coastal flooding (including tidal flooding), surface water flooding and groundwater flooding.
- 1.114 Flooding from rivers is the primary source of flooding within the Borough. Flood risk is associated with the River Itchen and Monks Brook, both of which have extensive flood outlines which cover a number of existing developed areas in the Borough, including parts of Chandler's Ford, Eastleigh Town Centre and Bishopstoke. The secondary source of flood risk in Eastleigh Borough is from the sea. The parts of the Borough which are currently at risk of tidal flooding are Netley, Hamble and Bursledon.
- 1.115 Historically, there have been some instances of groundwater flooding at the northern boundary of the Borough, marking the location where the South Downs chalk geology ends and the River Itchen meets less permeable bedrock. However, the Hampshire Groundwater Management Plan⁹¹ prepared by the County Council does not identify any locations within the Borough in its list of 'risk areas'.
- 1.116 Climate change is likely to increase fluvial flood flows in the Borough. This is likely to put additional pressure on areas of Eastleigh Borough near the River Itchen and in Chandler's Ford near the Monks Brook, which are key areas at risk.
- 1.117 Whilst some areas of the coast of Eastleigh Borough (including the lower lying areas at Hamble Quay and Ferrymans Quay) are susceptible to inundation as a result of high tides and/or inclement

⁹⁰ East Solent Coastal Partnership (2016) PUSH Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, Appendix C, Guidance Document: Eastleigh Borough Council. http://maps.hants.gov.uk/push/Reports/PUSH_SFRA_EBC_Guidance_for_Upload.pdf

⁹¹ Hampshire County Council (2013) Hampshire Groundwater Management Plan Final Draft for Consultation October 2013. <http://documents.hants.gov.uk/flood-water-management/groundwater/GroundwaterManagementPlan.pdf>

weather breaching sea defences, the topography of much of the coast is such that coastal flooding is less of a risk. Many coastal areas benefit from coastal defences but due to the relatively small number of properties located there, future levels of investment in these defences are likely to be limited.

- 1.118 The Surface Water Management Plan (SWMP)⁹² concludes that surface water flooding in the Borough affects some of the more built up areas but is fairly sporadic and there are relatively few substantial surface water flooding incidents. There are three hotspots specifically identified: the Monks Brook catchment, Quob Lane/Allington Lane in West End and The Quay in Hamble.

Historic environment

Historic development of the Borough

- 1.119 The historic development of Eastleigh Borough has been influenced by a wide variety of factors, including its railway, maritime and aviation history, and this is reflected by the Borough's cultural heritage resource. Whilst this resource includes better known assets such as Netley Abbey and Bursledon Windmill, the historic environment in the Borough is broad ranging, and incorporates a wide variety of features, sites and areas.

Designated and non-designated sites and areas

- 1.120 Many of Eastleigh Borough's historic features and areas are recognised through historic environment designations. These include Listed Buildings, Scheduled Monuments and Registered Historic Parks and Gardens which are nationally designated, and Conservation Areas. Eastleigh Borough contains 173 Grade II listed buildings, 9 Grade II* listed buildings, 10 Scheduled Monuments, 33 Registered Historic Parks and Gardens, and 8 Conservation Areas. The eight conservation areas in Eastleigh Borough are at Bishopstoke; Botley; Old Bursledon; Bursledon Windmill; Gaters Mill and Romill Close at West End; Hamble-le-Rice; Orchards Way at West End; and Netley Abbey⁹³. The Grace Dieu Protected Wreck is also partly located within the Borough.
- 1.121 There are currently no cultural heritage sites or features on Historic England's Heritage at Risk Register 2016⁹⁴. As the Heritage Risk Register does not include Grade II listed buildings (outside London, other than places of worship) the Borough Council considers whether those buildings are at risk as part of the Development Management process. Within the Borough there is one Grade II listed building (Peach House situated in Church Road, Bishopstoke) which has been identified as being at risk.
- 1.122 Historic features which do not meet the criteria for national listing or other national designation can be protected through local designations. There are also 38 locally listed buildings within Eastleigh Borough.

Townscape character and quality of built environment

- 1.123 The Council has produced a number of urban character area appraisals across the Borough that assist in the positive management of areas and provide guidance to ensure that new development in Eastleigh Borough is appropriate to its surroundings and helps to retain the character that gives each area its identity.

Archaeological assets

- 1.124 There are over 500 archaeological records for Eastleigh Borough on the Historic Environment Record Search⁹⁵, the historic environment record for Hampshire. These include ten nationally important scheduled monuments, ranging from remains of abbeys, castles and hill forts, to aqueducts and Second World War gun emplacements. These may or may not be visible above ground.

⁹² Hampshire County Council (2012) Eastleigh Surface Water Management Plan 2012. <http://documents.hants.gov.uk/flood-water-management/EastleighSWMPReport.pdf>

⁹³ Eastleigh Borough Council Authority (2016) Annual Monitoring Report 2015-2016. <https://www.eastleigh.gov.uk/media/1631/amr-2015-16-final-version.pdf>

⁹⁴ Historic England (2016) Heritage at Risk Register. <https://historicengland.org.uk/advice/heritage-at-risk/search-register/>

⁹⁵ Hampshire County Council (2018) Historic Environment Record Search. <http://historicenvironment.hants.gov.uk/AHBSearch.aspx>

Landscape

Landscape character

- 1.125 Eastleigh Borough falls under two Natural England character areas; South Hampshire Lowlands (128) and South Coast Plain (126). The description of these landscape areas can be accessed on the Natural England website at:
<http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/ourwork/landscape/englands/character/areas/southeast.aspx>.
- 1.126 The Hampshire Integrated Character Assessment⁹⁶ is a framework for other local authorities to develop strategies, plans and local action initiatives. It identifies 5 landscape character areas in Eastleigh Borough at county scale, which are Southampton Water, Netley Bursledon and Hamble Coastal Plain, Hamble Valley Forest of Bere West and Itchen Valley.
- 1.127 The Eastleigh Landscape Character Assessment⁹⁷ identifies nineteen different landscape character areas within the Borough. The landscape of the Borough is not subject to statutory landscape designations, but parts of it are attractive and it contributes to creating and maintaining the character of the Borough and its settlements. However, the intrusion of urbanising elements, particularly around the borders with Southampton but also in the narrowing gaps between some settlements, is diminishing this. Close to the urban edges, there are indications of degradation of land in anticipation of development. New development in these and other areas would change the landscape, impacting on landscape features and tranquillity. There are significant opportunities to improve linkages between areas of open space, parks and the open countryside.
- 1.128 A draft Landscape Sensitivity Appraisal of Sites⁹⁸ was published by EBC in order to assess the sensitivity of the landscape to change in areas where strategic development is being considered and proposed. The sensitivity of each proposed site to change has been assessed, taking into account the landscape features and character present and the visibility of areas from identified vantage points. Information has also been obtained from the existing Landscape Character Assessment mentioned above.

Light and noise pollution

- 1.129 Noise pollution throughout the Borough primarily stems from road, rail and air sources. The Borough's borders with Southampton are dominated by urban and suburban residential areas. There are also major industrial estates and shopping complexes and two major motorways bisecting the Borough. These factors have a strong influence on light pollution, and there are few areas in the Borough that are free of 'night glow'. Light pollution has also become an increasing issue in the wider area; according to the CPRE, light pollution in Hampshire increased by 13% between 1993 and 2000.⁹⁹
- 1.130 Since 2004 CPRE have undertaken a study of tranquillity in England. The study concluded that Hampshire as a whole is ranked 22nd out of 87 county and unitary authorities in England in terms of tranquillity scores (where 1 is the most tranquil). The Eastleigh area was however evaluated as one of the least tranquil local authorities in the county.

Material assets

Energy

- 1.131 The Council has a Climate Change Strategy¹⁰⁰ for reducing CO² from its own operations and from the Borough. To date, Eastleigh Borough have implemented the following programmes:
- Fleming Park - in 2007 it installed Combined Heat and Power (CHP) the electricity on site and the heat is used to warm the Leisure Centre pools and the nearby Civic Offices via a district energy pipe link.

⁹⁶ Hampshire County Council (2010) Hampshire Integrated Character Assessment. <https://www.hants.gov.uk/landplanningandenvironment/environment/landscape/integratedcharacterassessment>

⁹⁷ Eastleigh Borough Council (2011) Landscape Character Assessment for Eastleigh Borough. <https://www.eastleigh.gov.uk/planning-and-building/planning-policy-and-implementation/planning-policy-guidance/landscape-character-assessment>

⁹⁸ <https://www.eastleigh.gov.uk/media/1653/april-10-4-17draft-summary-landscape-appraisal.pdf>

⁹⁹ CPRE (2010) How light polluted are you?

¹⁰⁰ Eastleigh Borough Council (2011) Tackling Climate Change: A Strategy for 2011-2020. <https://www.eastleigh.gov.uk/media/2046/ccstrategy2011to2020.pdf>

- Photovoltaic (PV) solar panels - generate electricity and reduce carbon emissions. So far, it has 1435 PV panels installed on 15 sites around the Borough which generate approximately 266,000 kWh of electricity.
- Other projects include Solar Thermal Panels at Lakeside, Ground Source Heating at the Lowford Centre, Ground and Air Source Heat Pumps at the Point and Itchen Valley Country Park (IVCP); and a Wind Turbine and new Biomass Boiler also situated at IVCP¹⁰¹.

Waste arisings and recycling rates

- 1.132 There are four household waste recycling centres in the Borough. These are located at Stoney Croft Rise, Chandler's Ford; Knowle Lane, Fair Oak; Shamblehurst Lane, Hedge End; and Grange Road, Netley. Compared to national and regional averages, recycling rates in Eastleigh Borough is good, achieving 40.23% of waste recycled or composted in 2012/13, the highest in Hampshire. Household waste collected per head has reduced since 2006/7, from 351kg to 302kg in 2012/13¹⁰².

Minerals

- 1.133 In terms of mineral resources in the Borough, sand and gravel deposits exist at Hamble peninsula and the Itchen Valley. There are also rail-head aggregates depots in Eastleigh Borough for recycling, storage and transfer.

Previously developed land

- 1.134 Between 2001/2 and 2006/7, the proportion of completed housing developments on previously developed land was consistently high in the Borough, but there has been a significant reduction since then. This reflects developments such as South Street, Eastleigh and Dowd's Farm, Hedge End, both of which are greenfield sites but specifically planned for within the adopted Local Plan Review.

Soil

Soil type and quality

- 1.135 Soil quality is fundamental to the quality of agricultural land. The Agricultural Land Classification system provides a method for assessing the quality of farmland to enable informed choices to be made about its future use within the planning system. The most versatile agricultural land defined as Grades 1, 2 and 3a, which is deemed to be the land which is most flexible, productive and efficient in response to inputs and which can best deliver future crops for food and non-food uses such as biomass, fibres and pharmaceuticals¹⁰³.

Agricultural land quality

- 1.136 Eastleigh Borough has rich and diverse soils which have developed since the last ice age 10,000 years ago, and with farming practices over the centuries. Agricultural land quality in the southern half of Eastleigh Borough is generally high, and quite large areas particularly within the Hamble Peninsula were used formerly for horticulture, in particular strawberry growing. Much of the land in this area and in the central and eastern parts of the Borough is classified as Grades 1 and 2 (the most versatile and best quality land).¹⁰⁴

Water quality and water resources

Water resources

- 1.137 The Borough of Eastleigh is dominated by two main river catchments; the River Itchen catchment covers the majority of the Borough with the River Hamble catchment to the East. The wider Hampshire area has a significant reliance on groundwater. A major source of groundwater is the chalk aquifer of the Hampshire Downs, which forms a regionally significant aquifer for potable and agricultural use, and provides base flow to the River Itchen, which relies on groundwater to maintain flows.

¹⁰¹ Eastleigh (2015) Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011-2036, Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report, June 2015.

¹⁰² Eastleigh Borough Council (2015) Annual Monitoring Report 2013-2014.

¹⁰³ ODPM (2004) Planning Policy Statement 7

¹⁰⁴ Eastleigh Borough Council (2011) Landscape Character Assessment for Eastleigh Borough. <https://www.eastleigh.gov.uk/planning-and-building/planning-policy-and-implementation/planning-policy-guidance/landscape-character-assessment>

- 1.138 Within the River Itchen catchment there are seven sub catchments affecting Eastleigh Borough which link into the different rivers. The River Hamble catchment includes four sub catchments within the Eastleigh boundary. The majority of these affect the southern part of the Borough
- 1.139 The Itchen catchment is largely dominated by groundwater flow due the bedrock geology that underlies the area. The River Itchen is considered one of the best chalk streams in the world with excellent diversity and quality waters, meaning it is covered by several designations including the Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) designations. In contrast to the upper section of the River Itchen, the lower section flows through heavily urbanised areas. A major tributary that flows into the River Itchen, and forms a considerable part of this catchment, is Monks Brook which runs through Chandler's Ford. Much of this watercourse has been culverted.¹⁰⁵
- 1.140 The River Hamble catchment is predominantly rural in the upper section and highly urbanised in the lower section leading to very different characteristics in each. This catchment drains into a number of designated sites of national and international importance for nature conservation, such as the Solent and Southampton Special Protection Area and Ramsar site or the Solent Maritime Special Area of Conservation. The upper section runs over permeable chinks where there are few properties and a lower risk of surface water flooding, whereas the lower section is dominated by clay with the potential to cause flash flooding in the urbanised areas along the coast.¹⁰⁶

Water quality

- 1.141 Groundwater Source Protection Zones (SPZs) indicate the risk to groundwater supplies from potentially polluting activities and accidental releases of pollutants. Designed to protect individual groundwater sources, these zones show the risk of contamination from any activities that might cause pollution in the area. There are a number of SPZs to the north of the Borough. The outer zone (subsurface activity only) of zone 2C extends into the northern part of Chandler's Ford. There are also a number of small private abstractions in the Borough which require a 50m SPZ. These abstractions may be within private households and must be protected.
- 1.142 The Environment Agency manages water resources at a local level through the Catchment Abstraction Management Strategy (CAMS) process along with abstraction licensing strategies. The Eastleigh Borough area is covered by the Test and Itchen Abstraction Licensing Strategy (March 2013) and East Hampshire Abstraction Licensing Strategy (April 2013).
- 1.143 The Test and Itchen Abstraction Licensing Strategy suggests that the Lower River Itchen (from Winchester through Eastleigh and Southampton) could be affected by abstraction and does not meet environmental flow indicators. The Environment Agency is working Southern and Portsmouth Water to modify their abstraction licences to ensure that the protection of the River Itchen SAC is secured. The East Hampshire Abstraction Licensing Strategy suggests that there is water available for licensing in the Hamble catchment. A large groundwater abstraction at the headwaters of the River Hamble (Bishops Waltham) causes significant reduction in flow; however this is partly supported by the discharge from a major sewage works downstream. Flow must be protected to support the downstream River Hamble and the Solent SAC/SPA designations.
- 1.144 The Environment Agency has been monitoring the water quality/health of all watercourses receiving effluent discharges. The monitoring regime change in 2007 to align more fully with the Water Framework Directive (WFD).¹⁰⁷
- 1.145 The main River Itchen is currently at 'Good Ecological Potential', but is subject to change (for example, annual monitoring results been both at Poor and Moderate Ecological Potential since 2009). The Itchen is also subject to N2k targets (or objectives), which are more challenging than WFD ones. Currently, the Itchen does not meet all of its Protected Area N2K objectives. The overall ecological status is 'poor' primarily as a result of the chemical phytobenthos. Water issues are likely to arise from the historical phosphate loading into the river via sewerage treatment works

¹⁰⁵ Hampshire County Council (2012) Eastleigh Surface Water Management Plan. <http://documents.hants.gov.uk/flood-water-management/EastleighSWMPReport.pdf>

¹⁰⁶ Hampshire County Council (2012) Eastleigh Surface Water Management Plan. <http://documents.hants.gov.uk/flood-water-management/EastleighSWMPReport.pdf>

¹⁰⁷ The Environment Agency (2009) South East river Basin Management Plan, <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/south-east-river-basin-management-plan>

(such as Chickenhall at Eastleigh). Phosphate stripping has now been installed, and it is expected that chemical levels in the water should improve at the one site this classification is based on.

- 1.146 The section of the River Hamble north of Botley Mill, the Main River Hamble is currently classified as 'moderate' status, based on phosphate and fish. It is predicted that the fish element classification will improve by 2021 and the overall status will be 'good' by 2027. The reasons for not achieving good status for phosphates include rural diffuse pollution and discharge from sewerage treatment works. Fish status is not achieving good because of barriers to migration and poor physical habitat. The Monks Brook is currently at 'moderate' status (as at 2015) and is not predicted to get to 'good' by the end of the Second Cycle (2021). This is primarily due to the fact that it's currently technical infeasibility and affordability.
- 1.147 Drinking and waste water is supplied in the Borough by Southern Water. Water abstraction come from the River Itchen and import groundwater supplies from outside the Borough. Water is also taken from the River Itchen by Portsmouth Water but is supplied mainly to areas out of the Borough. Southern also operate two waste water treatment works within the Borough's boundary (Chickenhall, Eastleigh and Bursledon). According to the PUSH South Hampshire Integrated Water Management Strategy (2008), there is tension between proposed growth in south Hampshire and the potential impact of existing and future wastewater discharges on the internationally designated river and coastal waters in the area. On this basis, there may be little or no "environmental capacity" left in the receiving waters for the consented loads of pollutants to be increased.¹⁰⁸

¹⁰⁸ Atkins (2008) South Hampshire: Integrated Water Management Strategy. Partnership for Urban South Hampshire (PUSH).

Appendix 4

Assumptions used in the SA of site allocation options

Table A4.1: Assumptions and information sources used in the SA of site allocation options and Strategic Growth Options

Will the strategic location under consideration...	Assessment question and related assumptions	Scoring criteria		Information sources
SA1: Provide sufficient housing to meet identified local needs, including affordability and special needs				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contribute to meeting the objectively assessed housing need/the housing requirement identified in the Local Plan, including an appropriate mix of housing? • Meet need within the local area as well as the wider housing market? • Help to deliver affordable housing to meet Eastleigh's identified housing needs? 	<p>1.1 Will the development provide a significant contribution towards meeting identified affordable housing needs?</p> <p>In line with the Council's affordable housing policy, sites capable of accommodating 10-14 dwellings will be expected to provide 20% affordable housing. Sites capable of accommodating 15 or more dwellings will be expected to provide 35% affordable housing.</p>	++	Site is capable of accommodating 15 or more dwellings	<p>Issues and Options stage (Strategic Locations)</p> <p>EBC assessment and information from site promoters.</p> <p>Proposed Submission stage (non-strategic sites)</p> <p>Dwelling capacity information from EBC. All employment sites will be '0'.</p> <p>Submission stage – SGOs</p> <p>Dwelling capacity information from EBC. All employment sites will be '0'.</p>
		+?	Site is capable of accommodating 10-14 dwellings	
		0	Mainly employment use; no/negligible amount of housing offered at the location	
		?	Insufficient evidence is available to make a determination	
		-	Evidence that location will partially meet affordable housing requirements	
		--	Evidence that affordable housing is not economically viable on location or provision is unlikely due to the location being below the affordable housing threshold [10 dwellings]	
	<p>1.2 Will it provide other elements of identified housing need e.g. housing for older persons, self-build, support housing?</p> <p>Where mixed use locations incorporate residential development, effects in relation to this objective will depend on the likely proportion of homes falling into these specialist categories, as evidenced</p>	++	The location has been put forward to include provision of one or more of these additional elements of identified housing need	<p>Issues and Options stage (Strategic Locations)</p> <p>EBC assessment and information from site promoters.</p> <p>Proposed Submission stage (non-strategic sites)</p> <p>Information on provision of other</p>
		0	Mainly employment use; no/negligible amount of housing offered at the location	

Will the strategic location under consideration...	Assessment question and related assumptions	Scoring criteria		Information sources
	by site promoter's proposals.	+?	The scale and location indicate that provision of one or more of these additional elements could be possible.	elements of housing need not available on consistent basis for all site options; score all residential sites as '?' and all employment sites as '0'. Submission stage – SGOs Previous SA of relevant Strategic Spatial Option.
		- -	Development at this location would not contribute to meeting these additional needs	
SA2: Safeguard and improve community health, safety and wellbeing				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve opportunities for people to participate in cultural, leisure and recreation activities? • Promote healthy lifestyles, safety and wellbeing? • Provide good access to existing services, open space, facilities and community infrastructure? • Protect and enhance public rights of way? • Reduce crime, deprivation and promote social inclusion in the borough? 	<p>2.1 Are community facilities (community hall or library) available locally?</p> <p>Where development proposals would result in the provision of new community facilities, a significant positive effect is likely. For other proposals that will include new housing, the position of the strategic location could affect this objective by influencing people's ability to access existing services and facilities.</p>	++	The development of this location would provide or contribute to new community facilities or enhance existing facilities on location or within 400m	<p>Issues and Options stage (Strategic Locations)</p> <p>Information from site promoters and GIS data.</p> <p>Proposed Submission stage (non-strategic sites)</p> <p>Information on provision/enhancement of community facilities not available on consistent basis for all site options; refer solely to GIS data on existing facilities, therefore '++' score not possible. All employment sites will be '0'.</p> <p>Submission stage – SGOs</p> <p>Information on provision from EBC.</p>
		+	Under 400m distance from location providing for residential development to existing community hall or library	
		0	400 to 800m distance from location providing for residential development to existing community hall or library, or no residential development proposed at location	
		-	Over 800m from location providing for residential development to existing community hall or library	
	<p>2.2 Are primary healthcare facilities available locally?</p> <p>Walking distance to nearest GP surgery, health centre or hospital (same test as</p>	++	Provision of new or improved healthcare facilities or 0 to 400m to existing health facilities	<p>Issues and Options stage (Strategic Locations)</p> <p>Information from site promoters and GIS data.</p>
		+	401 to 800m to existing health facilities	

Will the strategic location under consideration...	Assessment question and related assumptions	Scoring criteria		Information sources
	<p>3.6). The position of the strategic location could affect this objective by influencing residents' or employees' ability to access existing health facilities. Capacity of existing GP surgeries would need to be explored outside of the SA process.</p>	0	801-1200m from existing health facilities	<p>Proposed Submission stage (non-strategic sites) Information on provision/enhancement of healthcare facilities not available on consistent basis for all site options; refer solely to GIS data on existing facilities, therefore '++' score not possible. All employment sites will be '0'.</p> <p>Submission stage – SGOs Information on provision from EBC.</p>
		-	1201-1600m from existing health facilities	
		- -	Over 1600m distance to existing health facilities	
	<p>2.3 What effect would the development have on local provision of sports pitches and facilities? Where development proposals would result in the provision of new sports pitches and facilities a positive effect is likely. Conversely, loss of existing facilities would have a negative effect.</p>	++	Location addresses under-provision of sports pitch provision in the wider locality	<p>Issues and Options stage (Strategic Locations) EBC assessment and information from site promoters.</p> <p>Proposed Submission stage (non-strategic sites) Information on provision/enhancement of sports pitches not available on consistent basis for all site options therefore positive scores not possible; refer to GIS data to assess existing facilities and score loss as '--?' not '-'</p> <p>(due to uncertainty re. suitable replacement) and no loss as '0'). All employment sites will be '0', unless development will result in the loss of sports provision.</p> <p>Submission stage – SGOs Previous SA of relevant Strategic Spatial Option.</p>
		+	Location provides sports pitches for residents of the location (where new facilities are required)	
		+?	Location could be suitable for supporting improvements to sports facilities provision either within the location or the wider area. Further information on the suitability of the location would be required.	
		-	Development at this location would not make any improvements to sports facilities provision either within the location or the wider locality	
		- -	Location results in loss of sports pitches/facilities without suitable replacement	

Will the strategic location under consideration...	Assessment question and related assumptions	Scoring criteria		Information sources
	<p>2.4 Is public open space available locally?</p> <p>Where development proposals would result in the provision of new public open space, a significant positive effect is likely. For other proposals, the position of the strategic location could affect this objective by influencing residents' or employees' ability to access existing public open space.</p>	++	The development of this location would provide or contribute to new publicly accessible open space	<p>Issues and Options stage (Strategic Locations)</p> <p>Information from site promoters and GIS data.</p> <p>Proposed Submission stage (non-strategic sites)</p> <p>Information on provision/enhancement of open space not available on consistent basis for all site options therefore '++' score not possible; refer solely to GIS data on existing open space; score loss of open space as '--?' not '--' to reflect uncertainty re. potential replacement. All employment sites will be '0' unless development will result in the loss of open space.</p> <p>Submission stage – SGOs</p> <p>Information on provision from EBC.</p>
+	Location is within 300m of existing publicly accessible open space	Proposed Submission stage (non-strategic sites)		
0	Location is within 300m to 800m existing publicly accessible open space	Information on provision/enhancement of open space not available on consistent basis for all site options therefore '++' score not possible; refer solely to GIS data on existing open space; score loss of open space as '--?' not '--' to reflect uncertainty re. potential replacement. All employment sites will be '0' unless development will result in the loss of open space.		
-	Location is more than 800m from existing publicly accessible open space	Submission stage – SGOs		
--	Development results in loss of publicly accessible open space	Information on provision from EBC.		
	<p>2.5 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same test as 3.10 and 11.2 below)</p> <p>Positive effects are likely in relation to this objective where the location of development proposals facilitates their connection to the cycle and footpath network, supporting active travel by residents or employees.</p>	+	Existing footpath and cycle path cross location or are adjacent to location boundary	<p>Issues and Options stage (Strategic Locations)</p> <p>Presence of Public Rights Of Way (PROW) or Eastleigh Cycle Network in GIS data.</p> <p>Proposed Submission stage (non-strategic sites)</p> <p>Presence of Public Rights Of Way (PROW) or Eastleigh Cycle Network in GIS data.</p> <p>Submission stage – SGOs</p> <p>Presence of Public Rights Of Way</p>
0	Existing footpath only crosses location or is adjacent to its boundary	Proposed Submission stage (non-strategic sites)		
-	No footpath or cycle path crosses location or is adjacent to its boundary	Submission stage – SGOs		

Will the strategic location under consideration...	Assessment question and related assumptions	Scoring criteria		Information sources
				(PROW) or Eastleigh Cycle Network in GIS data.
SA3: Develop a dynamic and diverse economy				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deliver new diverse and knowledge- based employment opportunities? • Support or encourage new business sectors and contribute to GVA in South Hampshire? • Encourage and support business start-ups and assist the development of SMEs? • Provide good access to a range of employment areas? • Enhance the vitality and viability of Eastleigh town centre and other district and local centres? • Help to develop and maintain a skilled workforce to support long- term competitiveness? • Ensure a wide cross section of the community benefits from economic prosperity? 	3.1(a) Is the location close to a major rail station? (same test as 4.1)	Criteria set out in Q. 4.1 below		Same score and justification as 4.1
	3.1 (b) Is the location close to a minor rail station? (same test as 4.2)	Criteria set out in Q. 4.2 below		Same score and justification as 4.2
	3.1 (c) Is the location close to a frequent bus route? (same test as 4.3)	Criteria set out in Q. 4.3 below		Same score and justification as 4.3
	3.1 (d) Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route? (same test as 4.4)	Criteria set out in Q. 4.4 below		Same score and justification as 4.4
	3.1 (e) Is the location close to a major employment centre? (same test as 4.5)	Criteria set out in Q. 4.5 below		Same score and justification as 4.5
	<p>3.2 Will the proposed development contribute towards meeting the need for new industrial, office or warehousing floorspace?</p> <p>Positive effects are likely in relation to this objective when proposals include employment floorspace.</p>	+	Location proposed wholly or partially for additional employment floorspace, including new facilities to support business start-ups/SMEs; or including new facilities to support new business sectors	<p>Issues and Options stage (Strategic Locations)</p> <p>EBC assessment and information from site promoters.</p> <p>Proposed Submission stage (non-strategic sites)</p> <p>Score all residential sites as '-' and all employment sites as '+'. Submission stage – SGOs</p> <p>Information on provision from EBC.</p>
		0	Location is capable of accommodating additional employment floorspace that includes new facilities to support business start-ups/SMEs; or new facilities to support new business sectors	
		-	Location would be unsuitable for additional employment floorspace that	

Will the strategic location under consideration...	Assessment question and related assumptions	Scoring criteria		Information sources
			includes new facilities to support business start-ups/SMEs; or new facilities to support new business sectors	
	<p>3.3 Will the proposed development result in a net loss of existing employment land, or land which would be suitable for employment purposes?</p> <p>Negative effects are likely in relation to this objective when proposals would result in a net loss of existing employment land.</p>	0	No	<p>Issues and Options stage (Strategic Locations)</p> <p>SLAA form 'Site Descriptions...' and 'Suitability' sections</p> <p>Proposed Submission stage (non-strategic sites)</p> <p>SLAA form 'Site Descriptions...' and 'Suitability' sections. Employment sites will be '0'.</p> <p>Submission stage – SGOs</p> <p>All SGOs would provide substantial amounts of new employment land. It has been assumed that land not allocated as employment land is not suitable for that use. As such, all SGOs will be assessed as '0', unless they result in a net loss of existing employment land.</p>
		-	Yes	
	<p>3.4 Will the proposed development increase the amount of commercial uses and other facilities in town, district or local centres?</p> <p>Positive effects are likely in relation to this objective when proposals would result in a net gain of commercial uses and other facilities.</p>	++	Increases retail floorspace or commercial floorspace in primary shopping area or other shopping frontages or new district centre proposed (effect on existing facilities uncertain)	<p>Issues and Options stage (Strategic Locations)</p> <p>Proposed uses from site promoters.</p> <p>Existing uses from SLAA form 'Site description...' and 'Suitability' of existing uses.</p> <p>GIS data for 'District and local centres', 'Eastleigh Town Centre Public Realm',</p>
		+?	New local centre proposed. Effect on existing facilities is uncertain	

Will the strategic location under consideration...	Assessment question and related assumptions	Scoring criteria		Information sources
		+	Increases in district or local centres	<p>'Eastleigh Town Centre Renaissance Quarter', 'Shopping frontages'.</p> <p>Proposed Submission stage (non-strategic sites)</p> <p>Existing uses from SLAA form 'Site description...' and 'Suitability' of existing uses.</p> <p>GIS data for 'District and local centres', 'Eastleigh Town Centre Public Realm', 'Eastleigh Town Centre Renaissance Quarter', 'Shopping frontages'.</p> <p>Information on provision/enhancement of retail/commercial space not available on consistent basis for residential site options, therefore only possibly to assess potential loss so only '0', '-', or '-' scores are possible.</p> <p>Submission stage – SGOs</p> <p>Information on provision from EBC.</p>
		0	No change, including residential-only development on land outside district or local centres and not resulting in loss of primary shopping area/ shopping frontage	
		-	Loss in town and district/local centres	
		--	Loss in primary shopping area or other shopping frontages	
<p>SA4: Reduce road traffic and congestion through improved accessibility to services, homes and jobs; reducing the need to travel by car/lorry and improving sustainable travel choice</p>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve the capacity of the transport network? • Provide opportunities to encourage sustainable travel choice? • Improve road safety? 	<p>4.1 Is the location close to a major rail station?</p> <p>Significant positive effects in relation to this objective are likely where residential or employment proposals are in proximity to a rail station with frequent peak-time service (Southampton Airport Parkway, Eastleigh, Hedge End, Botley and Swaythling stations).</p>	++	0 to 400m distance	<p>Issues and Options stage (Strategic Locations)</p> <p>GIS data.</p> <p>Proposed Submission stage (non-strategic sites)</p> <p>GIS data.</p> <p>Submission stage – SGOs</p>
		+	401 to 800m distance	
		0	801 to 1200m	
		-	1201 to 1400m distance	
		--	Over 1400m distance	

Will the strategic location under consideration...	Assessment question and related assumptions	Scoring criteria		Information sources
				GIS data.
	<p>4.2 Is the location close to a minor rail station?</p> <p>Minor positive effects in relation to this objective are likely where residential or employment proposals are in proximity to a rail station with infrequent peak-time service (all stations other than those listed at 4.1)</p>	+	0 to 400m distance	<p>Issues and Options stage (Strategic Locations)</p> <p>GIS data.</p> <p>Proposed Submission stage (non-strategic sites)</p> <p>GIS data.</p> <p>Submission stage – SGOs</p> <p>GIS data.</p>
		-	401 to 1200m distance	
		--	Over 1200m distance	
	<p>4.3 Is the location close to a frequent bus route?</p> <p>Significant positive effects in relation to this objective are likely where residential or employment proposals are in proximity to a bus route with a 20 min or better frequency bus service, i.e. the following routes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bluestar 1 Winchester-Chandlers 	++	0 to 400m distance	<p>Issues and Options stage (Strategic Locations)</p> <p>GIS data.</p> <p>Proposed Submission stage (non-strategic sites)</p> <p>GIS data.</p> <p>Submission stage – SGOs</p>
		+	401 to 600m distance	
		-	601 to 800m distance	

Will the strategic location under consideration...	Assessment question and related assumptions	Scoring criteria		Information sources
	<p>Ford-Southampton</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bluestar 2 Fair Oak-Bishopstoke-Eastleigh-Stoneham-Southampton • First X4/X5 Southampton-Bursledon-Fareham- Portsmouth/Gosport • Unilink U1 Airport Parkway-Highfield Campus-Southampton <p>Assumed that new bus stop could be provided on existing route to serve development at a strategic location.</p>	--	Over 800m distance	GIS data.
	<p>4.4 Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route?</p> <p>Minor positive effects in relation to this objective are likely where residential or employment proposals are in proximity to a bus route with a semi-frequent (between 20 and 30 min frequency) bus service, i.e. the following routes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Xelabus X6/X7 Eastleigh-Chandlers Ford only • First 8 Hedge End-West End-Townhill Park-Southampton (Hedge End to West End section likely to be withdrawn in short to medium term due to low usage) 	+	0 to 400m distance	<p>Issues and Options stage (Strategic Locations)</p> <p>GIS data.</p> <p>Proposed Submission stage (non-strategic sites)</p> <p>GIS data.</p> <p>Submission stage – SGOs</p> <p>GIS data.</p>
		-	400 to 800m distance	

Will the strategic location under consideration...	Assessment question and related assumptions	Scoring criteria		Information sources
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> First 6 Southampton City Centre-Woolston-Netley-Hamble-Wright's Hill-Butlocks Heath Bluestar 5 Eastleigh to Boyatt Wood only <p>Assumed that new bus stop could be provided on existing route to serve development at a strategic location.</p>	--	Over 800m distance	
	<p>4.5(a) Will residential development at the location be close to a major employment centre?</p> <p>For purely residential locations or mixed use locations with a significant residential component, positive effects are likely in relation to this objective when it is in proximity to defined major employment centres:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensign Way GE Aviation Hedge End Industrial Area Chalcroft Business Park Eastleigh River Side Phoenix Park Southampton Airport Business Park Tollgate Business Park Land adjoining Chalcroft Distribution Park Eastleigh town centre Chandlers Ford Industrial Estate Woodside Avenue and Boyatt 	++	Under 400m distance	<p>Issues and Options stage (Strategic Locations)</p> <p>GIS data.</p> <p>Proposed Submission stage (non-strategic sites)</p> <p>GIS data. All employment sites will be '0'.</p> <p>Submission stage – SGOs</p> <p>GIS data..</p>
+	400 to 1000m distance			
-	Over 1000m distance			
0	No significant residential use			

Will the strategic location under consideration...	Assessment question and related assumptions	Scoring criteria		Information sources
	<p>Wood Industrial Estates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hampshire Corporate Park Tollbar Offices <p>The Council has confirmed that the new employment areas to be provided in each Strategic Growth Option would be at least as large as those listed above and therefore should be considered as 'major' for the purposes of this assessment.</p>			
	<p>4.5(b) Will employment development at the location be close to a major population centre?</p> <p>For purely employment locations or mixed use locations with a significant employment component, positive effects are likely in relation to this objective when it is in proximity to defined major population centres:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Southampton Eastleigh, including Chandlers Ford Hedge End 	<p>++</p> <p>+</p> <p>-</p> <p>0</p>	<p>Under 400m distance</p> <p>400 to 1000m distance</p> <p>Over 1000m distance</p> <p>No significant employment use</p>	<p>Issues and Options stage (Strategic Locations)</p> <p>GIS data.</p> <p>Proposed Submission stage (non-strategic sites)</p> <p>GIS data.</p> <p>Submission stage – SGOs</p> <p>GIS data.</p>
	<p>4.6: Are health facilities available locally? (same test as 2.2 above)</p>		<p>Criteria set out in Q. 2.2 above</p>	<p>Same score and justification as 2.2.</p>
	<p>4.7 Are shopping and related services available locally?</p> <p>Positive effects are likely in relation this objective when proposals are located so that residents or employees are able to walk to local shops and related services.</p>	<p>++?</p> <p>+</p> <p>0</p>	<p>Potential provision of new shopping and related facilities or 0 to 200m distance</p> <p>201 to 400m distance</p> <p>401 to 600m distance</p>	<p>Issues and Options stage (Strategic Locations)</p> <p>Information from site promoters and GIS data.</p> <p>Proposed Submission stage (non-</p>

Will the strategic location under consideration...	Assessment question and related assumptions	Scoring criteria		Information sources
	This was assessed via proximity to the nearest defined Town, District or Local Centre in the adopted or emerging Local Plan, plus any significant superstore over 2,000 sq m but excluding neighbourhood parades and isolated convenience stores.	-	601 to 800m distance	<p>strategic sites)</p> <p>GIS data.</p> <p>Information on provision of new facilities not available on consistent basis for all site options, therefore '+ + ?' score not possible.</p> <p>All employment sites will be '0'.</p> <p>Submission stage – SGOs</p> <p>GIS data.</p> <p>Information on provision from EBC.</p> <p>Uncertainty removed where Council has indicated that new facilities will be provided.</p>
		--	Over 800m distance	
	<p>4.8 Is the location close to a primary school?</p> <p>Positive effects are likely in relation this objective when residential or mixed use proposals are located so that residents are able to walk to a primary school.</p> <p>Capacity of existing schools would need to be explored outside of the SA process.</p>	++(?)	Potential provision of new primary school (++?) or 0 to 400m distance (++)	<p>Issues and Options stage (Strategic Locations)</p> <p>Information from site promoters and GIS data.</p> <p>Proposed Submission stage (non-strategic sites)</p> <p>GIS data.</p> <p>Information on provision of new facilities not available on consistent basis for all site options, therefore '+ + ?' score not possible.</p> <p>Employment will be '0'.</p> <p>Submission stage – SGOs</p> <p>GIS data.</p>
		+	401-600m distance	
		0	601 to 800m distance, or no residential development proposed at location	
		-	801 to 1000m distance	
		--	Over 1000m distance	

Will the strategic location under consideration...	Assessment question and related assumptions	Scoring criteria		Information sources
				Information on provision from EBC. Uncertainty removed where Council has indicated that new facilities will be provided.
	<p>4.9 Is the location close to a secondary school?</p> <p>Positive effects are likely in relation this objective when residential or mixed use proposals are located so that residents are able to walk to a secondary school.</p> <p>Capacity of existing schools would need to be explored outside of the SA process.</p>	++(?)	Potential provision of new secondary school (++) or 0 to 800m distance (++)	<p>Issues and Options stage (Strategic Locations)</p> <p>Information from site promoters and GIS data.</p> <p>Proposed Submission stage (non-strategic sites)</p> <p>GIS data.</p> <p>Information on provision of new facilities not available on consistent basis for all site options, therefore '++?' score not possible.</p> <p>Employment sites will be '0'.</p> <p>Submission stage – SGOs</p> <p>GIS data.</p> <p>Information on provision from EBC.</p> <p>Uncertainty removed where Council has indicated that new facilities will be provided.</p>
		+	801 to 1200m distance	
		0	1201 to 1600m distance, or no residential development proposed at location	
		-	1601 to 2000m distance	
		--	Over 2000m distance	
	4.10 Can the location easily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same test as 2.5. above)	Criteria set out in Q. 2.5 above		Same score and justification as 2.5.
	4.11 Are there Geographical barriers between the location and key facilities/	+	No geographical barriers on the most direct walking route to any destination	Issues and Options stage (Strategic Locations)

Will the strategic location under consideration...	Assessment question and related assumptions	Scoring criteria		Information sources
	destinations? Negative effects in relation this objective are likely when pedestrians (residents or employees) are forced to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • cross a major geographic barrier e.g. a railway line, motorway/ dual carriageway etc. via a bridge, underpass or similar • walk along a route without a properly surfaced and lit footway of 2m+ width and hard surface throughout on the most direct walking route to any of the above facilities which are within the distance criterion.	0	Geographical barriers on the most direct walking route to one or two destinations	EBC officer judgement. Proposed Submission stage (non-strategic sites) Information on quality of footways to key facilities not available on consistent basis for all site options therefore only assess presence of geographic barriers via aerial photography; '--' score not possible, all other scores to have '?' appended to reflect lack of information re. 'adequate footway quality'. Submission stage – SGOs GIS data and Aerial photography. Previous SA of relevant Strategic Spatial Option.
-	Geographical barriers on the most direct walking route to three or more destinations and/or Lack of an adequate quality footway to more than one destination	- -	Lack of an adequate quality footway to more than one destination	
SA5: Protect and conserve natural resources				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have potential impact on natural resources? • Lead to the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land? • Lead to the more efficient use of land, for example by utilising brownfield sites? 	5.1 Will development avoid the sterilisation of mineral resources Negative effects are likely in relation to this objective when proposals would prevent the future extraction of known mineral reserves.	0	Location is not in an area safeguarded for minerals extraction, or minerals extraction has already taken place	Issues and Options stage (Strategic Locations) Mineral Safeguarding Areas and Minerals Consultation Areas in GIS data. Proposed Submission stage (non-strategic sites) Mineral Safeguarding Areas and Minerals Consultation Areas in GIS data. Submission stage – SGOs Mineral Safeguarding Areas and Minerals Consultation Areas in GIS data.
-?	Location is in Mineral Safeguarding Area or Mineral Consultation Area			

Will the strategic location under consideration...	Assessment question and related assumptions	Scoring criteria		Information sources
	<p>5.2 Will it result in the loss of higher grade agricultural land?</p> <p>Negative effects are likely in relation to this objective when proposals would result in the loss of higher grade agricultural land.</p>	0	Lower quality agricultural land (Grades 4 or 5)	<p>Issues and Options stage (Strategic Locations)</p> <p>Agricultural land classifications in GIS data.</p> <p>Proposed Submission stage (non-strategic sites)</p> <p>Agricultural land classifications in GIS data.</p> <p>Submission stage – SGOs</p> <p>Agricultural land classifications in GIS data.</p>
	-	Medium quality agricultural land (Grades 3a or 3b)	<p>Issues and Options stage (Strategic Locations)</p> <p>SLAA forms: site description.</p> <p>Proposed Submission stage (non-strategic sites)</p> <p>SLAA forms: site description.</p> <p>Submission stage – SGOs</p> <p>Previous SA of relevant Strategic Spatial Option.</p> <p>Aerial photography.</p>	
	- -	High quality agricultural land (Grades 1 or 2)		
	<p>5.3 Will it use previously developed land?</p> <p>Positive effects are likely in relation this objective when development locations are on previously developed rather than greenfield land.</p>	++		Yes
	-	No	<p>Issues and Options stage (Strategic Locations)</p> <p>SLAA forms: site description.</p> <p>Proposed Submission stage (non-strategic sites)</p> <p>SLAA forms: site description.</p> <p>Submission stage – SGOs</p> <p>Previous SA of relevant Strategic Spatial Option.</p> <p>Aerial photography.</p>	
	+/-	Mixed		
	<p>5.4 Will it deliver or support allotments or community farms?</p> <p>Positive effects are likely in relation this objective when development proposals support allotments or community farms.</p>	++		Delivery of new community farm
	+	Delivery of new allotments	<p>Issues and Options stage (Strategic Locations)</p> <p>EBC assessment and information from site promoters.</p> <p>Proposed Submission stage (non-</p>	
	+?	Location could be suitable for providing new allotments/community farm.		

Will the strategic location under consideration...	Assessment question and related assumptions	Scoring criteria		Information sources
		-	Development at this location would not make any contribution toward allotments or community farms either within the location or in the wider area	<p>strategic sites)</p> <p>Information on new provision of/contribution to community farms/allotments not available on consistent basis for all site options therefore only possible to check for loss of existing facilities by reference to SLAA forms.</p> <p>Employment will be '0', unless development would lead to loss of existing allotments or community farm.</p> <p>Submission stage – SGOs</p> <p>Previous SA of relevant Strategic Spatial Option.</p>
		- -	Loss of allotments or community farm without suitable replacement	
SA6: Reduce air, soil, water, light and noise pollution				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce air quality? • Impact on soil pollution? • Help to remediate land affected by contamination? • Have an impact on water pollution? • Have an impact on light pollution? • Have an impact on noise pollution? 	<p>6.1 Will the location be affected by significant noise generating uses or Air Quality Management Areas (AQMA)s?</p> <p>Negative effects are likely on this objective when residential, employment or other sensitive development will occur in locations subject to high levels of air or noise pollution.</p>	- -?	Impact from both significant noise generating uses and located within an AQMA	<p>Issues and Options stage (Strategic Locations)</p> <p>EBC assessment and information from site promoters.</p> <p>Proposed Submission stage (non-strategic sites)</p> <p>Information on existing air pollution and noise pollution not available on consistent basis for all site options. Instead, score as '-?' if site is within an AQMA or within 200 m of a railway, A-road or motorway and '--?' if both apply.</p> <p>EBC assessment.</p> <p>SLAA where EBC assessment is not</p>
		- ?	Impact from either significant noise generating uses or located within an AQMA	
		0	No impact from significant noise generating uses and not within an AQMA	

Will the strategic location under consideration...	Assessment question and related assumptions	Scoring criteria		Information sources
				<p>available.</p> <p>Submission stage – SGOs</p> <p>GIS data (score as ‘-?’ if site is within an AQMA or within 200 m of a railway, A-road or motorway and ‘--?’ if both apply).</p> <p>Previous SA of relevant Strategic Spatial Option.</p>
	<p>6.2 Will development increase pollution?</p> <p>Negative effects are likely in relation to this objective when development proposals will result in pollution that cannot be readily mitigated.</p>	+?	<p>There is potential for reduction in pollution e.g. remediation of contamination. Further information required</p>	<p>Issues and Options stage (Strategic Locations)</p> <p>EBC assessment and information from site promoters.</p> <p>Proposed Submission stage (non-strategic sites)</p> <p>EBC assessment.</p> <p>Employment sites including or potentially including industrial uses will be -?.</p> <p>Submission stage – SGOs</p> <p>Previous SA of relevant Strategic Spatial Option.</p>
0		<p>Development does not raise concerns which cannot be addressed by mitigation</p>		
- ?		<p>Development could have impacts either an AQMA or an SAC, or noise/contamination impacts</p>		
- -?		<p>Development could have impacts on more than 1 sensitive receptor, i.e. an AQMA and an SAC, and/or noise impacts and/or contamination impacts</p>		
<p>SA7: Plan for the anticipated levels of climate change</p>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have an impact on green infrastructure (including extent and quality of open space and linear routes for recreation)? • Increase or reduce the 	<p>7.1 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure? (types of GI: parks & gardens; amenity greenspace; semi-</p>	+	<p>Additional and/or improved GI assets</p>	<p>Issues and Options stage (Strategic Locations)</p> <p>EBC assessment and information from</p>
		+?	<p>Potential for additional and/or improved GI</p>	

Will the strategic location under consideration...	Assessment question and related assumptions	Scoring criteria		Information sources
<p>number of new properties at risk of flooding?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage development in areas affected by coastal change? 	<p>natural urban greenspace; green corridors; allotments; community gardens, city farms; cemeteries and churchyards - same test as 11.3)</p>	0	No impact (i.e. no gain or loss) of GI	<p>site promoters.</p> <p>Proposed Submission stage (non-strategic sites)</p> <p>Information re. provision of new/improved GI and re. opportunity to mitigate any loss not available on consistent basis for all site options therefore:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Score as '-?' if GIS open space layer, aerial imagery or SLAA form indicates loss of GI, otherwise score as '0'. <p>EBC has stated that all woodland will be retained.</p> <p>Employment sites will be '0' unless development will result in the loss of GI.</p> <p>Submission stage – SGOs</p> <p>Information on provision from EBC. EBC has stated that all woodland will be retained.</p> <p>GIS data.</p>
		-?	Loss of GI with potential opportunities for mitigation	
		- -	Loss of GI will no opportunities to mitigate	
	<p>7.2 Is the location at risk from flooding, taking into account the effects of climate change?</p> <p>Negative effects are likely in relation to this objective when a development location is in an area of high flood risk and the proposed type of development is sensitive to flood risk.</p>	0	Location not in area of surface water flood risk and location is not in Flood Zone 2 or 3 or proposed use is classified as appropriate to the Zone by NPPF Technical Guidance	<p>Issues and Options stage (Strategic Locations)</p> <p>Surface water flood risk and Environment Agency Flood Zone in GIS data.</p> <p>Proposed Submission stage (non-strategic sites)</p> <p>Surface water flood risk and</p>
		-?	Location is within EA Flood Zone 2 and proposed use is not classified as appropriate to the Zone by Technical Guidance to NPPF, or location is subject	

Will the strategic location under consideration...	Assessment question and related assumptions	Scoring criteria		Information sources
			to 'less' surface water flood risk	Environment Agency Flood Zone in GIS data.
		- -?	Location is within EA Flood Zone 3 and proposed use is not classified as appropriate to the Zone by Technical Guidance to NPPF, or location is subject to 'more' or 'intermediate' surface water flood risk	Submission stage – SGOs Surface water flood risk and Environment Agency Flood Zone in GIS data.
	7.3 Will the development be at risk from coastal change? If so, can the Shoreline Management Plan (SMP) objectives be supported?	+	Location is in area of coastal change and helps to deliver SMP objectives in this area (e.g. Flood defences, coastal protection works)	Issues and Options stage (Strategic Locations) EBC assessment.
	Negative effects are likely in relation to this objective when a development location is in an area at risk from coastal change but does not help to deliver SMP objectives.	?	Located in area of coastal change but insufficient information is available to comment on its contribution to SMP Objectives for this area.	Proposed Submission stage (non-strategic sites) EBC assessment for any coastal sites; non-coastal sites scored '0'.
		-	Location is in area of coastal change but doesn't contribute to SMP objectives	Submission stage – SGOs None of the SGOs are coastal sites, therefore all score '0'.
		0	Not located in area of coastal change	
SA8: Minimise Eastleigh's contribution to climate change by reducing the borough's carbon footprint and minimising other greenhouse gas emissions				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Promote a reduction in carbon emissions? 	Criteria for sustainable travel options in found in assessment criteria for SA Objective 3. This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.			
SA9: Reduce waste generation and disposal, encourage waste prevention and reuse and achieve the sustainable management of waste				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide, or be accessible to, facilities for the separation and recycling of waste? 	This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.			

Will the strategic location under consideration...	Assessment question and related assumptions	Scoring criteria		Information sources
SA10: Protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and geodiversity, improving its quality and range. Avoid, mitigate or, at last resort, compensate for adverse effects on biodiversity				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have an impact on biodiversity and geodiversity (including protected species, habitats, sites and landscapes at international, national and/or local levels of nature conservation designation)? • Provide new creation, restoration and/or enhancement opportunities for habitats and species? • Prejudice future Site biodiversity restoration? • Support creation, protection, enhancement and/or management of networks of biodiversity 	<p>10.1 Could development negatively impact or lead to loss of an internationally or nationally designated site (either alone or in-combination)?</p> <p>Internationally designated sites include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC • SPA • Ramsar <p>Nationally designated sites in Eastleigh include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SSSI 	+	Likely to have a positive impact, opportunities for enhancement	<p>Issues and Options stage (Strategic Locations)</p> <p>HRA screening zone in GIS data.</p> <p>Proposed Submission stage (non-strategic sites)</p> <p>EBC biodiversity assessment forms.</p> <p>GIS information used for those sites not included in the EBC biodiversity assessment.</p> <p>Submission stage – SGOs</p> <p>SGO Draft Background Paper (2017).</p> <p>GIS data.</p>
		0	Unlikely to have adverse impact	
		?	Likely impact is uncertain	
		-	Minor negative effects identified in EBC biodiversity assessment or potential mitigation has been identified for potentially significant effects	
		- -	Development is likely to have significant effects e.g. loss of site in part or whole	
	<p>10.2 Could development negatively impact or lead to loss of a locally designated biodiversity site (either alone or in-combination)?</p> <p>Locally designated sites include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LNR • SINC 	+	Likely to have a positive impact, opportunities for enhancement	<p>Issues and Options stage (Strategic Locations)</p> <p>GIS data.</p> <p>Proposed Submission stage (non-strategic sites)</p> <p>EBC biodiversity assessment forms.</p> <p>GIS information used for those sites not included in the EBC biodiversity assessment.</p>
		0	Unlikely to have adverse impact	
		?	Likely impact is uncertain	
		-	Minor negative effects identified in EBC biodiversity assessment or potential mitigation has been identified for potentially significant effects	

Will the strategic location under consideration...	Assessment question and related assumptions	Scoring criteria		Information sources
		--	Development is likely to have significant effects e.g. loss of one or more locally designated wildlife sites, in part or in whole	Submission stage – SGOs SGO Draft Background Paper (2017). GIS data.
	10.3 Will the development adversely affect areas with other nature conservation value, as identified in Biodiversity Action Plans (BAPs)? This includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BAP habitats • Habitats of principal importance • Areas likely to support BAP species • Areas likely to support species of principal importance 	+	Likely to have a positive impact, opportunities for enhancement	Issues and Options stage (Strategic Locations)
		0	Unlikely to have adverse impact	EBC officer assessment.
		?	Likely impact is uncertain	Proposed Submission stage (non-strategic sites)
		-	Minor negative effects identified in EBC biodiversity assessment or potential mitigation has been identified for potentially significant effects	EBC biodiversity assessment forms. SLAA information used for those sites not included in the EBC biodiversity assessment.
		- -	Development is likely to have significant effects e.g. loss of a large part of an area of nature conservation value	Submission stage – SGOs Previous SA of relevant Strategic Spatial Option, Draft Background Paper and EBC officer verification.
	10.4 Will the development adversely impact the biodiversity network (e.g. Priority Biodiversity Links (PBLs), Priority Biodiversity Areas (PBAs), hedgerows and other corridors for species movement)?	+	Likely to have a positive impact, opportunities for enhancement	Issues and Options stage (Strategic Locations)
		0	Unlikely to have adverse impact	EBC officer assessment
		?	Likely impact is uncertain	Proposed Submission stage (non-strategic sites)
		-	Minor negative effects identified in EBC biodiversity assessment or potential mitigation has been identified for potentially significant effects	EBC biodiversity assessment forms. GIS information used for those sites not included in the EBC biodiversity assessment.

Will the strategic location under consideration...	Assessment question and related assumptions	Scoring criteria		Information sources
		- -	Development is likely to have significant effects e.g. by severing/complete loss of link	Submission stage – SGOs Previous SA of relevant Strategic Spatial Option, GIS data.
	10.5 Will the development adversely affect ancient woodland?	+	Likely to have a positive impact, opportunities for enhancement	Issues and Options stage (Strategic Locations)
		0	Unlikely to have adverse impact	EBC officer assessment
		?	Likely impact is uncertain	Proposed Submission stage (non-strategic sites)
		-	Minor negative effects identified in EBC biodiversity assessment or potential mitigation has been identified for potentially significant effects	EBC biodiversity assessment forms. GIS information used for those sites not included in the EBC biodiversity assessment.
		- -	Development is likely to have significant effects e.g. direct loss of ancient woodland	Submission stage – SGOs SGO Draft Background Paper (2017) GIS data
SA11: Enhance the Borough’s multifunctional green infrastructure networks				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Help to reduce deficiencies in open space provision? • Support local and/or strategic Green Infrastructure networks? • Protect and enhance public rights of way? • Deliver good access to existing and/or create new Green Infrastructure? 	11.1 Will the development affect TPO trees?	0	No TPO trees on site	Issues and Options stage (Strategic Locations)
		-?	TPO trees on site; potential for negative impact or loss of protected trees	EBC officer assessment. Proposed Submission stage (non-strategic sites) EBC officer assessment. SLAA. Submission stage – SGOs

Will the strategic location under consideration...	Assessment question and related assumptions	Scoring criteria		Information sources	
				Previous SA of relevant Strategic Spatial Option.	
	11.2 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network?		Criteria set out in Q. 2.5 above	Same score and justification as 2.5.	
	11.3 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure? (same test as 7.1)		Criteria set out in Q. 7.1 above	Same score and justification as 7.1.	
SA12: Protect, enhance and manage the character and appearance of the landscape and townscape, maintaining and strengthening distinctiveness and its special qualities					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have an impact on landscape? • Achieve high quality and sustainable design for buildings, spaces and the public realm sensitive to the locality? • Protect the character and distinctiveness of the borough's settlements and countryside e.g. will the development adversely affect the separation of the borough's settlements? 	12.1 Will development adversely affect the separation of neighbouring settlements?	0	Location will maintain the separation between neighbouring settlements	<p>Issues and Options stage (Strategic Locations)</p> <p>EBC officer assessment.</p> <p>Proposed Submission stage (non-strategic sites)</p> <p>Base on score from EBC countryside gap assessment:</p> <p>Good = '0'</p> <p>Average or average/good = '-'</p> <p>Poor or poor/average = '--'</p> <p>All sites in urban areas will be '0'.</p> <p>Submission stage – SGOs</p> <p>SGO Draft Background Paper (2017).</p>	
	12.2 Will it protect the character of the	+?	Potential for a positive impact		Issues and Options stage (Strategic
		-	Development which results in loss or minor changes to the character of the gap		
	- -	Development will close the gap between neighbouring settlements or significantly change the character of the gap (e.g. visually or physically connect)			

Will the strategic location under consideration...	Assessment question and related assumptions	Scoring criteria		Information sources
	countryside, coast, towns and/or villages including views and settings?	0	Low impact	<p>Locations)</p> <p>EBC officer assessment.</p> <p>Proposed Submission stage (non-strategic sites)</p> <p>Base on score from EBC landscape study:</p> <p>Low sensitivity = '0'</p> <p>Moderate or Moderate/Low sensitivity = '-'</p> <p>High or High/Moderate sensitivity = '--'</p> <p>GIS information and professional judgement used for those sites not included in the EBC landscape study.</p> <p>Sites in urban areas will be '0', unless they could contribute to townscape improvement, in which case they will be '+?'</p> <p>Submission stage – SGOs</p> <p>Previous SA of relevant Strategic Spatial Option and EBC officer comments.</p>
		-	Negative impacts requiring mitigation	
		- -?	Negative landscape impacts (e.g. loss of view or setting) requiring further exploration of mitigation options	
		- -	Negative landscape impacts for which it is not possible to mitigate	
<p>SA13: Protect and enhance and manage buildings, monuments, features, sites, places, areas and landscapes of archaeological, historical and cultural heritage importance</p>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impact on the historic environment and features and areas of archaeological importance? Conserve and enhance the significance of heritage assets and their settings? Increase access to heritage 	<p>13.1 Will the development protect and enhance listed buildings and their settings, conservation areas, archaeological sites, historic landscapes and other sites of local importance for heritage?</p>	+?	Potential for development to enhance heritage assets	<p>Issues and Options stage (Strategic Locations)</p> <p>EBC officer assessment, drawing on listed building register, conservation area appraisals, Historic Environment</p>
		0	No/minor impact on heritage assets	
		-?	Potential negative impact on heritage	

Will the strategic location under consideration...	Assessment question and related assumptions	Scoring criteria		Information sources
assets?			assets that may require mitigation	<p>Record.</p> <p>Proposed Submission stage (non-strategic sites)</p> <p>EBC officer assessment.</p> <p>GIS information used for those sites not assessed by EBC officers.</p> <p>Submission stage – SGOs</p> <p>Previous SA of relevant Strategic Spatial Option.</p>
		- -	Significant impact on heritage assets where mitigation is unlikely or not possible	

Table A4.2: Assumptions used in the SA of Strategic Locations and Strategic Spatial Options

Will the strategic location under consideration...	Assessment question and related assumptions	Scoring criteria		Information sources
SA1: Provide sufficient housing to meet identified local needs, including affordability and special needs				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contribute to meeting the objectively assessed housing need/the housing requirement identified in the Local Plan, including an appropriate mix of housing? Meet need within the local area as well as the wider housing market? Help to deliver affordable housing to meet Eastleigh's identified housing needs? 	<p>1.1 Will the development provide a significant contribution towards meeting identified affordable housing needs?</p> <p>Where mixed use locations incorporate residential development, effects in relation to this objective will depend on the likely proportion of affordable housing provision, as evidenced by site promoter's proposals, dwelling capacity of the location relative to the 5 dwelling affordable housing threshold and other evidence on viability.</p>	++	Evidence that 40% or more of the housing offer at location will be affordable housing	EBC assessment and information from site promoters
		+?	Evidence that at least the typical proportion of affordable housing (35%) will be provided at the location	
		0	Mainly employment use; no/negligible amount of housing offered at the location	
		?	Insufficient evidence is available to make a determination	
		-	Evidence that location will partially meet affordable housing requirements	
		--	Evidence that affordable housing is not economically viable on location or provision is unlikely due to the location being below the affordable housing threshold [5 dwellings]	
		<p>1.2 Will it provide other elements of identified housing need e.g. housing for older persons, self-build, support housing?</p> <p>Where mixed use locations incorporate residential development, effects in relation to this objective will depend on the likely proportion of homes falling into these specialist categories, as evidenced by site</p>	++	
0	Mainly employment use; no/negligible amount of housing offered at the location			
+?	The scale and location indicate that provision of one or more of these additional elements could be possible, however site promoter has not specified whether they propose to meet these			

Will the strategic location under consideration...	Assessment question and related assumptions	Scoring criteria		Information sources
	promoter's proposals.		other elements of identified need	
		- -	Site promoter has stated that development at this location would not contribute to meeting these additional needs	
SA2: Safeguard and improve community health, safety and wellbeing				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve opportunities for people to participate in cultural, leisure and recreation activities? • Promote healthy lifestyles, safety and wellbeing? • Provide good access to existing services, open space, facilities and community infrastructure? • Protect and enhance public rights of way? • Reduce crime, deprivation and promote social inclusion in the borough? 	<p>2.1 Are community facilities (community hall or library) available locally?</p> <p>Where development proposals would result in the provision of new community facilities, a significant positive effect is likely. For other proposals that will include new housing, the position of the strategic location could affect this objective by influencing people's ability to access existing services and facilities.</p>	++	The development of this location would provide or contribute to new community facilities or enhance existing facilities on location or within 400m	Information from site promoters GIS data
		+	Under 400m distance from location providing for residential development to existing community hall or library	
		0	400 to 800m distance from location providing for residential development to existing community hall or library, or no residential development proposed at location	
		-	Over 800m from location providing for residential development to existing community hall or library	
	<p>2.2 Are primary healthcare facilities available locally?</p> <p>Walking distance to nearest GP surgery, health centre or hospital (same test as 3.6).</p> <p>The position of the strategic location could</p>	++	Provision of new or improved healthcare facilities or under 400m to existing health facilities	Information from site promoters GIS data
		+	400 to 1000m to existing health facilities	
		- -	Over 1000m distance to existing health facilities	

Will the strategic location under consideration...	Assessment question and related assumptions	Scoring criteria		Information sources
	affect this objective by influencing residents' or employees' ability to access existing health facilities. Capacity of existing GP surgeries would need to be explored outside of the SA process.			
	2.3 What effect would the development have on local provision of sports pitches and facilities? Where development proposals would result in the provision of new sports pitches and facilities a positive effect is likely. Conversely, loss of existing facilities would have a negative effect.	++	Location addresses under-provision of sports pitch provision in the wider locality	EBC assessment and information from site promoters
		+	Location provides sports pitches for residents of the location (where new facilities are required)	
		+?	Location could be suitable for supporting improvements to sports facilities provision either within the location or the wider area. Further information on the suitability of the location would be required and/or site promoter has not specified if development at this location would provide any contribution to this	
		-	Site promoter has stated that development at this location would not make any improvements to sports facilities provision either within the location or the wider locality	
		--	Location results in loss of sports pitches/facilities without suitable replacement	
	2.4 Is public open space available locally? Where development proposals would result in the provision of new public open space, a significant positive effect is likely. For other proposals, the position of the strategic location could affect this	++	The development of this location would provide or contribute to new publicly accessible open space	Information from site promoters GIS data
		+	Location is within 300m of existing publicly accessible open space	
		0	Location is within 300m to 800m existing	

Will the strategic location under consideration...	Assessment question and related assumptions	Scoring criteria		Information sources
	objective by influencing residents' or employees' ability to access existing public open space.		publicly accessible open space	Presence of Public Rights Of Way (PROW) or Eastleigh Cycle Network in GIS data.
		-	Location is more than 800m from existing publicly accessible open space	
		- -	Development results in loss of publicly accessible open space	
	2.5 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same test as 3.10 and 11.2 below)	+	Existing footpath and cycle path cross location or are adjacent to location boundary	
	Positive effects are likely in relation to this objective where the location of development proposals facilitates their connection to the cycle and footpath network, supporting active travel by residents or employees.	0	Existing footpath only crosses location or is adjacent to its boundary	
		-	No footpath or cycle path crosses location or is adjacent to its boundary	
SA3: Develop a dynamic and diverse economy				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deliver new diverse and knowledge- based employment opportunities? • Support or encourage new business sectors and contribute to GVA in South Hampshire? • Encourage and support business start-ups and assist the development of SMEs? • Provide good access to a range of employment areas? • Enhance the vitality and viability of Eastleigh town 	3.1(a) Is the location close to a major rail station? (same test as 4.1)	Criteria set out in Qn. 4.1 below		Same score and justification as 4.1
	3.1 (b) Is the location close to a minor rail station? (same test as 4.2)	Criteria set out in Qn. 4.2 below		Same score and justification as 4.2
	3.1 (c) Is the location close to a frequent bus route? (same test as 4.3)	Criteria set out in Qn. 4.3 below		Same score and justification as 4.3
	3.1 (d) Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route? (same test as 4.4)	Criteria set out in Qn. 4.4 below		Same score and justification as 4.4

Will the strategic location under consideration...	Assessment question and related assumptions	Scoring criteria		Information sources
<p>centre and other district and local centres?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Help to develop and maintain a skilled workforce to support long- term competitiveness? • Ensure a wide cross section of the community benefits from economic prosperity? 	3.1 (e) Is the location close to a major employment centre? (same test as 4.5)	Criteria set out in Qn. 4.5 below		Same score and justification as 4.5
	3.2 Will the proposed development contribute towards meeting the need for new industrial, office or warehousing floorspace?	+	Location proposed wholly or partially for additional employment floorspace, including new facilities to support business start-ups/SMEs; or including new facilities to support new business sectors	EBC assessment and information from site promoters
	Positive effects are likely in relation to this objective when proposals include employment floorspace.	0	Location is capable of accommodating additional employment floorspace that includes new facilities to support business start-ups/SMEs; or new facilities to support new business sectors	
		-	Location would be unsuitable for additional employment floorspace that includes new facilities to support business start-ups/SMEs; or new facilities to support new business sectors	
	3.3 Will the proposed development result in a net loss of existing employment land, or land which would be suitable for employment purposes?	0	No	SLAA form 'Site Descriptions...' and 'Suitability' sections
	Negative effects are likely in relation to this objective when proposals would result in a net loss of existing employment land.	-	Yes	
	3.4 Will the proposed development increase the amount of commercial uses and other facilities in town, district or local centres?	++	Increases retail floorspace or commercial floorspace in primary shopping area or other shopping frontages	Proposed uses from site promoters Existing uses from SLAA form 'Site description...' and 'Suitability' of existing uses
		+?	New local centre proposed. Effect on existing facilities is uncertain	

Will the strategic location under consideration...	Assessment question and related assumptions	Scoring criteria		Information sources
	Positive effects are likely in relation to this objective when proposals would result in a net gain of commercial uses and other facilities.	+	Increases in district or local centres	GIS data for 'District and local centres', 'Eastleigh Town Centre Public Realm', 'Eastleigh Town Centre Renaissance Quarter', 'Shopping frontages'
		0	No change, including residential-only development on land outside district or local centres and not resulting in loss of primary shopping area/ shopping frontage	
		-	Loss in town and district/local centres	
		- -	Loss in primary shopping area or other shopping frontages	
SA4: Reduce road traffic and congestion through improved accessibility to services homes and jobs; reducing the need to travel by car/lorry and improving sustainable travel choice				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve the capacity of the transport network? • Provide opportunities to encourage sustainable travel choice? • Improve road safety? 	4.1 Is the location close to a major rail station?	++	Under 400m distance	GIS data
		+	400 to 1200m distance	
	Significant positive effects in relation to this objective are likely where residential or employment proposals are in proximity to a rail station with frequent peak-time service (Southampton Airport Parkway, Eastleigh, Hedge End, Botley stations).	-	Over 1200m distance	
	4.2 Is the location close to a minor rail station?	+	Under 400m distance	GIS data
		0	400 to 600m distance	
	Minor positive effects in relation to this objective are likely where residential or employment proposals are in proximity to a rail station with infrequent peak-time service (all stations other than those	-	Over 600m distance	

Will the strategic location under consideration...	Assessment question and related assumptions	Scoring criteria		Information sources
	listed at 4.1)			
	4.3 Is the location close to a frequent bus route?	++	Under 400m distance	GIS data
		+	400 to 600m distance	
	<p>Significant positive effects in relation to this objective are likely where residential or employment proposals are in proximity to a bus route with a 20 min or better frequency bus service, i.e. the following routes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bluestar 1 Winchester-Chandlers Ford-Southampton • Bluestar 2 Fair Oak-Bishopstoke-Eastleigh-Stoneham-Southampton • First X4/X5 Southampton-Bursledon-Fareham- Portsmouth/ Gosport • Unilink U1 Airport Parkway-Highfield Campus-Southampton • First 7 (Townhill Park-Portswood-Southampton) <p>Assumed that new bus stop could be provided on existing route to serve development at a strategic location.</p>	-	Over 600m distance	
	4.4 Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route?	+	Under 300m distance	GIS data
	<p>Minor positive effects in relation to this objective are likely where residential or employment proposals are in proximity to a bus route with a semi frequent (30 min</p>	-	Over 300m distance	

Will the strategic location under consideration...	Assessment question and related assumptions	Scoring criteria		Information sources
	<p>frequency) bus service, i.e. the following routes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Xelabus X6/X7 Eastleigh-Chandlers Ford only • First 8 Hedge End-West End-Townhill Park-Southampton (Hedge End to West End section likely to be withdrawn in short to medium term due to low usage) • First 6 Hamble-Netley-Hedge End (formerly 20 minutes and in my view has potential to operate at this higher frequency in future) • Bluestar 5 Eastleigh to Boyatt Wood only <p>Assumed that new bus stop could be provided on existing route to serve development at a strategic location.</p>			
	<p>4.5(a) Will residential development at the location be close to a major employment centre?</p> <p>For purely residential locations or mixed use locations with a significant residential component, positive effects are likely in relation to this objective when it is in proximity to defined major employment centres:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensign Way • GE Aviation • Hedge End Industrial Area • Chalcroft Business Park • Eastleigh River Side • Phoenix Park • Southampton Airport Business Park 	++	Under 400m distance	GIS data
		+	400 to 1000m distance	
		-	Over 1000m distance	
		0	No significant residential use	

Will the strategic location under consideration...	Assessment question and related assumptions	Scoring criteria		Information sources
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tollgate Business Park Land adjoining Chalcroft Distribution Park Eastleigh town centre Chandlers Ford Industrial Estate Woodside Avenue and Boyatt Wood Industrial Estates Hampshire Corporate Park Tollbar Offices 			
	<p>4.5(b) Will employment development at the location be close to a major population centre?</p> <p>For purely employment locations or mixed use locations with a significant employment component, positive effects are likely in relation to this objective when it is in proximity to defined major population centres:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Southampton Eastleigh, including Chandlers Ford Hedge End 	++	Under 400m distance	GIS data
		+	400 to 1000m distance	
		-	Over 1000m distance	
		0	No significant employment use	
	4.6: Are health facilities available locally? (same test as 2.2 above)	Criteria set out in Qn. 2.2 above		Same score and justification as 2.2
	<p>4.7 Are shopping and related services available locally?</p> <p>Positive effects are likely in relation this objective when proposals are located so that residents or employees are able to walk to local shops and related services. This is assessed via proximity to the</p>	++?	Potential provision of new shopping and related facilities	Information from site promoters and GIS data
		+	Under 400m distance	
		0	400 to 800m distance	
		-	Over 800m distance	

Will the strategic location under consideration...	Assessment question and related assumptions	Scoring criteria		Information sources
	nearest defined Town, District or Local Centre in the adopted or emerging Local Plan, plus any significant superstore over 2,000 sq m but excluding neighbourhood parades and isolated convenience stores.			
	4.8 Is the location close to a primary school?	++?	Potential provision of new primary school	Information from site promoters and GIS data
	Positive effects are likely in relation this objective when residential or mixed use proposals are located so that residents are able to walk to a primary school. Capacity of existing schools would need to be explored outside of the SA process.	+	Under 400m distance	
		0	400 to 800m distance, or no residential development proposed at location	
		-	Over 800m distance	
	4.9 Is the location close to a secondary school?	++?	Potential provision of new secondary school	Information from site promoters and GIS data
	Positive effects are likely in relation this objective when residential or mixed use proposals are located so that residents are able to walk to a secondary school. Capacity of existing schools would need to be explored outside of the SA process.	+	Under 800m distance	
		0	800 to 1600m distance, or no residential development proposed at location	
		-	Over 1600m distance	
	4.10 Can the location easily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same test as 2.5. above)	Criteria set out in Qn. 2.5 above		Same score and justification as 2.5

Will the strategic location under consideration...	Assessment question and related assumptions	Scoring criteria		Information sources
	<p>4.11 Are there Geographical barriers between the location and key facilities/ destinations?</p> <p>Negative effects in relation this objective are likely when pedestrians (residents or employees) are forced to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • cross a major geographic barrier e.g. a railway line, motorway/ dual carriageway etc. via a bridge, underpass or similar • walk along a route without a properly surfaced and lit footway of 2m+ width and hard surface throughout <p>.....on the most direct walking route to any of the above facilities which are within the distance criterion.</p>	+	No geographical barriers on the most direct walking route to any destination	EBC officer judgement
		0	Geographical barriers on the most direct walking route to one or two destinations	
		-	Geographical barriers on the most direct walking route to three or more destinations and/or Lack of an adequate quality footway to more than one destination	
		- -	Lack of an adequate quality footway to more than one destination	
SA5: Protect and conserve natural resources				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have potential impact on natural resources? • Lead to the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land? • Lead to the more efficient use of land, for example by utilising brownfield sites? 	5.1 Will development avoid the sterilisation of mineral resources	0	Location is not in an area safeguarded for minerals extraction, or minerals extraction has already taken place	Mineral Safeguarding Areas and Minerals Consultation Areas in GIS data
	Negative effects are likely in relation to this objective when proposals would prevent the future extraction of known mineral reserves.	-?	Location is in Mineral Safeguarding Area or Mineral Consultation Area	
	5.2 Will it result in the loss of higher grade agricultural land?	0	Lower quality agricultural land (Grades 4 or 5)	Agricultural land classifications in GIS data
	-	Medium quality agricultural land (Grades 3a or 3b)		

Will the strategic location under consideration...	Assessment question and related assumptions	Scoring criteria		Information sources
	Negative effects are likely in relation to this objective when proposals would result in the loss of higher grade agricultural land.	- -	High quality agricultural land (Grades 1 or 2)	
	5.3 Will it use previously developed land? Positive effects are likely in relation this objective when development locations are on previously developed rather than greenfield land.	++	Yes	SLAA forms: site description
		-	No	
		+/-	Mixed	
	5.4 Will it deliver or support allotments or community farms? Positive effects are likely in relation this objective when development proposals support allotments or community farms.	++	Delivery of new community farm	EBC assessment and information from site promoters
		+	Delivery of new allotments	
		+?	Location could be suitable for providing new allotments/community farm. The site promoter has not indicated if such provision would be included as part of development at this location.	
		-	Site promoter has stated that development at this location would not make any contribution toward allotments or community farms either within the location or in the wider area	
		- -	Loss of allotments or community farm without suitable replacement	
SA6: Reduce air, soil, water, light and noise pollution				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce air quality? • Impact on soil pollution? • Help to remediate land affected by contamination? 	6.1 Will the location be affected by significant noise generating uses or Air Quality Management Areas?	- -?	Impact from both significant noise generating uses and located within an Air Quality Management Area	EBC assessment and information from site promoters

Will the strategic location under consideration...	Assessment question and related assumptions	Scoring criteria		Information sources
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have an impact on water pollution? • Have an impact on light pollution? • Have an impact on noise pollution? 	<p>Negative effects are likely on this objective when residential, employment or other sensitive development will occur in locations subject to high levels of air or noise pollution.</p>	- ?	Impact from either significant noise generating uses or Air Quality Management Areas	
		0	No impact from significant noise generating uses or Air Quality Management Areas	
	<p>6.2 Will development increase pollution?</p> <p>Negative effects are likely in relation to this objective when development proposals will result in pollution that cannot be readily mitigated.</p>	+?	There is potential for reduction in pollution e.g. remediation of contamination. Further information required	EBC assessment and information from site promoters
		0	Development does not raise concerns which cannot be addressed by mitigation	
		- ?	Development could have impacts either an AQMA or an SAC, or noise/contamination impacts	
		- -?	Development could have impacts on more than 1 sensitive receptor, i.e. an AQMA and an SAC, and/or noise impacts and/or contamination impacts	
SA7: Plan for the anticipated levels of climate change				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have an impact on green infrastructure (including extent and quality of open space and linear routes for recreation)? • Increase or reduce the number of new properties at risk of flooding? • Manage development in areas affected by coastal change? 	<p>7.1 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure? (same test as 11.3)</p>	+	Additional and/or improved GI assets	EBC assessment and information from site promoters
		+?	Potential for additional and/or improved GI	
		0	No impact (i.e. no gain or loss) of GI	
		-?	Loss of GI with potential opportunities for mitigation	
		- -	Loss of GI will no opportunities to mitigate	

Will the strategic location under consideration...	Assessment question and related assumptions	Scoring criteria		Information sources
	<p>7.2 Is the location at risk from flooding, taking into account of the effects of climate change?</p> <p>Negative effects are likely in relation to this objective when a development location is in an area of high flood risk and the proposed type of development is sensitive to flood risk.</p>	0	Location not in area of surface water flood risk and location is not in Flood Zone 2 or 3 or proposed use is classified as appropriate to the Zone by NPPF Technical Guidance	Surface water flood risk and Environment Agency Flood Zone GIS data
		-?	Location is within EA Flood Zone 2 and proposed use is not classified as appropriate to the Zone by Technical Guidance to NPPF, or location is subject to 'less' surface water flood risk	
		- -?	Location is within EA Flood Zone 3 and proposed use is not classified as appropriate to the Zone by Technical Guidance to NPPF, or location is subject to 'more' or 'intermediate' surface water flood risk	
	<p>7.3 Will the development be at risk from coastal change? If so, can the Shoreline Management Plan (SMP) objectives be supported?</p> <p>Negative effects are likely in relation to this objective when a development location is in an area at risk from coastal change but does not help to deliver SMP objectives.</p>	+	Location is in area of coastal change and helps to deliver SMP objectives in this area (e.g. Flood defences, coastal protection works)	EBC assessment
		?	Located in area of coastal change but insufficient information is available to comment on its contribution to SMP Objectives for this area.	
		-	Location is in area of coastal change but doesn't contribute to SMP objectives	
		0	Not located in area of coastal change	
<p>SA8: Minimise Eastleigh's contribution to climate change by reducing the borough's carbon footprint and minimising other greenhouse gas emissions</p>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Promote a reduction in carbon emissions? 	<p>Criteria for sustainable travel options in found in assessment criteria for SA Objective 3. This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.</p>			

Will the strategic location under consideration...	Assessment question and related assumptions	Scoring criteria		Information sources	
SA9: Reduce waste generation and disposal, encourage waste prevention and reuse and achieve the sustainable management of waste					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide, or be accessible to, facilities for the separation and recycling of waste? 	This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.				
SA10: Protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and geodiversity, improving its quality and range. Avoid, mitigate or, at last resort, compensate for adverse effects on biodiversity					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Have an impact on biodiversity and geodiversity (including protected species, habitats, sites and landscapes at international, national and/or local levels of nature conservation designation)? Provide new creation, restoration and/or enhancement opportunities for habitats and species? Prejudice future Site biodiversity restoration? Support creation, protection, enhancement and/or management of networks of biodiversity 	<p>10.1 Is the location within the HRA screening zone?</p> <p>HRA screening trigger: All locations which fall within the following areas will be subject to project level HRA screening by EBC –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 200m of an SAC, SPA and/or Ramsar site 25m of a water course, where the section of water course is no further than 8km upstream of an SAC, SPA and/or Ramsar <p>Development locations in the HRA screening zone are assumed to have a negative effect on this objective but with uncertainty at this stage relating to the potential for avoidance or mitigation.</p>	0	Location is not within HRA screening zone	HRA screening zone in GIS data	
		- -?	Location is within HRA screening zone - avoidance and/or mitigation measures may be required		
	<p>10.2 Is the location within 200m of a SSSI?</p> <p>Development locations within 200m of a SSSI are assumed to have a negative</p>	0	Location is not within 200m of a SSSI		GIS data
		- -?	Location is within 200m of a SSSI; avoidance and/or mitigation measures may be required		

Will the strategic location under consideration...	Assessment question and related assumptions	Scoring criteria		Information sources
	effect on this objective but with uncertainty relating to the potential for avoidance or mitigation.			
	10.3 Is the location within 200m of a Local Nature Reserve?	0	Location is not within 200m of a Local Nature Reserve	GIS data
	Development locations within 200m of a Local Nature Reserve are assumed to have a negative effect on this objective but with uncertainty relating to the potential for avoidance or mitigation	-?	Location is within 200m of a Local Nature Reserve; avoidance and/or mitigation measures may be required	
	10.4 Will the development adversely affect a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation? (N.B. No NNRs are present in the District)	+?	Likely to have a positive impact, opportunities for enhancement	EBC officer assessment
		0	Unlikely to have adverse impact	
		-?	Potential for adverse effects on a SINC and/or potential for mitigation of an otherwise significant adverse effect	
		- -?	Loss of SINC	
	10.5 Will the development adversely affect protected species?	+?	Likely to have a positive impact, opportunities for enhancement	
		0	Development at this location is unlikely to have an impact	
		-?	Potential for adverse effects and/or potential for mitigation of an otherwise significant adverse effect	
		- -?	Potential for significant adverse impacts	

Will the strategic location under consideration...	Assessment question and related assumptions	Scoring criteria		Information sources	
	10.6 Will the development adversely affect sites with local designation of nature conservation value (e.g. Biodiversity Opportunity Areas, Biodiversity Action Plan Priority Areas, and Priority Habitat etc.)?	+?	Likely to have a positive impact, opportunities for enhancement	EBC officer assessment	
		0	Unlikely to have adverse impact		
		-?	Potential for adverse effects on local nature conservation designations and/or potential for mitigation of an otherwise significant adverse effect		
		- -?	Potential for significant adverse effects on a local nature conservation designation and/or potential for mitigation		
	10.7 Will the development adversely impact the biodiversity network (e.g. Biodiversity Action Plan Priority Links, hedgerows and other corridors for species movement)?	+	Likely to have a positive impact, opportunities for enhancement		EBC officer assessment
		0	Unlikely to have adverse impact / development has potential to mitigate		
		-?	Potential for adverse effects on a local nature conservation designation (e.g. by damage to the quality of a link) and/or potential for mitigation of an otherwise significant adverse effect		
		- -?	Potential for significant adverse effects e.g. by severing/complete loss of link		
	10.8 Will the development adversely affect ancient woodland?	+?	Potential indicated for improvement to ancient woodland and/or commitment to manage offsite ancient woodland which may suffer adverse impacts from recreation of development at this location	EBC officer assessment	
		0	No impact on ancient woodland		

Will the strategic location under consideration...	Assessment question and related assumptions	Scoring criteria		Information sources
		-?	Ancient woodland is within the location area or within 25m; potential for adverse impacts	
		- -	Loss of ancient woodland	
SA11: Enhance the Borough's multifunctional green infrastructure networks				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Help to reduce deficiencies in open space provision? • Support local and/or strategic Green Infrastructure networks? • Protect and enhance public rights of way? • Deliver good access to existing and/or create new Green Infrastructure? 	11.1 Will the development affect TPO trees?	0	No TPO trees on site	EBC officer assessment
	11.2 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network?	-?	TPO trees on site; potential for negative impact or loss of protected trees	
	11.3 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure? (same test as 7.1)	Criteria set out in Qn. 7.1 above	Criteria set out in Qn. 7.1 above	Same score and justification as 7.1
	SA12: Protect, enhance and manage the character and appearance of the landscape and townscape, maintaining and strengthening distinctiveness and its special qualities			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have an impact on landscape? • Achieve high quality and sustainable design for buildings, spaces and the public realm sensitive to the locality? • Protect the character and distinctiveness of the borough's settlements and countryside e.g. will the development adversely affect the separation of the borough's settlements? 	12.1 Will development adversely affect the separation of neighbouring settlements?	0	Location will maintain the separation between neighbouring settlements	EBC officer assessment
		-	Development which results in loss or minor changes to the character of the gap	
		- -	Development will close the gap between neighbouring settlements or significantly change the character of the gap (e.g. visually or physically connect)	

Will the strategic location under consideration...	Assessment question and related assumptions	Scoring criteria		Information sources	
	12.2 Will it protect the setting of the South Downs National Park?	+?	Potential for a positive impact on the setting of the National Park	EBC officer assessment	
		0	No impact on the setting of the National Park		
		-?	Negative impact on the setting of the National Park which requires mitigations		
		- -	Negative impact on the setting of the National Park where it is not possible to mitigate		
	12.3 Will it protect the character of the countryside, coast, towns and/or villages?	+?	Potential for a positive impact	EBC officer assessment	
		0	Low landscape impact		
		-	Negative landscape impacts requiring mitigation		
		- -?	Negative landscape impacts requiring further exploration of mitigation options		
		- -	Negative landscape impacts for which it is not possible to mitigate		
	12.4 Will it have an impact on locally important views and settings?	+?	Potential for a positive impact	EBC officer assessment	
		0	Low impact		
		- ?	Negative impact requiring further exploration of mitigation options		
	- -?	Loss of view or setting requiring further exploration of mitigation options			

Will the strategic location under consideration...	Assessment question and related assumptions	Scoring criteria		Information sources
SA13: Protect and enhance and manage buildings, monuments, features, sites, places, areas and landscapes of archaeological, historical and cultural heritage importance				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impact on the historic environment and features and areas of archaeological importance? Conserve and enhance the significance of heritage assets and their settings? Increase access to heritage assets? 	13.1 Will the development protect and enhance listed buildings and their settings, conservation areas, archaeological sites, historic landscapes and other sites of local importance for heritage?	+?	Potential for development to enhance heritage assets	EBC officer assessment, drawing on listed building register, conservation area appraisals, Historic Environment Record
		0	No/minor impact on heritage assets	
		-?	Potential negative impact on heritage assets that may require mitigation	
		- -	Significant impact on heritage assets where mitigation is unlikely or not possible	

Appendix 5

Strategic Location assessments (assessed December 2015)

Allbrook 1 – Land at Allbrook

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
1. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified local needs, including affordability and special needs		
1.1 Will the development provide a significant contribution towards meeting identified affordable housing needs?	+?	No issues have yet been raised that would suggest the typical proportion (35%) could not be achieved. Therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely. The proportion of affordable housing which could be delivered is currently uncertain (?) until further work is undertaken by the site promoter.
1.2 Will it provide other elements of identified housing need e.g. housing for older persons, self-build, support housing?	+?	There would appear to be scope in this strategic location for provision of other elements of identified housing need. However, the site promoter has not specified whether they propose to meet other such elements of identified housing need. Therefore a minor positive effect (+) is likely, but is uncertain (?) at this stage.
2. Safeguard and improve community health, safety and wellbeing		
2.1 Are community facilities (community hall or library) available locally?	+	The strategic location is within 800m of Boyatt Lane Scout Hut to the north, and 800m of Allbrook Scout Hut to the south. Parts of this strategic location lie just within 400m of these two community facilities. Therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely. It is recognised that these community facilities provide a somewhat limited range of uses at present; however, increased development in the area may offer opportunities to improve these facilities.
2.2 Are health facilities available locally?	- -	This strategic location is over 1,000m away from the nearest GP/health centre. The majority of the location is located within 800m of the Nuffield Hospital. However, this is a private facility located in Chandler's Ford which is not generally available to non-paying users. Therefore, a significant negative (- -) effect is likely.
2.3 What effect would the development have on local provision of sports pitches and facilities?	+?	There is scope in this strategic location for provision of sports pitches and facilities therefore a minor positive effect (+) could occur. Site promoters have not indicated that sports pitches would be provided as part of development at this strategic location, therefore effect is uncertain (?) at this stage.
2.4 Is public open space available locally?	++	The majority of this strategic location is within 300m of the following existing publicly accessible open space: Pitmore Close, Allbrook Knoll, Allbrook Hill Recreation. Site promoters have also indicated that additional public open space would be provided as part of development at this strategic location. Therefore, a significant positive (++) effect is likely.
2.5 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network?	+	A footpath bisects the strategic location from south east to north west connecting the road Knowle Hill with the bridleway on Boyatt Lane. A route which is part of the Eastleigh Cycle Network passes through the north west of the location on Boyatt Lane. Given these opportunities to connect to the footpath and cycle network, a minor positive (+) effect is likely.
3. Develop a dynamic and diverse economy		
3.1(a) Is the location close to a major rail station?	-	This strategic locations is more than 1,200m from the nearest major rail station; therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
3.1 (b) Is the location close to a minor rail station?	-	This strategic location is more than 600m away from the

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
		nearest minor rail station; therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
3.1 (c) Is the location close to a frequent bus route?	++	The most northern part of this strategic location is located within 400m of the Bluestar 1 Bus Route which connects Winchester and Southampton. On this basis a significant positive (++) effect is noted.
3.1 (d) Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route?	-	This strategic location is more than 300m from the nearest semi-frequent bus route; therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
3.1 (e) Is the location close to a major employment centre?	-	This strategic location is more than 1,000m from the nearest major employment centre; therefore a minor negative (-) effect is likely. It should be noted that a small amount of employment use (10,000 m. sq.) is considered as part development at this strategic location.
3.2 Will the proposed development contribute towards meeting the need for new industrial, office or warehousing floorspace?	+	10,000sq.m. of employment floorspace is proposed at this strategic location; therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely.
3.3 Will the proposed development result in a net loss of existing employment land, or land which would be suitable for employment purposes?	0	No net loss of existing employment land would result in development of this strategic location; therefore, a negligible (0) effect is likely.
3.4 Will the proposed development increase the amount of commercial uses and other facilities in town, district or local centres?	0	No change in the commercial uses or other facilities in town, district or local centres currently proposed as part of development at this strategic location. Therefore, a negligible (0) effect is likely.
4. Reduce road traffic and congestion through improved accessibility to services, homes and jobs; reducing the need to travel by car/lorry and improving sustainable travel choice		
4.1 Is the location close to a major rail station? (same score as 3.1a)	-	This strategic location is more than 1,200m from the nearest major rail station; therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
4.2 Is the location close to a minor rail station? (same score as 3.1b)	-	This strategic location is more than 600m away from the nearest minor rail station; therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
4.3 Is the location close to a frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1c)	++	The most northern part of this strategic location is located within 400m of the Bluestar 1 Bus Route which connects Winchester and Southampton. On this basis a significant positive (++) effect is note.
4.4 Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1d)	-	This strategic location is more than 300m from the nearest semi-frequent bus route; therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
4.5(a) Will residential development at the location be close to a major employment centre? (same score as 3.1e)	-	This strategic location is more than 1,000m from the nearest major employment centre; therefore a minor negative (-) effect is likely. It should be noted that a small amount of employment use (10,000 m. sq.) is considered as part of the development at this strategic location.
4.5(b) Will employment development at the location be close to a major population centre?	++	Parts of this strategic location are within 400m of Eastleigh/Chandler's Ford, a major population centre in the borough. Therefore, a significant positive (++) effect is likely.
4.6 Are health facilities available locally? (same score as 2.2)	--	This strategic location is over 1,000m away from the nearest GP/health centre. The majority of the location is located within 800m of the Nuffield Hospital. However, this is a private facility located in Chandler's Ford which is not generally available to non-paying users. Therefore, a significant negative (--) effect is likely.
4.7 Are shopping and related services available locally?	-	The most northern part of this strategic location is just within 800m of the Hiltingbury Local Centre in Chandler's

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
		Ford. However, the vast majority of the location is significantly further away and therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
4.8 Is the location close to a Primary school?	+	The western part of this strategic location is within 400m, with the majority of the location within 800m of Scantabout Primary School. Therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely.
4.9 Is the location close to a Secondary school?	+	This strategic location is within 800m of Thornden Secondary School and within 1600m of Crestwood School. Therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely.
4.10 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	+	A footpath bisects the location from south east to north west connecting the road Knowle Hill with the bridleway on Boyatt Lane. A route which is part of the Eastleigh Cycle Network passes through the north west of the location on Boyatt Lane. Given these opportunities to connect to the footpath and cycle network, a minor positive (+) effect is likely.
4.11 Are there Geographical barriers between the location and key facilities/ destinations?	- -	The Junction 13 of the M3, and the route of the motorway itself are a significant barrier to accessing the facilities and services of the Chandler's Ford area by walking and cycling. The location is severed from north to south by Allbrook Way which is a fast road which does not currently have any footpath or cycle ways. Improvements would need to be explored when master planning development in this strategic location. Therefore a significant negative (- -) effect is likely. It is noted that the most southerly part of the location is just 0.2 of a mile further to Boyatt Wood Centre. Improvements to links to facilities in the location could be explored.
5. Protect and conserve natural resources		
5.1 Will development avoid the sterilisation of mineral resources?	-?	This strategic location includes areas identified as part of the Hampshire County Council Mineral Consultation Area. Minerals include construction sand and river terrace deposits. Development could potentially have a minor negative (-) effect access to mineral resource is lost by development. This effect is uncertain (?) until it is determined if prior extraction of these minerals can or should be undertaken.
5.2 Will it result in the loss of higher grade agricultural land?	-	The majority of this strategic location is located within land identified as Grade 3 agricultural land. Therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
5.3 Will it use previously developed land?	-	This strategic location is located on greenfield and land; therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
5.4 Will it deliver or support allotments or community farms?	+?	This strategic location could be suitable for providing new allotments/community farm; therefore a minor positive (+) effect could occur. The site promoter has not indicated if such provision would be included as part of development at this strategic location therefore effects are uncertain (?) at this stage.
6. Reduce air, soil, water, light and noise pollution		
6.1 Will the location be affected by significant noise generating uses or Air Quality Management Areas?	- -?	The north western part of the location is within close proximity to the M3 motorway, including Junction 12. Allbrook Way bisects the location and accommodates a high volume of fast moving traffic. These two key roads will generate noise and air pollution. The eastern part of this strategic location is overflowed by aircraft banking to the west. The northern part of the location falls within an Air Quality Management Area. Therefore, a significant negative (- -) effect is likely but uncertain (?) subject to technical assessments and consideration of mitigation.

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
6.2 Will development increase pollution?	0	The development does not raise concerns which cannot be addressed by mitigation; therefore a negligible (0) effect is likely.
7. Plan for the anticipated levels of climate change		
7.1 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure?	+	New open space is proposed as part of development at this strategic location. Therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely.
7.2 Is the location at risk from flooding, taking into account of the effects of climate change?	- -?	An area of intermediate surface water flood risk is present to the centre of the strategic location to the east of Allbrook Way where there is existing body of water associated with extraction at the former brickworks and to the northern edge of the location adjacent to the M3. Therefore a significant negative (- -) effect is likely. However, the overall effect at this strategic location is uncertain (?) as the majority of the location is not within an area of flood risk and consideration of design and mitigation options is required.
7.3 Will the development be at risk from coastal change? If so, can the Shoreline Management Plan Objectives be supported?	0	Not located in an area of coastal change; therefore a negligible (0) effect is likely.
8. Minimise Eastleigh's contribution to climate change by reducing the borough's carbon footprint and minimising other greenhouse gas emissions.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
9. Reduce waste generation and disposal, encourage waste prevention and reuse and achieve the sustainable management of waste.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
10. Protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and geodiversity, improving its quality and range.		
10.1 Is the location within the HRA screening zone?	- -?	The strategic location is within 25m of three watercourses which are tributaries of the River Itchen. The most southern part of the location is within 200 of the River Itchen. A significant negative (- -) effect could occur, subject (?) to the outcome of HRA screening.
10.2 Is the location within 200m of a SSSI?	- -?	The strategic location is within 200m of the River Itchen SSSI; therefore, a significant negative (- -) effect is likely. The overall effect is uncertain (?) as mitigation or avoidance measures may be required.
10.3 Is the location within 200m of a Local Nature Reserve?	0	The south of the strategic location is within 200m of a Local Nature Reserve; therefore, a negligible (0) effect is likely.
10.4 Will the development adversely affect a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation? (N.B. No NNRs are present in the District)	-?	Lincolns Copse SINC and Allbrook Clay Pit SINC are both within this strategic location and Pitmore Gully Copse is adjacent to the north. Lincolns Copse SINC and Allbrook Clay Pit SINC cover much of this strategic location (approx. 10ha). A minor negative (-) effect is likely, although this is uncertain prior to obtaining information about design/layout and mitigation or enhancement opportunities.
10.5 Will the development adversely affect sites with local designation of nature conservation value (e.g. Biodiversity Opportunity Areas, Biodiversity Action Plan Priority Areas, and Priority Habitat etc.)?	-?	Significant areas of woodland are present within both the designated sites and the wider development. Waterways and the large water bodies within the clay pits are also of note and unimproved grassland is present within Allbrook Clay Pits SINC. A minor negative (-) effect is likely, although this is uncertain (?) at this stage prior to

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
		obtaining information about design/layout and mitigation or enhancement opportunities.
10.6 Will the development adversely affect protected species?	-?	Due to the proximity of the strategic location to the Itchen and the connections to the SAC via the waterways, otter may use the sites. If fish are present within Allbrook Clay Pits otters could also visit this site to hunt. A minor negative (-) effect is likely, but is uncertain (?) prior to further obtaining further information about design/layout and mitigation or enhancement opportunities.
10.7 Will the development adversely impact the biodiversity network (e.g. Biodiversity Action Plan Priority Links)?	-?	The M3 Priority Biodiversity Link is present to the north and east of the strategic location. This corridor should remain clear of development in order to avoid negative impacts. A minor negative (-) effect is likely, although this is uncertain (?) at this stage prior to obtaining further information about design/layout and mitigation or enhancement opportunities.
10.8 Will the development adversely affect ancient woodland?	-?	Ancient woodland is identified within this strategic location. A minor negative (-) effect is likely, although this is uncertain (?) at this stage and is subject to consideration of design/layout and mitigation measures.
11. Enhance the Borough's multifunctional green infrastructure networks.		
11.1 Will the development affect TPO trees?	-?	There are a number of TPO trees at this strategic location. These are primarily in two pockets of woodland, but also in other small pockets to the edges of the location. A minor negative (-) effect is likely, although this is uncertain (?) at this stage and is subject to consideration of design/layout and mitigation measures.
11.2 Can the location be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	+	A footpath bisects the strategic location from south east to north west connecting the road Knowle Hill with the bridleway on Boyatt Lane. A route which is part of the Eastleigh Cycle Network passes through the north west of the location on Boyatt Lane. Given these opportunities to connect to the footpath and cycle network, a minor positive (+) effect is likely.
11.3 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure? (same score as 7.1)	+	New open space is proposed as part of development at this strategic location. Therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely.
12. Protect, enhance and manage the character and appearance of the landscape and townscape, maintaining and strengthening distinctiveness and its special qualities.		
12.1 Will development adversely affect the separation of neighbouring settlements?	- -	There is potential for coalescence between the settlements of Boyatt Wood and Allbrook/Otterbourne Hill; therefore a significant negative (--) effect is likely. The overall effect is currently uncertain prior to obtaining further information on design/layout.
12.2 Will it protect the setting of the South Downs National Park?	0	Development at this strategic location is unlikely to impact on the setting of the National Park; therefore a negligible (0) effect is likely.
12.3 Will it protect the character of the countryside, coast, towns and/or villages?	- -?	Development at this strategic location could result in coalescence of settlements. Parts of this strategic location are also visually prominent and locally important. Therefore, a significant negative (- -) effect could occur; however this is uncertain prior to obtaining further information on design/layout and possible mitigation options.
12.4 Will it have an impact on locally important	- ?	The area is visually sensitive due to its small size,

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
views and settings?		exposed open areas and the prominent wooded high ground which are locally important. Therefore, minor negative (-) effect is likely, however this is uncertain prior to obtaining further information on design/layout and possible mitigation options.
13. Protect and enhance and manage buildings, monuments, features, sites, places, areas and landscapes of archaeological, historical and cultural heritage importance.		
13.1 Will the development protect and enhance listed buildings and their settings, conservation areas, archaeological sites, historic landscapes and other sites of local importance for heritage?	-?	Lincolns, a locally listed house, is present at this strategic location. Buildings at Lincolns Farm as also proposed for local listing. A minor negative (-) impact is likely, but is uncertain prior to consideration to obtaining further information about design/layout and possible mitigation or enhancement opportunities.

Allbrook 2 – North of Allbrook Hill

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
1. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified local needs, including affordability and special needs		
1.1 Will the development provide a significant contribution towards meeting identified affordable housing needs?	+?	No issues have yet been raised that would suggest the typical proportion (35%) could not be achieved. Therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely. The proportion of affordable housing which could be delivered is currently uncertain (?) until further work is undertaken by the site promoter.
1.2 Will it provide other elements of identified housing need e.g. housing for older persons, self-build, support housing?	+?	There would appear to be scope in this location for provision of other elements of identified housing need. However the site promoter has not specified whether they propose to meet other such elements of identified housing need. Therefore a minor positive (+) effect is likely, but is uncertain (?) at this stage.
2. Safeguard and improve community health, safety and wellbeing		
2.1 Are community facilities (community hall or library) available locally?	+	This strategic location is within 400m of Allbrook Scout Hut. It is recognised that these community facilities provide a somewhat limited range of uses at present. However increased development in the area may offer opportunities to improve these facilities. Therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely.
2.2 Are health facilities available locally?	- -	This strategic location is over 1000m away from the nearest GP/health centre. Therefore, a significant negative (- -) effect is likely.
2.3 What effect would the development have on local provision of sports pitches and facilities?	-	Development at this strategic location is unlikely to be suitable for new sports pitches on site. A minor negative (-) effect is likely.
2.4 Is public open space available locally?	+	The majority of this strategic location is within 300m of Allbrook Knoll and Allbrook Hill Recreation. Therefore a minor positive (+) effect is likely.
2.5 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network?	-	No public rights of way cross, or are adjacent to, this strategic location. Therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
3. Develop a dynamic and diverse economy		
3.1(a) Is the location close to a major rail station?	-	This strategic location is more than 1,200m from the nearest major rail station; therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
3.1 (b) Is the location close to a minor rail station?	-	This strategic location is more than 600m away from the nearest minor rail station; therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
3.1 (c) Is the location close to a frequent bus route?	-	This strategic location is more than 600m from the nearest frequent bus route; therefore a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
3.1 (d) Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route?	-	This strategic location is more than 300m from the nearest semi-frequent bus route; therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
3.1 (e) Is the location close to a major employment centre?	-	This strategic location is more than 1000m from the nearest major employment centre; therefore a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
3.2 Will the proposed development contribute towards meeting the need for new industrial, office or warehousing floorspace?	-	This strategic location is not suitable for additional employment floorspace. Site promoters have not proposed employment at this location. Therefore, a

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
		minor negative (-) effect is likely.
3.3 Will the proposed development result in a net loss of existing employment land, or land which would be suitable for employment purposes?	0	No net loss of existing employment land would result in development of this strategic location; therefore, a negligible (0) effect is likely.
3.4 Will the proposed development increase the amount of commercial uses and other facilities in town, district or local centres?	0	No change in the commercial uses or other facilities in town, district or local centres currently proposed as part of development at this strategic location. Therefore, a negligible (0) effect is likely.
4. Reduce road traffic and congestion through improved accessibility to services, homes and jobs; reducing the need to travel by car/lorry and improving sustainable travel choice		
4.1 Is the location close to a major rail station? (same score as 3.1a)	-	This strategic location is more than 1,200m from the nearest major rail station; therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
4.2 Is the location close to a minor rail station? (same score as 3.1b)	-	This strategic location is more than 600m away from the nearest minor rail station; therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
4.3 Is the location close to a frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1c)	-	This strategic location is more than 600m from the nearest frequent bus route; therefore a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
4.4 Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1d)	-	This strategic location is more than 300m from the nearest semi-frequent bus route; therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
4.5(a) Will residential development at the location be close to a major employment centre? (same score as 3.1e)	-	This strategic location is more than 1000m from the nearest major employment centre; therefore a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
4.5(b) Will employment development at the location be close to a major population centre?	0	There is no employment proposed as part of development at this strategic location. Therefore, a negligible (0) effect is likely.
4.6 Are health facilities available locally? (same score as 2.2)	--	This strategic location is over 1,000m away from the nearest GP/health centre. Therefore, a significant negative (- -) effect is likely.
4.7 Are shopping and related services available locally?	-	This strategic location is more than 800m from the nearest shopping facilities; therefore a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
4.8 Is the location close to a Primary school?	-	This strategic location is more than 800m to the nearest primary school. Therefore a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
4.9 Is the location close to a Secondary school?	+	This strategic location is within 800m of Thornden Secondary School and within 1,600m of Crestwood School. Therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely.
4.10 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	-	No public rights of way cross, or are adjacent to, this strategic location. Therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
4.11 Are there Geographical barriers between the location and key facilities/ destinations?	+	There are no geographical barriers between the strategic location and key facilities/destinations. Therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely.
5. Protect and conserve natural resources		
5.1 Will development avoid the sterilisation of mineral resources?	-?	This strategic location includes land identified as part of the HCC Minerals Consultation Area. Development could potentially have a minor negative (-) effect if access to mineral resource is lost by development. This effect is uncertain (?) until it is determined if extraction of these minerals can or should be

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
		undertaken.
5.2 Will it result in the loss of higher grade agricultural land?	-	Land at this strategic location is identified as grade 3 agricultural land; therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
5.3 Will it use previously developed land?	-	This strategic location is located on greenfield and land; therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
5.4 Will it deliver or support allotments or community farms?	+?	This strategic location could be suitable for providing new allotments/community farm; therefore a minor positive (+) effect could occur. The site promoter has not indicated if such provision would be included as part of development at this location therefore effects are uncertain (?) at this stage.
6. Reduce air, soil, water, light and noise pollution		
6.1 Will the location be affected by significant noise generating uses or Air Quality Management Areas?	0	Based on information currently available, there are no significant noise generating uses which would impact on development at this strategic location and there are no AQMAs in the vicinity; therefore a negligible (0) effect is likely.
6.2 Will development increase pollution?	0	The development does not raise concerns which cannot be addressed by mitigation; therefore a negligible (0) effect is likely.
7. Plan for the anticipated levels of climate change		
7.1 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure?	+?	The strategic location is currently a GI asset for people and biodiversity through its use as informal residential gardens. New open space is proposed as part of development at this location. Therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely, although this is uncertain (?) at this stage prior to obtaining further information about scale/design of any new public open space.
7.2 Is the location at risk from flooding, taking into account of the effects of climate change?	-?	The eastern edge of this strategic location is identified as at a 'less' risk of surface water flooding. Therefore a minor negative (-) effect is likely. However, the overall effect at this location is uncertain (?) as the majority of the location is not within an area of flood risk and consideration of design and mitigation options is required.
7.3 Will the development be at risk from coastal change? If so, can the Shoreline Management Plan Objectives be supported?	0	Not located in an area of coastal change; therefore a negligible (0) effect is likely.
8. Minimise Eastleigh's contribution to climate change by reducing the borough's carbon footprint and minimising other greenhouse gas emissions.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
9. Reduce waste generation and disposal, encourage waste prevention and reuse and achieve the sustainable management of waste.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
10. Protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and geodiversity, improving its quality and range.		
10.1 Is the location within the HRA screening zone?	--?	The strategic location is within 25m of a watercourse which is a tributary of the River Itchen. The south western part of this location is within 200 of the River Itchen. A significant negative (--) effect could

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
		occur, subject (?) to the outcome of HRA screening.
10.2 Is the location within 200m of a SSSI?	--?	The strategic location is within 200m of the River Itchen SSSI; therefore, a significant negative (--) effect is likely. The overall effect is uncertain (?) as mitigation or avoidance measures may be required.
10.3 Is the location within 200m of a Local Nature Reserve?	0	The strategic location is not within 200m of a Local Nature Reserve; therefore, a negligible (0) effect is likely.
10.4 Will the development adversely affect a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation? (N.B. No NNRs are present in the District)	0	This strategic location is unlikely to have an adverse impact on a SINC; therefore a negligible (0) effect is likely.
10.5 Will the development adversely affect sites with local designation of nature conservation value (e.g. Biodiversity Opportunity Areas, Biodiversity Action Plan Priority Areas, and Priority Habitat etc.)?	0	Development at this strategic location is unlikely to have an adverse impact on sites with local nature conservation designation. Therefore, a negligible (0) effect is likely.
10.6 Will the development adversely affect protected species?	-?	Due to the proximity of the strategic location to the Itchen and the connections to the SAC via the waterways, otter may use the sites. If fish are present within Allbrook Clay Pits otters could pass through this location to hunt. A minor negative (-) could occur, however this is uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information on design/layout and mitigation and enhancement opportunities.
10.7 Will the development adversely impact the biodiversity network (e.g. Biodiversity Action Plan Priority Links)?	-?	Consideration should be given to any links through the site which may be used by otters. A minor negative (-) effect could occur, but is uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further site specific information.
10.8 Will the development adversely affect ancient woodland?	0	Unlikely to have an adverse impact on ancient woodland; therefore, a negligible (0) effect is likely.
11. Enhance the Borough's multifunctional green infrastructure networks.		
11.1 Will the development affect TPO trees?	-?	TPO trees are present at the eastern edge of this strategic location. A minor negative (-) effect is likely, although this is uncertain (?) at this stage prior to obtaining further information on design/layout and mitigation measures.
11.2 Can the location be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	-	No public rights of way cross, or are adjacent to, this strategic location. Therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
11.3 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure? (same score as 7.1)	+?	The location is currently a GI asset for people and biodiversity through its use as informal residential gardens. New open space is proposed as part of development at this strategic location. Therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely, although this is uncertain (?) at this stage prior to obtaining further information about scale/design of any new public open space.
12. Protect, enhance and manage the character and appearance of the landscape and townscape, maintaining and strengthening distinctiveness and its special qualities.		
12.1 Will development adversely affect the separation of neighbouring settlements?	-	Development at this strategic location will result in minor loss of gap and sense of settlement separation; therefore a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
12.2 Will it protect the setting of the South Downs National Park?	0	Development at this strategic location is unlikely to impact the setting of the National Park; therefore a

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
		negligible (0) effect is likely.
12.3 Will it protect the character of the countryside, coast, towns and/or villages?	-	The proximity to the existing older part of Allbrook, plus the elevation and visual prominence of the higher part of this strategic location could result in impact on the character of the local setting. Sensitive design and layout of development and open space could offer some mitigation of this. Overall, a minor negative (-) effect could occur, but is uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information on design/layout.
12.4 Will it have an impact on locally important views and settings?	-	The proximity to the existing older part of Allbrook, plus the elevation and visual prominence of the higher part of this strategic location could result in impact on the character of the local setting. Sensitive design and layout of development and open space could offer some mitigation of this. Overall, a minor negative (-) effect could occur, but is uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information on design/layout.
13. Protect and enhance and manage buildings, monuments, features, sites, places, areas and landscapes of archaeological, historical and cultural heritage importance.		
13.1 Will the development protect and enhance listed buildings and their settings, conservation areas, archaeological sites, historic landscapes and other sites of local importance for heritage?	0	A locally listed cottage is adjacent to this strategic location. However, a negligible (0) effect is likely.

Bishopstoke 1 – North of Stoke Park Woods

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
1. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified local needs, including affordability and special needs		
1.1 Will the development provide a significant contribution towards meeting identified affordable housing needs?	+?	No issues have yet been raised that would suggest the typical proportion (35%) could not be achieved. Therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely. The proportion of affordable housing which could be delivered is currently uncertain (?) until further work is undertaken by the site promoter.
1.2 Will it provide other elements of identified housing need e.g. housing for older persons, self-build, support housing?	+?	There is scope in this strategic location for provision of other elements of identified housing need. The site promoter has not proposed to meet other such elements of identified housing need. A minor positive (+) effect could occur but is uncertain (?) at this stage.
2. Safeguard and improve community health, safety and wellbeing		
2.1 Are community facilities (community hall or library) available locally?	++	The most eastern part of this strategic location is within 800m of three community facilities: Bishopstoke Guide Hut, Scout Hut and the Old School. The site promoter has stated that a new local centre would be provided at this strategic location. Therefore, a significant positive (++) effect is likely.
2.2 Are health facilities available locally?	+	A small area (approx. 0.5ha) of this strategic location is just within 1,000m of Stokewood Surgery; therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely. A significant majority of the location is more than 1,000m from any existing health facilities. There are recognised issues regarding capacity at the GP surgery, further work will need to be undertaken.
2.3 What effect would the development have on local provision of sports pitches and facilities?	+?	There is scope in this strategic location for provision of sports pitches and facilities therefore a minor positive effect (+) could occur. Site promoters have not indicated that sports pitches would be provided as part of development at this strategic location. Therefore, the effect is uncertain (?) at this stage.
2.4 Is public open space available locally?	++	The strategic location is surrounded by publicly accessible open space: Stoke Park Woods, Upperbarn Copse and Crowdhill Copse. Site promoters have also indicated that additional public open space would be provided as part of development at this strategic location. Therefore, a significant positive (++) effect is likely.
2.5 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network?	+	A number of bridleways cross the strategic location or are adjacent to the location. Although there is no opportunity to connect to cycle paths which form part of the Eastleigh Cycle Network, the opportunities to connect to multifunction bridleways suggest a minor positive (+) effect.
3. Develop a dynamic and diverse economy		
3. Develop a dynamic and diverse economy	-	This strategic location is more than 1,200m from the nearest major rail station; therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
3.1(a) Is the location close to a major rail station?	-	This strategic location is more than 600m away from the nearest minor rail station; therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
3.1 (b) Is the location close to a minor rail station?	+	The south east of the location is just within 600m of a bus route with a 20min or better frequency (the

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
		Bluestar 2 Bus Route which connects Fair Oak to Southampton via Eastleigh) therefore a minor positive (+) effect is likely. The majority of the location is further than 600m a frequent bus route.
3.1 (c) Is the location close to a frequent bus route?	-	This strategic location is more than 300m from the nearest semi-frequent bus route; therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
3.1 (d) Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route?	-	This strategic location is more than 1000m from the nearest major employment centre; therefore a minor negative (-) effect is likely. It should be noted that a small amount of employment use (10,800 m. sq.) is being considered as part development at this strategic location.
3.1 (e) Is the location close to a major employment centre?	+	12,800sq.m. of employment floorspace is proposed at this strategic location; therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely.
3.2 Will the proposed development contribute towards meeting the need for new industrial, office or warehousing floorspace?	0	No net loss of existing employment land would result through development of this strategic location and additional employment is proposed by site promoters; therefore, a negligible (0) effect is likely.
3.3 Will the proposed development result in a net loss of existing employment land, or land which would be suitable for employment purposes?	+?	Site promoters have indicated that a new local centre could be provided with development in this strategic location. It is possible that trade from existing centres could be taken. A minor positive (+) effect is likely, however this is uncertain (?) until further information on scale/impact is available.
4. Reduce road traffic and congestion through improved accessibility to services, homes and jobs; reducing the need to travel by car/lorry and improving sustainable travel choice		
4.1 Is the location close to a major rail station? (same score as 3.1a)	-	This strategic location is more than 1,200m from the nearest major rail station; therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
4.2 Is the location close to a minor rail station? (same score as 3.1b)	-	This strategic location is more than 600m away from the nearest minor rail station; therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
4.3 Is the location close to a frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1c)	+	The south east of the location is just within 600m of a bus route with a 20min or better frequency (the Bluestar 2 Bus Route which connects Fair Oak to Southampton via Eastleigh); therefore a minor positive (+) effect is likely. The majority of the location is further than 600m a frequent bus route.
4.4 Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1d)	-	This strategic location is more than 300m from the nearest semi-frequent bus route; therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
4.5(a) Will residential development at the location be close to a major employment centre? (same score as 3.1e)	-	This strategic location is more than 1000m from the nearest major employment centre; therefore a minor negative (-) effect is likely. It should be noted that a small amount of employment use (10,800 m. sq.) is being considered as part development at this strategic location.
4.5(b) Will employment development at the location be close to a major population centre?	-	This strategic location is more than 1000m from the nearest major population centre; therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
4.6 Are health facilities available locally? (same score as 2.2)	+	A small area (approx. 0.5ha) of this strategic location is just within 1,000m of Stokewood Surgery; therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely. A significant majority of the location is more than 1,000m from any exiting health facilities. There are recognised issues regarding capacity at the GP

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
		surgery, further work will need to be undertaken.
4.7 Are shopping and related services available locally?	++?	A small area (approx. 0.5ha) of this strategic location is just within 800m of Fair Oak Village Centre. A significant majority of the location is more than 800m from any existing shopping or related facilities. Site promoters have indicated that a new local centre could be provided with development at this strategic location. Therefore, a significant positive (++) effect is likely. It is possible that trade from existing centres could be taken. However, this is uncertain until further information on scale/impact is available, thus the effect is currently uncertain (?).
4.8 Is the location close to a Primary school?	++?	The south western part of this strategic location is within 800m of Stoke Park Junior School. The majority of the location is beyond 800m of an existing primary school. Site promoters have indicated that a new primary school could be provided with development at this strategic location. Therefore a significant positive (++) effect could occur.
4.9 Is the location close to a Secondary school?	0	A small area (less than 0.5ha) of this strategic location is just within 1600m of Wyvern College. Therefore a negligible (0) effect is likely. The majority of the location is beyond 1600m of a secondary school. There are recognised capacity issues at Wyvern School and further work will need to be undertaken regarding secondary school provision.
4.10 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	+	A number of bridleways cross the strategic location or are adjacent to the location. Although there is no opportunity to connect to cycle paths which form part of the Eastleigh Cycle Network, the opportunities to connect to multifunction bridleways suggest a minor positive (+) effect.
4.11 Are there Geographical barriers between the location and key facilities/ destinations?	--	The strategic location is somewhat separated from existing settlements of Bishopstoke and Fair Oak by Stoke Park Woods, Upperbarn Copse and Crowdhill Copse. There are some bridleways through these woods connecting into Bishopstoke and Fair Oak. However, these are not conveniently surfaced, overlooked or well-lit. They are generally only used for recreational walking. There are also significant changes in ground level through many of these wooded areas. They represent a fairly significant barrier. Therefore a significant negative (-) effect is likely.
5. Protect and conserve natural resources		
5.1 Will development avoid the sterilisation of mineral resources?	-?	This strategic location includes an area between Stoke Park Wood and Upperbarn Copse identified as part of the Hampshire County Council Mineral Consultation Area for its potential resource of construction sand. An area on the edge of the location to the north west is also identified as a Minerals Consultation Area for river terrace deposits and an area of Hampshire County Council Minerals Safeguarding. Development could potentially have a minor negative (-) effect as access to mineral resource is lost by development. This effect is uncertain (?) until it is determined if extraction of these minerals can or should be undertaken prior to the location being developed.
5.2 Will it result in the loss of higher grade agricultural land?	0	The majority of this strategic location is located within land identified as Grade 4 agricultural land. Therefore, a negligible (0) effect is likely.
5.3 Will it use previously developed land?	-	This strategic location is located on greenfield land; therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
5.4 Will it deliver or support allotments or community farms?	+?	This strategic location could be suitable for providing new allotments/community farm. The site promoter has not indicated if provision for this would be made. A positive effect (+) could occur however this is uncertain (?) at this stage.
6. Reduce air, soil, water, light and noise pollution		
6.1 Will the location be affected by significant noise generating uses or Air Quality Management Areas?	0	Based on information currently available, there are no significant noise generating uses which would impact on development at this strategic location. The location is not within an AQMA. Therefore, a negligible (0) effect is likely.
6.2 Will development increase pollution?	-?	Development at this location is likely to impact on traffic flows and volumes on nearby roads and potentially to Eastleigh town, impacting on local air quality generally, with potential to impact the Eastleigh AQMA, and the nature conservation interests of the River Itchen SAC and SSSI due to pollution from traffic. However, the scale of this option suggests that development at this strategic location alone would result in a minor negative but (-) effect. A new road is proposed in combination with development at other nearby strategic locations. The effect of such a road scheme is currently uncertain (?).
7. Plan for the anticipated levels of climate change		
7.1 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure?	-?	The strategic location is a greenfield site with GI assets within or adjacent to the site including bridleways and important connectivity between woodland important for biodiversity and recreation. Development at this strategic location could result in a loss of GI. However, design of development including new open space and links to the wider GI network could provide mitigation. Therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely although this is uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information on design/layout.
7.2 Is the location at risk from flooding, taking into account of the effects of climate change?	--?	An area of intermediate surface water flood risk is present on the edge of the strategic location to the north west and south where fish ponds are currently located, plus a narrow strip across the location to the north. The north west of the location is also in Flood Zone 2 Therefore a significant negative (--) effect is likely. However, the overall effect at this strategic location is uncertain (?) as the majority of the site is not within an area of flood risk and consideration of design and mitigation options is required.
7.3 Will the development be at risk from coastal change? If so, can the Shoreline Management Plan Objectives be supported?	0	Not located in an area of coastal change; therefore a negligible (0) effect is likely.
8. Minimise Eastleigh's contribution to climate change by reducing the borough's carbon footprint and minimising other greenhouse gas emissions.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
9. Reduce waste generation and disposal, encourage waste prevention and reuse and achieve the sustainable management of waste.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
10. Protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and		

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
geodiversity, improving its quality and range.		
10.1 Is the location within the HRA screening zone?	--?	The strategic location is within 25m of several watercourses which are tributaries of the River Itchen. A significant negative (--) effect could occur, subject (?) to the outcome of HRA screening and consideration of mitigation.
10.2 Is the location within 200m of a SSSI?	0	The strategic location is not within 200m of a SSSI; therefore, a negligible (0) effect is likely.
10.3 Is the location within 200m of a Local Nature Reserve?	0	The strategic location is not within 200m of a Local Nature Reserve; therefore, a negligible (0) effect is likely.
10.4 Will the development adversely affect a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation? (N.B. No NNRs are present in the District)	-?	A number of SINC's are adjacent to this strategic location: Stoke Park Woods, Upperbarn Copse, Crowdhill Copse, Hill Copse, Brick Kiln Copse. These are designated for their ancient woodland. In addition there is a small wet woodland: Judges Gully Copse. A key issue for development at this strategic location is the risk of significant fragmentation of these sites and the subsequent negative impacts on their biodiversity. Therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely, although this is uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information about design/layout and potential mitigation and enhancement opportunities.
10.5 Will the development adversely affect protected species?	--?	The strategic location is likely to be important for a number of protected species including: water voles, otters, Bechstein's bats, Great Crested newts, badgers and reptiles. There are also pockets of priority habitat at this strategic location. A significant negative (-) effect is likely although uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information through surveys and design/layout details.
10.6 Will the development adversely affect sites with local designation of nature conservation value (e.g. Biodiversity Opportunity Areas, Biodiversity Action Plan Priority Areas, and Priority Habitat etc.)?	-?	The strategic location is incorporated into the Stoke Park Priority Biodiversity Area. Land identified as part of the Itchen Valley Biodiversity Opportunity Area is present across the north of the location. Hedgerows at this strategic location are important for species dispersal through their connections with adjacent ancient woodland. A minor negative effect is likely (-), although this is uncertain (?) prior to further information about design/layout and potential mitigation and enhancement opportunities.
10.7 Will the development adversely impact the biodiversity network (e.g. Biodiversity Action Plan Priority Links)?	-?	A minor negative effect is likely (-), although this is uncertain (?) prior to further information about design/layout and potential mitigation and enhancement opportunities.
10.8 Will the development adversely affect ancient woodland?	-?	A number of SINC's designated for their ancient woodland are adjacent to this strategic location (see 10.4). A minor negative effect is likely (-), although this is uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information about design/layout and potential mitigation and enhancement opportunities.
11. Enhance the Borough's multifunctional green infrastructure networks.		
11.1 Will the development affect TPO trees?	0	Small areas of TPO trees are present adjacent to the east and west of this strategic location. However there are no TPO trees within the area of this strategic location. Therefore, a negligible (0) effect is likely.
11.2 Can the location be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	+	A number of bridleways cross the strategic location or are adjacent to the location. Although there is no opportunity to connect to cycle paths which form part of the Eastleigh Cycle Network, the opportunities to

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
		connect to multifunction bridleways suggest a minor positive (+) effect.
11.3 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure? (same score as 7.1)	-?	The strategic location is a greenfield site with GI assets within or adjacent to the site including bridleways and important connectivity between woodland important for biodiversity and recreation. Development at this strategic location could result in a loss of GI. However, design of development including new open space and links to the wider GI network could provide mitigation. Therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely although this is uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information on design/layout.
12. Protect, enhance and manage the character and appearance of the landscape and townscape, maintaining and strengthening distinctiveness and its special qualities.		
12.1 Will development adversely affect the separation of neighbouring settlements?	-	Development at this strategic location would potentially reduce the separation between the settlements of Bishopstoke and Fair Oak, and may erode the clear separation between Fair Oak/Crowdhill and Fishers Pond/Colden Common. A minor negative (-) effect is likely.
12.2 Will it protect the setting of the South Downs National Park?	0	Development at this strategic location is unlikely to have an impact on the National Park.
12.3 Will it protect the character of the countryside, coast, towns and/or villages?	--?	The character of this strategic location consists of small fields, woodland blocks with open views towards the countryside. Development at this strategic location would increase the sense of urbanisation in this area, could reduce the separation between settlements and affect views from the area surrounding the location. A significant negative (- -) effect is likely, although the scale of this impact is uncertain prior to obtaining further information on design/layout.
12.4 Will it have an impact on locally important views and settings?	--?	Woodlands shield existing urban development from open countryside. There are open views towards the countryside on the north side of Stoke Park Woods which are sensitive to urban development. Development close to the Winchester Road will add to perceived urbanisation of the countryside behind sporadic development on the main road frontage. A significant negative (- -) effect is likely, although the scale of this impact is uncertain prior to obtaining further information on design/layout.
13. Protect and enhance and manage buildings, monuments, features, sites, places, areas and landscapes of archaeological, historical and cultural heritage importance.		
13.1 Will the development protect and enhance listed buildings and their settings, conservation areas, archaeological sites, historic landscapes and other sites of local importance for heritage?	-?	This majority of this strategic location is within the Stoke Park Woods Deer Park, registered as a historic park and garden. Crowdhill Farmhouse, a grade II listed building is located in the east of this location. In the south west area of this location there are two possible Bronze Age Barrows and an undated enclosure. A small area in the north east of this location is within an area identified as a Medieval Fishpond. Development at this strategic location would likely have a minor negative effect (-), although this is uncertain prior to further information on design/layout.

Bishopstoke 2 – South of Bishopstoke

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
1. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified local needs, including affordability and special needs		
1.1 Will the development provide a significant contribution towards meeting identified affordable housing needs?	+?	No issues have yet been raised that would suggest the typical proportion (35%) could not be achieved. Therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely. The proportion of affordable housing which could be delivered is currently uncertain (?) until further work is undertaken by the site promoter.
1.2 Will it provide other elements of identified housing need e.g. housing for older persons, self-build, support housing?	+?	There would appear to be scope in this strategic location for provision of other elements of identified housing need. However, the site promoter has not specified whether they propose to meet other such elements of identified housing need. Therefore a minor positive effect (+) is likely, but is uncertain (?) at this stage.
2. Safeguard and improve community health, safety and wellbeing		
2.1 Are community facilities (community hall or library) available locally?	+	The majority of this strategic location is within either 400m or 800m of several community facilities including: Fair Oak Village Hall and youth centres. Therefore a minor positive (+) effect is likely.
2.2 Are health facilities available locally?	++	The northern part of this strategic location is within 400m of Stokewood GP surgery. Therefore, a significant positive (++) effect is likely. The central areas of the location are within 1,000m of the GP surgery. The western end of this strategic location is beyond 1,000m. There are recognised issues regarding capacity at the GP surgery, further work will need to be undertaken.
2.3 What effect would the development have on local provision of sports pitches and facilities?	+?	There is scope in this strategic location for provision of sports pitches and facilities. Site promoters have not indicated that sports pitches would be provided as part of development at this strategic location. A minor positive (+) effect could occur but is uncertain (?) prior to further information.
2.4 Is public open space available locally?	+++	This strategic location is within 300m of three areas of public open space. One of which, at Blackberry Drive, is within the identified location. It is uncertain (?) at present if development at this strategic location would result in the loss of this open space, however there is no indication from the site promoters that this would be lost. Site promoters have also indicated that public open space would be provided as part of development at this strategic location and therefore, a significant positive (++) effect is possible if this would result in a net gain of public open space.
2.5 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network?	+	There are points of entry to the strategic location by footpaths to from the north, south, east and west of the location and these branch into a number of footpaths within the location. A cycle route forming part of the Eastleigh Cycle Network passes through the north east of the location. Therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely.
3. Develop a dynamic and diverse economy		
3.1(a) Is the location close to a major rail station?	-	This strategic location is more than 1200m from the nearest major rail station; therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
3.1 (b) Is the location close to a minor rail station?	-	This strategic location is more than 600m away from the nearest minor rail station; therefore, a minor negative (-) (-) effect is likely.
3.1 (c) Is the location close to a frequent bus route?	++	The north east and north west of the location is within 400m of the Bluestar 2 service which connects Fair Oak to Southampton via Eastleigh. Therefore, a significant positive (++) effect is likely.
3.1 (d) Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route?	-	This strategic location is more than 300m from the nearest semi-frequent bus route; therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
3.1 (e) Is the location close to a major employment centre?	-	This strategic location is not within 1000m of a major employment centre. Therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
3.2 Will the proposed development contribute towards meeting the need for new industrial, office or warehousing floorspace?	0	Some employment is already present at West Horton Farm, plus other small employment premises along Allington Lane. This strategic location could well be suitable for further employment floorspace. However the site promoter has not indicated if the existing employment would be retained or if any new employment would be included as part of development. Overall, a negligible (0) effect is likely, although this is uncertain (?) at this stage.
3.3 Will the proposed development result in a net loss of existing employment land, or land which would be suitable for employment purposes?	-?	Employment is present at West Horton Farm, plus other small employment premises along Allington Lane. The site promoter has not indicated if the existing employment land would be retained. The strategic location could be suitable for employment land. Overall, a negative effect could occur, but this is uncertain (?) and further information is required.
3.4 Will the proposed development increase the amount of commercial uses and other facilities in town, district or local centres?	0	There would be no change in the amount of commercial uses in town, district and local centres; therefore, a negligible (0) effect is likely. Development at this strategic location could increase the catchment and therefore support expansion of existing centres. This effect is uncertain prior to further information.
4. Reduce road traffic and congestion through improved accessibility to services homes and jobs; reducing the need to travel by car/lorry and improving sustainable travel choice		
4.1 Is the location close to a major rail station? (same score as 3.1a)	-	This strategic locations is more than 1200m from the nearest major rail station; therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
4.2 Is the location close to a minor rail station? (same score as 3.1b)	-	This strategic location is more than 600m away from the nearest minor rail station; therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
4.3 Is the location close to a frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1c)	++	The north east and north west of the location is within 400m of the Bluestar 2 service which connects Fair Oak to Southampton via Eastleigh. Therefore, a significant positive (++) effect is likely.
4.4 Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1d)	-	This strategic location is more than 300m from the nearest semi-frequent bus route; therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
4.5(a) Will residential development at the location be close to a major employment centre? (same score as 3.1e)	-	This strategic location is not within 1,000m of a major employment centre. Therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
4.5(b) Will employment development at the location	0	No significant employment use; therefore,

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
be close to a major population centre?		negligible (0) effect is likely
4.6 Are health facilities available locally? (same score as 2.2)	++	The northern part of this strategic location is within 400m of Stokewood GP surgery. Therefore, a significant positive (++) effect is likely. The central areas of the location are within 1,000m of the GP surgery. The western end of this strategic location is beyond 1,000m. There are recognised issues regarding capacity at the GP surgery, further work will need to be undertaken.
4.7 Are shopping and related services available locally?	+	The north-western part of this strategic location is within 400m of Whalesmead local centre in Bishopstoke. However, the majority of the remainder of this strategic location is further than 400m but less than 800m of Whalesmead Local Centre or Fair Oak Local Centre. Therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely.
4.8 Is the location close to a Primary school?	+++?	The north western part of this strategic location is within 800m of Stoke Park Primary School and the east of this strategic location is within 800m of Fair Oak Primary School. Site promoters have indicated that a new primary school is likely to be part of development at this strategic location. Therefore a significant positive (++) effect is likely.
4.9 Is the location close to a Secondary school?	+++?	The eastern part of this strategic location is within 800m of Wyvern College. Therefore a significant positive (++) effect is likely. The majority of this strategic location is within 1,600m of Wyvern College. There are recognised capacity issues at Wyvern School and further work will need to be undertaken regarding secondary school provision. It is noted that a new secondary school as part of development west of Horton Heath, immediately to the east of this strategic location, has a resolution to permit.
4.10 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	+	There are points of entry to the site by footpaths to from the north, south, east and west of the location and these branch into a number of footpaths within the location. A cycle route forming part of the Eastleigh Cycle Network passes through the north east of the location. Therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely.
4.11 Are there Geographical barriers between the location and key facilities/ destinations?	+?	The most direct walking route would be through Whalesmead which avoids busy roads and is well let with pavements. The developer's proposals suggest that the vehicular access to the site will be via a new link road, footpath and cycle routes would need to be provided along with improved access via Allington Lane. Therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely. However, this is uncertain at this stage.
5. Protect and conserve natural resources		
5.1 Will development avoid the sterilisation of mineral resources?	-?	Small areas are identified for Minerals Safeguarding and in the HCC Minerals Consultation Area to the north east and north west of this strategic location. Development could potentially have a minor negative (-) effect if access to mineral resource is lost by development. This effect is uncertain (?) until it is determined if extraction of these minerals can or should be undertaken prior to the location being developed
5.2 Will it result in the loss of higher grade agricultural land?	0	The majority of this strategic location is located within land identified as Grade 4 agricultural land. Therefore, a negligible (0) effect is likely.

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
5.3 Will it use previously developed land?	+/-	The majority of the location is previously undeveloped, however there are also land uses which include a scrap yard, brickworks and nursery. Therefore a mixed (+/-) effect is likely.
5.4 Will it deliver or support allotments or community farms?	+?	This strategic location could be suitable for new allotments/community farms. The site promoter has not indicated if these facilities would be included as part of development at this strategic location. A minor positive (+) effect could occur, however this is currently uncertain (?) prior to further information.
6. Reduce air, soil, water, light and noise pollution		
6.1 Will the location be affected by significant noise generating uses or Air Quality Management Areas?	0	Based on information currently available, there would be no significant noise generating uses which would impact on development at this strategic location. The location does not fall within an AQMA. Therefore, a negligible (0) effect is likely.
6.2 Will development increase pollution?	--?	Given the scale of the location there is likely to be a significant impact on traffic flows and volumes on nearby roads and potentially to Eastleigh town. Pollution from a significant increase in vehicles could impact local air quality generally, the Eastleigh AQMA, and the nature conservation interests of the River Itchen SAC. A new road is proposed in combination with development at other nearby strategic locations. The effect of such a road scheme is currently uncertain. A significant negative (- -) effect could occur, although is currently uncertain (?) prior to further transport assessment work and consideration of mitigation opportunities.
7. Plan for the anticipated levels of climate change		
7.1 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure?	+?	The strategic location is a greenfield site with some GI assets within or adjacent to the site (e.g. footpaths, woodland). Development at this strategic location could result in a loss of GI. However, the design of development including new open space and links to the wider GI network has potential for improvements to GI. A minor positive (+) effect could occur, however this is uncertain (?) at this stage prior to further information on design/layout and enhancement opportunities.
7.2 Is the location at risk from flooding, taking into account of the effects of climate change?	--?	There is a small area identified as Flood Zone 2 and 3 at the southern edge of this strategic location. There are small areas of 'less' and 'intermediate' risk of surface water flooding across the location. Therefore a significant negative (--) effect is likely. However, the overall effect at this strategic location is uncertain (?) as the majority of the site is not within an area of flood risk and consideration of design and mitigation options is required.
7.3 Will the development be at risk from coastal change? If so, can the Shoreline Management Plan Objectives be supported?	0	Not located in an area of coastal change; therefore a negligible (0) effect is likely.
8. Minimise Eastleigh's contribution to climate change by reducing the borough's carbon footprint and minimising other greenhouse gas emissions.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		

SA objective/ criterion	Justification	
9. Reduce waste generation and disposal, encourage waste prevention and reuse and achieve the sustainable management of waste.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
10. Protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and geodiversity, improving its quality and range.		
10.1 Is the location within the HRA screening zone?	- -?	Watercourses are present within this strategic location. A significant negative (- -) effect could occur, although this is uncertain (?) subject to the outcome of HRA screening and consideration of mitigation.
10.2 Is the location within 200m of a SSSI?	0	The strategic location is not within 200m of a SSSI; therefore, a negligible (0) effect is likely.
10.3 Is the location within 200m of a Local Nature Reserve?	0	The strategic location is not within 200m if a Local Nature Reserve; therefore, a negligible (0) effect is likely.
10.4 Will the development adversely affect a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation? (N.B. No NNRs are present in the District)	-?	West Horton Farm Wood SINC is designated for its wet willow and alder carr with remnants of ancient woodland. Hydrological connectivity and hedgerow networks are important to maintain the relationship with other wetland and woodland. Impacts could also occur to Quobleigh Ponds Woods SINC, outside of this strategic location, due to impact of development on hydrological connections and migratory routes for great crested newts. A minor negative (-) effect is likely, however the scale of effect is currently uncertain (?) prior obtaining to further information about design/layout and consideration of mitigation or enhancement opportunities.
10.5 Will the development adversely affect sites with local designation of nature conservation value (e.g. Biodiversity Opportunity Areas, Biodiversity Action Plan Priority Areas, and Priority Habitat etc.)?	-?	Although the majority of the grassland within the site is improved and of little biodiversity interest, some areas of semi improved grassland and fen and rush pasture has been identified. A minor negative (-) could occur, however this is currently uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information about design/layout.
10.6 Will the development adversely affect protected species?	-?	Several different protected species could be present at or utilise this strategic location, including but not limited to: great crested newts, bats, otters. Due to the aquatic and hedgerow connections to the SAC otter may use the sites. Historically otters have been recorded below the Allington Bridge and on the western boundary of Land West of Horton Heath and are likely to use this site. A minor negative (-) effect is likely, although uncertain (?) at this stage prior to obtaining further information about design/layout and consideration of mitigation or enhancement opportunities.
10.7 Will the development adversely impact the biodiversity network (e.g. Biodiversity Action Plan Priority Links)?	-?	A number of hedgerows of importance have been identified with other hedgerows assessed as of medium potential. The Itchen Valley Priority Biodiversity Area extends into the western part of the location. A minor negative (-) effect is likely, however the scale of effect is currently uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information about design/layout and consideration of mitigation or enhancement opportunities.
10.8 Will the development adversely affect ancient	-?	Remnants of ancient woodland are present as part of West Horton Farm Wood SINC. Hydrological connectivity and hedgerow networks are important

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
woodland?		to maintain the relationship with other wetland and woodland. A minor negative (-) effect is likely, however the scale of effect is currently uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information about design/layout and consideration of mitigation or enhancement opportunities.
11. Enhance the Borough's multifunctional green infrastructure networks.		
11.1 Will the development affect TPO trees?	-?	A small area of TPO trees is present on the edge of this strategic location near to Templecombe Road. The TPO trees consists of 1 Ash and 6 Field Maple. A minor negative (-) effect could occur; however this is currently uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information about design/layout which could incorporate or avoid effect on these trees.
11.2 Can the location be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	+	There are points of entry to the site by footpaths to from the north, south, east and west of the location and these branch into a number of footpaths within the location. A cycle route forming part of the Eastleigh Cycle Network passes through the north east of the location. Therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely.
11.3 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure? (same score as 7.1)	+?	The strategic location is a greenfield site with some GI assets within or adjacent to the site (e.g. footpaths, woodland). Development at this strategic location could result in a loss of GI. However, the design of development including new open space and links to the wider GI network has potential for improvements to GI. A minor positive (+) effect could occur, however this is uncertain (?) at this stage prior to obtaining further information on design/layout and enhancement opportunities.
12. Protect, enhance and manage the character and appearance of the landscape and townscape, maintaining and strengthening distinctiveness and its special qualities.		
12.1 Will development adversely affect the separation of neighbouring settlements?	-	Development may remove any residual gap between Bishopstoke and Fair Oak close to the Fair Oak Road and may erode the perceived separation of Bishopstoke/Fair Oak with development west of Horton Heath. A minor negative (-) effect is likely, however the scale of this effect is uncertain subject to obtaining further information on design/layout.
12.2 Will it protect the setting of the South Downs National Park?	0	Development at this strategic location is unlikely to have an impact on the National Park.
12.3 Will it protect the character of the countryside, coast, towns and/or villages?	-	The undeveloped open character of the recreational land south of the Fair Oak Road is very vulnerable to urbanisation. The rural character of woodland and watercourses would be affected by development at this strategic location. A minor negative (-) effect is likely, however the scale of this effect is uncertain prior to obtaining further information on design/layout.
12.4 Will it have an impact on locally important views and settings?	-?	New development at this strategic location is likely to be visible from parts of Allington Lane. A minor negative (-) effect is likely, however the scale of this effect is uncertain (?) subject to further information on design/layout.
13. Protect and enhance and manage buildings, monuments, features, sites, places, areas and		

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
landscapes of archaeological, historical and cultural heritage importance.		
13.1 Will the development protect and enhance listed buildings and their settings, conservation areas, archaeological sites, historic landscapes and other sites of local importance for heritage?	-?	Grade II listed buildings are present at this strategic location at the end of West Horton Lane. A minor negative (-) effect is likely, although this is uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information about design/layout.

Botley 1 – North east of Winchester Street

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
1. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified local needs, including affordability and special needs		
1.1 Will the development provide a significant contribution towards meeting identified affordable housing needs?	+?	No issues have yet been raised that would suggest the typical proportion (35%) could not be achieved. Therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely. The proportion of affordable housing which could be delivered is currently uncertain (?) until further work is undertaken by the site promoter.
1.2 Will it provide other elements of identified housing need e.g. housing for older persons, self-build, support housing?	+?	There is scope in this strategic location for provision other elements of identified housing need. The site promoter has not proposed to meet other such elements of identified housing need. A minor positive (+) effect could occur but is uncertain (?) at this stage.
2. Safeguard and improve community health, safety and wellbeing		
2.1 Are community facilities (community hall or library) available locally?	+	The far south eastern area of this strategic location is within 400m of the Market Hall in Botley. Aside from the far north western area, most of this site is also within 800m of this community facility and the Botley Centre and the Masonic Hall to the south west. Therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely.
2.2 Are health facilities available locally?	++	The far south eastern area of this strategic location is within 400m of the Botley Health Centre. The rest of this strategic location is within 1.0km of this facility. Therefore, a significant positive (+) effect is likely.
2.3 What effect would the development have on local provision of sports pitches and facilities?	+?	There is scope in this strategic location for provision of sports pitches and facilities therefore a minor positive effect (+) could occur. Site promoters have not indicated that sports pitches would be provided as part of development at this location. Therefore this effect is uncertain (?) at this stage.
2.4 Is public open space available locally?	++	Development of this strategic location includes open space provision. In addition, this site is also within 300m of Sycamore Walk and Chestnut Walk open spaces located to the south west of this location. Therefore a significant positive (++) effect is likely.
2.5 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network?	0	There is a footpath crossing the eastern area of this location linking the location to Winchester Street and Maddoxford Lane in Boorley Green. Therefore, a negligible (0) effect is likely.
3. Develop a dynamic and diverse economy		
3.1(a) Is the location close to a major rail station?	+	This strategic location is 500m to the west of Botley railway station; therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely.
3.1 (b) Is the location close to a minor rail station?	-	This strategic location is over 600m from a minor rail station; therefore a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
3.1 (c) Is the location close to a frequent bus route?	-	This strategic location is over 600m from any frequent bus route; therefore a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
3.1 (d) Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route?	-	This strategic location is over 300m from a semi-frequent bus service; therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
3.1 (e) Is the location close to a major employment	-	This strategic location is over 1.0km from a major

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
centre?		employment centre; therefore a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
3.2 Will the proposed development contribute towards meeting the need for new industrial, office or warehousing floorspace?	+	6,000sq.m. of employment floorspace is proposed at this location; therefore, a positive (+) effect is likely.
3.3 Will the proposed development result in a net loss of existing employment land, or land which would be suitable for employment purposes?	0	The development of this strategic location would not result in any loss of existing employment land therefore a negligible (0) effect is likely.
3.4 Will the proposed development increase the amount of commercial uses and other facilities in town, district or local centres?	0	This strategic location is identified for mixed uses but is located outside district and local centres and will therefore not result in any loss of a primary shopping area. Therefore a negligible (0) effect is likely.
4. Reduce road traffic and congestion through improved accessibility to services homes and jobs; reducing the need to travel by car/lorry and improving sustainable travel choice		
4.1 Is the location close to a major rail station? (same score as 3.1a)	+	This strategic location is 500m to the west of Botley railway station; therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely.
4.2 Is the location close to a minor rail station? (same score as 3.1b)	-	This strategic location is over 600m from a minor rail station; therefore a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
4.3 Is the location close to a frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1c)	-	This strategic location is over 600m from any frequent bus route; therefore a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
4.4 Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1d)	-	This strategic location is over 300m from a semi-frequent bus service; therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
4.5(a) Will residential development at the location be close to a major employment centre? (same score as 3.1e)	-	This strategic location is over 1.0km from a major employment centre; therefore a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
4.5(b) Will employment development at the location be close to a major population centre?	+	The strategic location is approximately 900m east of the major population centre at Hedge End; therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely, in relation to this objective.
4.6 Are health facilities available locally? (same score as 2.2)	++	The far south eastern area of this strategic location is within 400m the Botley Health Centre. The rest of this strategic location is within 1.0km of this facility. Therefore, a significant positive (+) effect is likely.
4.7 Are shopping and related services available locally?	+	The south western area of this strategic location is within 400m of Botley village centre. Aside from the north west of the area, most of this site is also within 800m from this centre. Therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely.
4.8 Is the location close to a Primary school?	+	The southern area of this strategic location is within 400m of Botley Church of England Primary School. The rest of this site is within 800m of this school facility. Therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely.
4.9 Is the location close to a Secondary school?	0	The north western area of this strategic location is within 1.6km of Wildern Secondary School. The rest of this location is over 1.6km from any school facility; therefore, a negligible (0) effect is likely. There are recognised capacity issues at Wildern School and further work will need to be undertaken regarding secondary school provision
4.10 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	0	There is a footpath crossing the eastern area of this location linking the location to Winchester Street and Maddoxford Lane in Boorley Green. Therefore, a

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
		negligible (0) effect is likely.
4.11 Are there Geographical barriers between the location and key facilities/ destinations?	-	There are no significant geographical barriers on the most direct walking route to key facilities in Botley. Access to other facilities, including a secondary school in Hedge End, involves a route which is poorly lit and surfaced and of substandard width. Therefore a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
5. Protect and conserve natural resources		
5.1 Will development avoid the sterilisation of mineral resources?	-?	The south eastern area of this strategic is located in an area of potential sharp sand and gravel resource included within the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan 2013 Mineral Consultation Area. The south eastern area is also located on an area of River Terrace deposits, which is identified as a Consultation Area in the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan. Development at this location could prevent future mineral extraction therefore a minor negative (-) effect is likely. This effect is uncertain as the potential for effects will depend on the scale and design of development proposals and whether minerals can be extracted prior to development within the Local Plan period.
5.2 Will it result in the loss of higher grade agricultural land?	--	Most of this strategic location is located on higher quality (Grade 1 and 2) agricultural land, aside the far northern part of this location which is on medium quality (Grade 3a or b) agricultural land. Overall, a significant negative (--) effect is likely.
5.3 Will it use previously developed land?	+/-	This strategic location includes greenfield and previously developed land; therefore, a mixed-minor positive and minor negative (-) effect is likely.
5.4 Will it deliver or support allotments or community farms?	+	The site is being promoted for mixed uses, including allotments. A minor positive (+) effect is therefore likely to occur.
6. Reduce air, soil, water, light and noise pollution		
6.1 Will the location be affected by significant noise generating uses or Air Quality Management Areas?	-?	There is a significant impact of noise from road traffic and the railway line and a detailed noise assessment is required to determine developable area. The proposed employment uses within this strategic location may have an impact on adjacent existing residential properties. The combination of employment and residential uses proposed are also likely to adversely impact on each other therefore site layout requires careful consideration. This location is not within an AQMA. Overall, a minor negative (-) effect is likely but uncertain (?) subject to technical assessments and consideration of mitigation.
6.2 Will development increase pollution?	-?	Development at this location is likely to impact on traffic flows and volumes on nearby roads and local air quality, including the nearby existing Air Quality Management Area (Botley). A minor negative (-) effect is likely, although is currently uncertain (?) prior to further transport assessment work and consideration of mitigation opportunities.
7. Plan for the anticipated levels of climate change		

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
7.1 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure?	+?	The strategic location is a greenfield site with some GI assets within or adjacent to the site (e.g. footpaths, woodland). Development at this location could result in a loss of GI. However, the design of development including new open space and links to the wider GI network has potential for improvements to GI. Furthermore allotments, open space and a cemetery are being promoted within a mixture of uses within the site. A minor positive (+) effect is therefore likely to occur.
7.2 Is the location at risk from flooding, taking into account of the effects of climate change?	--?	<p>The north western and eastern areas of this location include a range of surface water flooding areas.</p> <p>Most of the location is subject to 'less' water flooding areas; therefore a minor negative (-) effect is likely. However, there is an area in the north west which is subject to 'more' surface water flood risk.</p> <p>Overall a significant negative (--) effect is likely. This effect is uncertain as it would depend on the ability of the design and layout of the particular development proposal to avoid or mitigate flood risk.</p>
7.3 Will the development be at risk from coastal change? If so, can the Shoreline Management Plan Objectives be supported?	0	Not located in an area of coastal change therefore a negligible (0) effect is likely.
8. Minimise Eastleigh's contribution to climate change by reducing the borough's carbon footprint and minimising other greenhouse gas emissions.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
9. Reduce waste generation and disposal, encourage waste prevention and reuse and achieve the sustainable management of waste.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
10. Protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and geodiversity, improving its quality and range.		
10.1 Is the location within the HRA screening zone?	0	This strategic location is not within the HRA screening zone; therefore a negligible (0) effect is likely.
10.2 Is the location within 200m of a SSSI?	0	This strategic location is not within 200m of a SSSI; therefore a negligible (0) effect is likely.
10.3 Is the location within 200m of a Local Nature Reserve?	0	This strategic location is not within 200m of a Local Nature Reserve; therefore a negligible (0) effect is likely.
10.4 Will the development adversely affect a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation? (N.B. No NNRs are present in the District)	-?	Immediately to the south of the strategic location is Botley Mill Woodland SINC designated for its wet woodland. A minor negative (-) effect is likely, although this is uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information on design/layout and consideration of mitigation and enhancement opportunities.
10.5 Will the development adversely affect sites with local designation of nature conservation value (e.g. Biodiversity Opportunity Areas, Biodiversity Action Plan Priority Areas, and Priority Habitat etc.)?	-?	The biodiversity value of this site is somewhat diminished as the landscape is made up of large fields used for arable farming. The Hamble Valley BOA lies to the east, it will be important to consider discharge of water and maintain good quality flows.

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
		A minor negative (-) effect is likely, although this is uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information on design/layout and consideration of mitigation and enhancement opportunities.
10.7 Will the development adversely affect protected species?	-?	Due to the presence of Bushy Copse SINC and Botley Mill woodland SINC and their proximity to the River Hamble this strategic location may harbour species associated with wet habitats. Otter, water vole reptiles and amphibians could use the river corridor and the wet habitats, and bats could be present within the woodlands and hedges. A breeding and overwintering bird survey is likely to be required focusing on wetland and woodland birds in particular. A minor negative (-) effect could occur, but this is uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information on design/layout.
10.6 Will the development adversely impact the biodiversity network (e.g. Biodiversity Action Plan Priority Links)?	-?	The railway Priority Biodiversity Link runs along east to west along the northern part of the strategic location. It will be important that dispersal routes are kept open within this corridor and habitats enhanced. A minor negative (-) effect is likely, although this is uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information on design/layout and consideration of mitigation and enhancement opportunities.
10.7 Will the development adversely affect ancient woodland?	0	Unlikely to have an adverse impact on ancient woodland; therefore, a negligible (0) effect is likely.
11. Enhance the Borough's multifunctional green infrastructure networks.		
11.1 Will the development affect TPO trees?	0	No TPO trees are present within or adjacent to this location; therefore a negligible (0) effect is likely.
11.2 Can the location be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	0	There is a footpath crossing the eastern area of this location linking the location to Winchester Street and Maddoxford Lane. Therefore, a negligible (0) effect is likely.
11.3 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure? (same score as 7.1)	+	The strategic location is a greenfield site with some GI assets within or adjacent to the site (e.g. footpaths, woodland). Development at this location could result in a loss of GI. However, the design of development including new open space and links to the wider GI network has potential for improvements to GI. Furthermore allotments, open space and a cemetery are being promoted within a mixture of uses within the site. A minor positive (+) effect is therefore likely to occur.
12. Protect, enhance and manage the character and appearance of the landscape and townscape, maintaining and strengthening distinctiveness and its special qualities.		
12.1 Will development adversely affect the separation of neighbouring settlements?	-?	Development at the northern end of this strategic location may diminish the separation between the settlements of Hedge End, Boorley Green and Botley.

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
		Construction of a new by-pass may also contribute to the erosion of the gap in this location. A minor negative (-) effect is likely, although uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information on design and layout.
12.2 Will it protect the setting of the South Downs National Park?	0	Development at this strategic location is unlikely to have an impact on the National Park.
12.3 Will it protect the character of the countryside, coast, towns and/or villages?	-?	There is likely to be an effect on the undeveloped character of the landscape partially screened from Winchester Road by existing ribbon development. This strategic location is flatter towards the river valley rising at the more exposed northern end. A minor negative (-) effect is likely, although uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information on design and layout.
12.4 Will it have an impact on locally important views and settings?	-?	Key views of this strategic location are from Winchester Road, the elevated section of the railway and from the footpath dissecting it. A minor negative (-) effect is likely, although uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information on design and layout.
13. Protect and enhance and manage buildings, monuments, features, sites, places, areas and landscapes of archaeological, historical and cultural heritage importance.		
13.1 Will the development protect and enhance listed buildings and their settings, conservation areas, archaeological sites, historic landscapes and other sites of local importance for heritage?	-?	Uplands Farm is a Grade II listed building located within the strategic location. There is a further Grade II listed farmhouse to the north (Newhouse Farm). The eastern part of the location adjoins the Botley Conservation Area. A negative (-) effect is likely, although uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information on design and layout, as effects could be mitigated.

Botley 2 – East of Hedge End

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
1. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified local needs, including affordability and special needs		
1.1 Will the development provide a significant contribution towards meeting identified affordable housing needs?	+?	No issues have yet been raised that would suggest the typical proportion (35%) could not be achieved. Therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely. The proportion of affordable housing which could be delivered is currently uncertain (?) until further work is undertaken by the site promoter.
1.2 Will it provide other elements of identified housing need e.g. housing for older persons, self-build, support housing?	+?	There is scope in this strategic location for provision of other elements of identified housing need. The site promoter has not proposed to meet other such elements of identified housing need. A minor positive (+) effect could occur but is uncertain (?) at this stage.
2. Safeguard and improve community health, safety and wellbeing		
2.1 Are community facilities (community hall or library) available locally?	+	The south western area of this strategic location includes the Pavilion at Norman Rodaway District Park. Aside from the central north eastern area, most of the location is within 800m of this community facility, the Masonic Hall and Botley Centre in the north east. Therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely.
2.2 Are health facilities available locally?	+	The northern part of this strategic location and small areas in the south west are within 400m–1.0km of doctor’s surgeries at Botley Health Centre and those within Hedge End including St Lukes. The rest of this location is more than 1.0 km from an existing healthcare facility. Therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely.
2.3 What effect would the development have on local provision of sports pitches and facilities?	--?	The strategic location comprises sports pitches which would be lost if this area was development. Therefore a significant negative (--) impact is likely. It is possible that replacement pitches may be identified; therefore an uncertain (?) effect is likely.
2.4 Is public open space available locally?	++?/--	<p>The development being appraised in this strategic location could include the potential expansion of Manor Farm Country Park. The expansion of this park is still uncertain and will depend upon the development proposals put forward for this location. The option is therefore assessed as having a significant positive effect with uncertainty (++?).</p> <p>In addition, this location is within 300m of several smaller public open spaces, including Precosa Road, Sengana Close and Noble Road to the west.</p> <p>Development at this strategic location would also result in the loss of Little Hatts Recreational Ground and Norman Rodway Sports Ground in the south. The location is therefore also assessed as having a significant negative effect (--) in relation to this SA objective.</p> <p>Overall, the location is therefore assessed as having a mixed significant positive with uncertainty and significant negative (++?/--).</p>
2.5 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network?	0	There are footpaths and bridleways adjacent to the northern, north western and southern boundaries of

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
		the location. In addition, public rights of way intersect sections of the northern and southern areas of the location. The location cannot readily be connected to the Eastleigh Cycle Network therefore, a negligible (0) effect is likely.
3. Develop a dynamic and diverse economy		
3.1(a) Is the location close to a major rail station?	-	This strategic location is over 1200m from a major railway station; therefore a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
3.1 (b) Is the location close to a minor rail station?	-	This strategic location is over 600m from a minor railway station; therefore a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
3.1 (c) Is the location close to a frequent bus route?	-	This strategic location is over 600m from any frequent bus route; therefore a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
3.1 (d) Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route?	-	This strategic location is over 300m from a semi-frequent bus service; therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
3.1 (e) Is the location close to a major employment centre?	-	This strategic location is over 1.0km from a major employment centre; therefore a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
3.2 Will the proposed development contribute towards meeting the need for new industrial, office or warehousing floorspace?	-	This strategic location has not been favourably considered for employment as part of the SLAA. The site promoter has not stated if employment would be part of development at this location. Therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
3.3 Will the proposed development result in a net loss of existing employment land, or land which would be suitable for employment purposes?	0	The development of this strategic location would not result in any loss of existing employment land therefore a negligible (0) effect is likely.
3.4 Will the proposed development increase the amount of commercial uses and other facilities in town, district or local centres?	0	This strategic location is identified for residential use only, is located outside district and local centres and would therefore not result in any loss of a primary shopping area. Therefore a negligible (0) effect is likely.
4. Reduce road traffic and congestion through improved accessibility to services homes and jobs; reducing the need to travel by car/lorry and improving sustainable travel choice		
4.1 Is the location close to a major rail station? (same score as 3.1a)	-	This strategic location is over 1200m from a major railway station; therefore a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
4.2 Is the location close to a minor rail station? (same score as 3.1b)	-	This strategic location is over 600m from a minor railway station; therefore a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
4.3 Is the location close to a frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1c)	-	This strategic location is over 600m from a frequent bus route; therefore a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
4.4 Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1d)	-	This strategic location is over 300m from a semi-frequent bus service; therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
4.5(a) Will residential development at the location be close to a major employment centre? (same score as 3.1e)	-	This strategic location is over 1.0km from a major employment centre; therefore a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
4.5(b) Will employment development at the location be close to a major population centre?	0	The strategic location is for residential uses only and therefore a negligible (0) effect is likely.
4.6 Are health facilities available locally? (same	+	The northern part of this strategic location and small

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
score as 2.2)		areas in the south west are within 400m–1.0km of doctor’s surgeries at Botley Health Centre and those within Hedge End, including St Lukes.. The rest of this location is more than 1.0 km from an existing healthcare facility. Therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely.
4.7 Are shopping and related services available locally?	-	This strategic location is over 800m distance to a shopping or related centre. Furthermore the Council’s site assessment form for this location did not identify any shopping facilities within 1.0km of this location; therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
4.8 Is the location close to a Primary school?	+	The north and south western areas of this strategic location are within 400m of Freegrounds Infant and Junior School and Kings Copse Primary School to the west. The rest of the location is within 800m of these primary school facilities, therefore a minor positive (+) effect is likely.
4.9 Is the location close to a Secondary school?	0	This strategic location is within 800m-1.6km of Wildern Secondary School, to the north west, therefore a negligible (0) effect is likely. There are recognised capacity issues at Wildern School and further work will need to be undertaken regarding secondary school provision.
4.10 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	0	There are public rights of way adjacent to the northern, north western and southern boundaries of the location. In addition, public rights of way intersect sections of the northern and southern areas of the location. Therefore, a negligible (0) effect is likely.
4.11 Are there Geographical barriers between the location and key facilities/ destinations?	+	There are no significant geographical barriers on the most direct walking route to any destination. Therefore a minor positive (+) effect is likely.
5. Protect and conserve natural resources		
5.1 Will development avoid the sterilisation of mineral resources?	-?	This strategic location contains small areas of potential construction sand: Palaeogene, Thanet Sand Formation, Lambeth Group, Harwich Formation, London Clay Formation. These are included within the Mineral Consultation Areas in the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan 2013. Development at this location could prevent future mineral extraction therefore a minor negative (-) effect is likely. This effect is uncertain as the potential for effects will depend on the scale and design of development proposals and whether minerals can be extracted prior to development within the Local Plan period.
5.2 Will it result in the loss of higher grade agricultural land?	--	The majority of this strategic location is located on higher quality (Grade 2) agricultural land, with a smaller area in the north located on medium quality (Grade 3a or b) land. Therefore, a significant negative (--) effect is likely.
5.3 Will it use previously developed land?	-	This strategic location is located on greenfield land therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
5.4 Will it deliver or support allotments or community farms?	+?	This strategic location could be suitable for new allotments/community farms. The site promoter has not indicated if these facilities would be included as part of development at this location. A minor positive (+) effect could occur, however this is currently uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information.

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
6. Reduce air, soil, water, light and noise pollution		
6.1 Will the location be affected by significant noise generating uses or Air Quality Management Areas?	-?	The strategic location is likely to be affected by noise from road traffic, especially associated with the new Pylands Lane Link Road which has outline planning permission, as there may be increased traffic flows. The location is not within an AQMA. A minor negative (-) effect is likely, although the scale is uncertain (?) prior to further transport assessment work and consideration of mitigation opportunities.
6.2 Will development increase pollution?	-?	Development at this location is likely to impact on traffic flows and volumes on nearby roads and impacting on local air quality. A detailed air quality assessment is required to determine impacts on existing air quality. There is evidence of a garden nursery use on the northern part of the location which raises potential pollution concerns. A minor negative (-) effect is likely, although the scale is uncertain (?) prior to further transport assessment work and consideration of mitigation opportunities.
7. Plan for the anticipated levels of climate change		
7.1 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure?	+?	The strategic location is a greenfield site with some GI assets within or adjacent to the site (e.g. footpaths, woodland). Development at this location could result in a loss of GI. However, the design of development including new open space and links to the wider GI network has potential for improvements to GI. A minor positive (+) effect could occur, however this is uncertain (?) at this stage prior to obtaining further information on design/layout and enhancement opportunities.
7.2 Is the location at risk from flooding, taking into account of the effects of climate change?	--?	A small part of the central southern area of the strategic location is within Flood Zones 2 and 3. This area also includes 'intermediate' surface water flooding areas. In addition, north eastern areas of the location are subject to surface water flooding at the 'more', 'intermediate' and 'less' levels of flood risk. Overall a significant negative (--) is likely. This effect is uncertain as it would depend on the ability of the design and layout of the particular development proposal to avoidance or mitigate flood risk.
7.3 Will the development be at risk from coastal change? If so, can the Shoreline Management Plan Objectives be supported?	0	Not located in an area of coastal change therefore a negligible effect is likely.
8. Minimise Eastleigh's contribution to climate change by reducing the borough's carbon footprint and minimising other greenhouse gas emissions.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
9. Reduce waste generation and disposal, encourage waste prevention and reuse and achieve the sustainable management of waste.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
10. Protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and geodiversity, improving its quality and range.		

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
10.1 Is the location within the HRA screening zone?	--?	The central area of this strategic location contains a section of water course which is no further than 8km upstream of a European site therefore a significant negative (--) effect is likely. This effect is uncertain as it depends on the potential for avoidance or mitigation measures to be included in a development proposal.
10.2 Is the location within 200m of a SSSI?	--?	The southern area of this strategic location is within 200m of Upper Hamble Estuary and Woods SSSI therefore a significant negative (--) effect is likely. This effect is uncertain as it depends on the potential for avoidance or mitigation measures to be included in a development proposal.
10.3 Is the location within 200m of a Local Nature Reserve?	-?	The central area of this strategic location includes part (approx. 1.4ha) of Manor Farm Local Nature Reserve; therefore a minor negative (-) effect is likely. This effect is uncertain as it depends on the potential for avoidance or mitigation measures to be included in a development proposal.
10.4 Will the development adversely affect a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation? (N.B. No NNRs are present in the District)	-?	Tanhouse Meadow SINC lies within location, an area of damp meadow associated with the stream so hydrology will need to be considered carefully. A minor negative (-) effect is likely, although this is uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information on design/layout and consideration of mitigation and enhancement opportunities.
10.5 Will the development adversely affect sites with local designation of nature conservation value (e.g. Biodiversity Opportunity Areas, Biodiversity Action Plan Priority Areas, and Priority Habitat etc.)?	-?	This strategic location appears to contain scrub and rough grassland habitats in some parts; if these habitats are important to maintain hydrology of the site they should be protected and maintained. The Hamble PBA and BOA lie adjacent to the south. A negative (-) effect is likely, although this is uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information on design/layout and consideration of mitigation and enhancement opportunities.
10.6 Will development adversely affect protected species?	-?	This strategic location contains a stream, rough grassland scrub and meadow habitat and is likely to harbour a number of species. Otter, water vole, bat and grass snake could use the stream and all reptile species could reside or forage within the grassland. The location may provide foraging habitat for badger species. A breeding bird survey will be essential for this location. A minor negative (-) effect could occur, but this is uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information on design/layout.
10.6 Will the development adversely impact the biodiversity network (e.g. Biodiversity Action Plan Priority Links)?	-?	Wildern Priority Biodiversity Link lies adjacent to the northern end of this location. A minor negative (-) effect is likely, although this is uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information on design/layout and consideration of mitigation and enhancement opportunities.
10.7 Will the development adversely affect ancient woodland?	-?	Ancient woodland is identified adjacent to this location at Gould Copse which lies to the east and Catland/Fosters/Bottom Copses, although there is

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
		no indication that loss of this ancient woodland is proposed. A minor negative (-) effect is likely, although this is uncertain (?) at this stage and is subject to consideration of design/layout and mitigation measures.
11. Enhance the Borough's multifunctional green infrastructure networks.		
11.1 Will the development affect TPO trees?	0	No TPO trees are present within or adjacent to this location; therefore a negligible (0) effect is likely.
11.2 Can the location be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	0	There are footpaths and bridleways adjacent to the northern, north western and southern boundaries of the location. In addition, public rights of way intersect sections of the northern and southern areas of the location. The location cannot readily be connected to the Eastleigh Cycle Network therefore, a negligible (0) effect is likely.
11.3 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure? (same score as 7.1)	+?	The strategic location is a greenfield site with some GI assets within or adjacent to the site (e.g. footpaths, woodland). Development at this location could result in a loss of GI. However, the design of development including new open space and links to the wider GI network has potential for improvements to GI. A minor positive (+) effect could occur, however this is uncertain (?) at this stage prior to obtaining further information on design/layout and enhancement opportunities.
12. Protect, enhance and manage the character and appearance of the landscape and townscape, maintaining and strengthening distinctiveness and its special qualities.		
12.1 Will development adversely affect the separation of neighbouring settlements?	-?	Development in this strategic location would extend the existing urban edge of Hedge End to the east. It would diminish the gap between Botley and Hedge End as perceived from roads and footpath close to this location. A minor negative (-) effect is likely, although the scale is uncertain (?) prior to further transport assessment work and consideration of mitigation opportunities.
12.2 Will it protect the setting of the South Downs National Park?	0	Development at this strategic location is unlikely to have an impact on the National Park.
12.3 Will it protect the character of the countryside, coast, towns and/or villages?	-?	It likely that there would be an effect on the predominately undeveloped character of low lying agricultural fields and recreational land wrapping around the eastern edge of the Hedge End settlement. A minor negative (-) effect is likely, although the scale is uncertain (?) prior to further transport assessment work and consideration of mitigation opportunities.
12.4 Will it have an impact on locally important views and settings?	-?	This strategic location can be viewed from parts of the Hedge End/Botley Road, the existing urban edge, parts of Brook Lane and the footpaths between the two settlements. A minor negative (-) effect is likely, although the scale is uncertain (?)

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
		prior to further transport assessment work and consideration of mitigation opportunities.
13. Protect and enhance and manage buildings, monuments, features, sites, places, areas and landscapes of archaeological, historical and cultural heritage importance.		
13.1 Will the development protect and enhance listed buildings and their settings, conservation areas, archaeological sites, historic landscapes and other sites of local importance for heritage?	0	Development at this strategic location is unlikely to have an impact on heritage assets (0).

Eastleigh 1 – Eastleigh Riverside

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
1. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified local needs, including affordability and special needs		
1.1 Will the development provide a significant contribution towards meeting identified affordable housing needs?	?	No issues have yet been raised that would suggest the typical proportion (35%) could not be achieved on a residential element of a mixed use scheme. However it is uncertain (?) what the overall amount of new housing is likely to be at this time until further work is undertaken by the site promoter.
1.2 Will it provide other elements of identified housing need e.g. housing for older persons, self-build, support housing?	?	It is uncertain (?) at this time where there is scope in this location for provision of other elements of identified housing need. Site promoter has not proposed to meet other such elements of identified housing need.
2. Safeguard and improve community health, safety and wellbeing		
2.1 Are community facilities (community hall or library) available locally?	+	The north western area of this strategic location is within 400m of several community halls including Centre 66, Eastleigh College Education Avenue and the Masonic Centre. In addition, the Swan Centre Library is also located to the north west of the location. Therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely.
2.2 Are health facilities available locally?	++	The northern western area of this strategic location is within 400m of St Andrews Surgery, Eastleigh Health Centre and Genix Healthcare Dental Clinic. Aside from a small southern area, the rest of this strategic location is also within 1.0km of these healthcare facilities. Therefore, a significant positive (++) effect is likely.
2.3 What effect would the development have on local provision of sports pitches and facilities?	0	This strategic location is for some residential and employment use and does not involve existing sports pitches and facilities; therefore a negligible (0) effect is likely.
2.4 Is public open space available locally?	--/+	The north-eastern areas of this strategic location are within 300m of Leigh road recreational facility and The Hub recreational facility. Therefore a minor positive (+) effect is likely in relation to this SA objective. However, the southern area of this strategic location includes Campbell Road recreational facility. Therefore a significant negative (--) effect could occur, although this is uncertain prior to obtaining further information on layout/design. Overall the location is therefore assessed as having a mixed minor positive and significant negative effect (+/--).
2.5 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network?	-	There are no footpath or cycle paths crossing this location or adjacent to its boundary; therefore a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
3. Develop a dynamic and diverse economy		
3.1(a) Is the location close to a major rail station?	++	Eastleigh railway station is immediately adjacent to the north western area of this strategic location and Southampton Airport Parkway station is approximately 1.2km south west of the location. Therefore, a significant positive (++) effect is likely.
3.1 (b) Is the location close to a minor rail station?	-	This strategic location is over 600m from a minor rail

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
		station; therefore a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
3.1 (c) Is the location close to a frequent bus route?	++	The north western area of this strategic location is within 400m of the Bluestar 2: Fair Oak-Bishopstoke-Eastleigh-Stoneham-Southampton bus route. Apart from an area in the south, the rest of this strategic location is also within 600m of this bus route. Therefore, a significant positive (++) effect is likely.
3.1 (d) Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route?	+	The north western area of this strategic location is within 400m of the Bluestar 5: Eastleigh to Boyatt Wood only. Apart from an area in the south, the rest of this strategic location is also within 600m of this bus route. Therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely.
3.1 (e) Is the location close to a major employment centre?	++	This strategic location is for mixed uses, including residential development and this location includes the Eastleigh Riverside employment centre and is adjacent to the eastern side of the employment opportunities in Eastleigh town centre. Therefore, a significant positive (++) effect is likely.
3.2 Will the proposed development contribute towards meeting the need for new industrial, office or warehousing floorspace?	+	Development here is likely to involve replacing existing employment floorspace rather than any significant additional floorspace. This floorspace has the potential to meet future specific needs. Therefore a minor positive (+) effect is likely.
3.3 Will the proposed development result in a net loss of existing employment land, or land which would be suitable for employment purposes?	0	This strategic location consists of existing industrial units and the proposed use includes some residential facilities. However, the Council has identified that proposals will include the replacement of existing employment floorspace. Therefore, a negligible effect (0) is likely.
3.4 Will the proposed development increase the amount of commercial uses and other facilities in town, district or local centres?	0	This strategic location is for mixed uses, including employment. It is located outside any district or town centre and therefore will not result in any loss of the primary shopping area or an increase in the amount of commercial uses in town, district or local centres. It is assumed that this strategic location for employment would not be used for commercial uses that would be more sustainably located in the town, district or local centres. Therefore, a negligible (0) effect is likely.
4. Reduce road traffic and congestion through improved accessibility to services homes and jobs; reducing the need to travel by car/lorry and improving sustainable travel choice		
4.1 Is the location close to a major rail station? (same score as 3.1a)	++	Eastleigh station is immediately adjacent to the north western area of this strategic location and Southampton Airport Parkway station is approximately 1.2km south west of the location. Therefore, a significant positive (++) effect is likely.
4.2 Is the location close to a minor rail station? (same score as 3.1b)	-	This strategic location is over 600m from a minor rail station; therefore a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
4.3 Is the location close to a frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1c)	++	The north western area of this strategic location is within 400m of the Bluestar 2: Fair Oak-Bishopstoke-Eastleigh-Stoneham-Southampton bus route. Apart from an area in the south, the rest of this strategic location is also within 600m of this bus route. Therefore, a significant positive (++) effect is likely.

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
4.4 Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1d)	+	The north western area of this strategic location is within 400m of the Bluestar 5: Eastleigh to Boyatt Wood bus route. Apart from an area in the south, the rest of this strategic location is also within 600m of this bus route. Therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely.
4.5(a) Will residential development at the location be close to a major employment centre? (same score as 3.1e)	++	This strategic location is proposed for mixed uses, including residential development. This location includes the Eastleigh Riverside employment centre and is adjacent to the employment opportunities available at Eastleigh town centre. Therefore, a significant positive (++) effect is likely.
4.5(b) Will employment development at the location be close to a major population centre?	++	This strategic location is proposed for mixed uses, including employment and is adjacent to the eastern area of a major population centre at Eastleigh; therefore a significant positive (++) effect is likely.
4.6 Are health facilities available locally? (same score as 2.2)	++	The northern western area of this strategic location is within 400m of St Andrews Surgery, Eastleigh Health Centre and Genix Healthcare Dental Clinic. Aside from a small southern area, the rest of this strategic location is also within 1.0km of these healthcare facilities. Therefore, a significant positive (++) effect is likely.
4.7 Are shopping and related services available locally?	+	The north western area of this strategic location is adjacent to Eastleigh town centre. In addition, the far north eastern area is within 800m of Bishopstoke's Riverside district centre. Aside from an area in the south, the rest of this strategic location is also within 800m of Eastleigh town centre. Therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely.
4.8 Is the location close to a Primary school?	+	This strategic location is for mixed uses, including residential development. Part of the western area is located within 400m of Cherbourg Primary School. The western half of this location is also within 800m of Cherbourg Primary, Norwood Primary School and The Crescent County Junior and Infant School. Therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely.
4.9 Is the location close to a Secondary school?	+	This strategic location is for mixed uses, including residential development and part of the western area is located within 800m of Quilley School of Engineering. The rest of this location is within 1.6km of Crestwood College for Business and Enterprise to the north. Therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely.
4.10 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	-	There are no footpath or cycle paths crossing this location or adjacent to its boundary; therefore a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
4.11 Are there Geographical barriers between the location and key facilities/ destinations?	-	The London-Weymouth railway line acts as a physical barrier between the strategic location and the key facilities and destination of Eastleigh town. There is currently a single bridge over the railway line at this location. Therefore a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
5. Protect and conserve natural resources		
5.1 Will development avoid the sterilisation of mineral resources?	-?	The central area of this strategic location includes an Aggregate Recycling Site. In addition, a very small area in the north east is located in an area of Sharp Sand and Gravel Resource. Both sites have been safeguarded in the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan 2013. Development at this location could prevent future mineral extraction therefore a minor

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
		negative (-) effect is likely. This effect is uncertain as the potential for effects will depend on the scale and design of development proposals and whether minerals can be extracted prior to development within the Local Plan period.
5.2 Will it result in the loss of higher grade agricultural land?	0	This strategic location is not classified as agricultural land, aside from the eastern area, which is located on lower agricultural quality (Grade 4) land. Therefore, a negligible effect (0) is likely.
5.3 Will it use previously developed land?	++	This strategic location consists of existing industrial units; therefore a significant positive (++) effect is likely.
5.4 Will it deliver or support allotments or community farms?	-	This strategic location is unlikely to be suitable for allotments or a community farm given its location and its proposed use for employment with some residential development. There a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
6. Reduce air, soil, water, light and noise pollution		
6.1 Will the location be affected by significant noise generating uses or Air Quality Management Areas?	--?	This strategic location falls within an Air Quality Management Area (Eastleigh) and is therefore already likely to be impacted by poor air quality. This location is also likely to be significantly affected by noise and air pollution from the railway line and aircraft. Formerly part of the railway works and airport land, a detailed site investigation is required. Although mostly employment uses are being proposed, some residential development is also proposed. It may be possible for the impacts to be mitigated through remedial measures. Therefore a significant negative (--) effect is likely but uncertain (?) subject to technical assessments and consideration of mitigation.
6.2 Will development increase pollution?	--?	Due to the scale of the proposed development and the types of uses proposed and their associated vehicle movements, emissions are likely to significantly affect the nearby existing Air Quality Management Area. A detailed air quality assessment is therefore required to determine impacts on existing air quality. The proposed uses are also likely to have a significant noise impact on existing residential properties due to vehicle movements associated with them. A detailed noise assessment is required and site access needs careful consideration. Therefore a significant negative (--) effect is likely but uncertain (?) subject to technical assessments and consideration of mitigation.
7. Plan for the anticipated levels of climate change		
7.1 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure?	+?	This strategic location is an existing industrial area with very limited green infrastructure. There may be some scope to secure new and improved green infrastructure within the area as part of its redevelopment. A minor positive (+) effect could occur, however this is uncertain (?) at this stage prior to obtaining further information on design/layout and enhancement opportunities.

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
7.2 Is the location at risk from flooding, taking into account of the effects of climate change?	-?	This strategic location contains areas of surface water flooding; most of these are identified of 'less' surface water risk. Therefore a minor negative (-) is likely. This effect is uncertain as it would depend on the ability of the design and layout of the particular development proposal to avoid or mitigate flood risk.
7.3 Will the development be at risk from coastal change? If so, can the Shoreline Management Plan Objectives be supported?	0	Not located in an area of coastal change therefore a negligible effect is likely.
8. Minimise Eastleigh's contribution to climate change by reducing the borough's carbon footprint and minimising other greenhouse gas emissions.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
9. Reduce waste generation and disposal, encourage waste prevention and reuse and achieve the sustainable management of waste.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
10. Protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and geodiversity, improving its quality and range.		
10.1 Is the location within the HRA screening zone?	- -?	The north eastern area of this strategic location is within 200m of the River Itchen SAC. Therefore a significant negative (- -) effect is likely. This effect is uncertain (?) as it depends on the potential for avoidance or mitigation measures to be included in a development proposal.
10.2 Is the location within 200m of a SSSI?	- -?	The north eastern area of this strategic location is within 200m of the River Itchen SSSI. Therefore a significant negative (- -) effect is likely. This effect is uncertain (?) as it depends on the potential for avoidance or mitigation measures to be included in a development proposal.
10.3 Is the location within 200m of a Local Nature Reserve?	0	This strategic location is not within 200m of any Local Nature Reserves; therefore a negligible (0) effect is likely.
10.4 Will the development adversely affect a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation? (N.B. No NNRs are present in the District)	0	Unlikely to have an adverse impact on a SINC; therefore, a negligible (0) effect is likely.
10.5 Will the development adversely affect sites with local designation of nature conservation value (e.g. Biodiversity Opportunity Areas, Biodiversity Action Plan Priority Areas, and Priority Habitat etc.)?	0	Unlikely to have an adverse impact on local designations of nature conservation value.
10.6 Will the development adversely affect protected species?	-?	This is an urban site with no opportunities for ground dwelling species. However, due to the proximity of the river, bats could be roosting within buildings if in a poor state of repair. A potentially minor negative (-), but uncertain effect is therefore identified.
10.7 Will the development adversely impact the biodiversity network (e.g. Biodiversity Action Plan Priority Links)?	0	Unlikely to have an adverse impact on the biodiversity network therefore, a negligible (0) effect is likely.
10.8 Will the development adversely affect ancient woodland?	0	Unlikely to have an adverse impact on ancient woodland therefore, a negligible (0) effect is likely.
11. Enhance the Borough's multifunctional green infrastructure networks.		
11.1 Will the development affect TPO trees	0	There are no TPO trees in this strategic location

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
		therefore a negligible effect is likely
11.2 Can the location be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	-	There are no footpath or cycle paths crossing this location or adjacent to its boundary; therefore a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
11.3 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure? (same score as 7.1)	+?	This strategic location is an existing industrial area with very limited green infrastructure. There may be some scope to secure new and improved green infrastructure within the area as part of its redevelopment. A minor positive (+) effect could occur, however this is uncertain (?) at this stage prior to obtaining further information on design/layout and enhancement opportunities.
12. Protect, enhance and manage the character and appearance of the landscape and townscape, maintaining and strengthening distinctiveness and its special qualities.		
12.1 Will development adversely affect the separation of neighbouring settlements?	0	Development in this location is unlikely to adversely affect the separation of settlements. Therefore a negligible (0) effect is likely.
12.2 Will it protect the setting of the South Downs National Park?	0	Development at this location is unlikely to have an impact on the National Park. Therefore a negligible (0) effect is likely.
12.3 Will it protect the character of the countryside, coast, towns and/or villages?	0	Development at this location is unlikely to have an impact on the character of the countryside, coast, towns or villages. Therefore a negligible (0) effect is likely.
12.4 Will it have an impact on locally important views and settings?	0	Development in this location is unlikely to have an impact on locally important views or settings. Therefore a negligible (0) effect is likely.
13. Protect and enhance and manage buildings, monuments, features, sites, places, areas and landscapes of archaeological, historical and cultural heritage importance.		
13.1 Will the development protect and enhance listed buildings and their settings, conservation areas, archaeological sites, historic landscapes and other sites of local importance for heritage?	0	There are no heritage assets that would be affected through the development of this location. Therefore a negligible (0) effect is likely.

Eastleigh 2 – Northern Business Park

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
1. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified local needs, including affordability and special needs		
1.1 Will the development provide a significant contribution towards meeting identified affordable housing needs?	0	This strategic location is for employment use only; therefore a negligible (0) effect is likely.
1.2 Will it provide other elements of identified housing need e.g. housing for older persons, self-build, support housing?	0	This strategic location is for employment use only; therefore a negligible (0) effect is likely.
2. Safeguard and improve community health, safety and wellbeing		
2.1 Are community facilities (community hall or library) available locally?	0	This strategic location is for employment use only; therefore a negligible (0) effect is likely.
2.2 Are health facilities available locally?	+	St Andrews Surgery is within 1.0km to the north of this strategic location; therefore a minor positive (+) effect is likely.
2.3 What effect would the development have on local provision of sports pitches and facilities?	0	This strategic location is for employment use only and does not involve existing sports pitches and facilities; therefore a negligible (0) effect is likely.
2.4 Is public open space available locally?	--/+	Campbell Road recreational space is adjacent to the northern area of this location. Therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely.
2.5 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network?	+	There is an existing footpath adjacent to the southern and eastern area of this strategic location, linking the location to Bishopstoke Road and the watercourse north of Itchen Valley Park; therefore a minor positive (+) effect is likely.
3. Develop a dynamic and diverse economy		
3.1(a) Is the location close to a major rail station?	+	Southampton Airport Parkway station is approximately 815m south west of this location and Eastleigh station is located 1.0km to the north of this strategic location. Therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely.
3.1 (b) Is the location close to a minor rail station?	-	This strategic location is over 600m from a minor rail station; therefore a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
3.1 (c) Is the location close to a frequent bus route?	+	A small area of the north western edge of this strategic location is within 600m of the Bluestar 2: Fair Oak-Bishopstoke-Eastleigh-Stoneham-Southampton bus route. Therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely.
3.1 (d) Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route?	-	This strategic location is over 300m from a semi-frequent bus route; therefore a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
3.1 (e) Is the location close to a major employment centre?	0	This strategic location is for employment use only and as such is unlikely to affect this objective; therefore a negligible (0) effect is likely.
3.2 Will the proposed development contribute towards meeting the need for new industrial, office or warehousing floorspace?	+	40,000sq.m. of employment floorspace is proposed at this location; therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely.
3.3 Will the proposed development result in a net loss of existing employment land, or land which would be suitable for employment purposes?	0	The development of this strategic location will not result in any loss of existing employment land therefore a negligible (0) effect is likely.
3.4 Will the proposed development increase the amount of commercial uses and other facilities in town, district or local centres?	0	This strategic location is identified for employment use only and is located outside district and local centres. It will therefore not result in any loss of a

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
		primary shopping area or an increase in the amount of commercial uses in town, district or local centres. This assumes that this strategic location for employment would not be used for commercial uses that would be more sustainably located in the town, district or local centres. Therefore a negligible (0) effect is likely.
4. Reduce road traffic and congestion through improved accessibility to services homes and jobs; reducing the need to travel by car/lorry and improving sustainable travel choice		
4.1 Is the location close to a major rail station? (same score as 3.1a)	+	Southampton Airport Parkway station is approximately 815m south west of this location and Eastleigh station is located 1.0km to the north of this strategic location. Therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely.
4.2 Is the location close to a minor rail station? (same score as 3.1b)	-	This strategic location is over 600m from a minor rail station; therefore a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
4.3 Is the location close to a frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1c)	+	A small area of the north western edge of this strategic location is within 600m of the Bluestar 2: Fair Oak-Bishopstoke-Eastleigh-Stoneham-Southampton bus route. Therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely.
4.4 Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1d)	-	This strategic location is over 300m from a semi-frequent bus route; therefore a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
4.5(a) Will residential development at the location be close to a major employment centre? (same score as 3.1e)	0	This strategic location is for employment use only and as such is unlikely to affect this objective; therefore a negligible (0) effect is likely.
4.5(b) Will employment development at the location be close to a major population centre?	++	This strategic location is approximately 400m east of a major population centre at Eastleigh; therefore, a significant positive (++) effect is likely.
4.6 Are health facilities available locally? (same score as 2.2)	+	St Andrews Surgery is less than 1.0km to the north of this strategic location; therefore a minor positive (+) effect is likely.
4.7 Are shopping and related services available locally?	-	The strategic location is more than 800m from the nearest shopping and related service area. Furthermore, the Council's SLAA site assessment form for this location, did not identify any shopping facilities within 1.0km of this location; therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
4.8 Is the location close to a Primary school?	0	This strategic location is for employment use only; therefore a negligible (0) effect is likely.
4.9 Is the location close to a Secondary school?	0	This strategic location is for employment use only; therefore a negligible (0) effect is likely.
4.10 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	+	There is an existing footpath adjacent to the southern and eastern area of this strategic location, linking the location to Bishopstoke Road; therefore a minor positive (+) effect is likely.
4.11 Are there Geographical barriers between the location and key facilities/ destinations?	--	Railway lines and Southampton Airport act as a significant physical barrier between this site and key facilities/destinations. There are currently no footways accessing the site. Therefore a significant negative (--) effect is likely.
5. Protect and conserve natural resources		

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
5.1 Will development avoid the sterilisation of mineral resources?	-?	This strategic location is located on the western periphery of an area identified for its potential sharp sand and gravel resource in the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan 2013. This strategic location also includes River Terrace deposits in the southern and eastern areas and is close to the Eastleigh Railway Aggregates Terminal in the north. These are both also identified as Consultation Areas in the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan 2013. Development at this strategic location could prevent future mineral extraction therefore a minor negative (-) effect is likely. This effect is uncertain as the potential for effects will depend on the scale and design of development proposals and whether minerals can be extracted prior to development within the Local Plan period.
5.2 Will it result in the loss of higher grade agricultural land?	0	This strategic location is not classified as agricultural land therefore a negligible (0) effect is likely.
5.3 Will it use previously developed land?	-	The location has not been previously developed; therefore a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
5.4 Will it deliver or support allotments or community farms?	-	This strategic location is unlikely to be suitable for allotments or a community farm given its location and its proposed use for employment. Therefore a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
6. Reduce air, soil, water, light and noise pollution		
6.1 Will the location be affected by significant noise generating uses or Air Quality Management Areas?	-?	This strategic location was part of the railway works and airport land and could be significantly affected by noise from aircraft and industrial uses, therefore a detailed site investigation is required to understand the potential impact and mitigation required. Due to the commercial uses being proposed at this strategic location, the impact should be able to be managed through remedial measures. This location is adjacent to but not within Eastleigh AQMA. Overall, due to the proposed employment use of this location, a minor negative (-) effect is likely but uncertain (?) subject to technical assessments and consideration of mitigation.
6.2 Will development increase pollution?	--?	Due to the scale of the proposed development and the types of uses proposed and their associated vehicle movements, emissions could have a significant effect on the nearby existing Air Quality Management Area. A detailed air quality assessment is therefore required to determine impacts on existing air quality. The proposed uses are also likely to have a significant noise impact on existing residential properties due to vehicle movements associated with them. A detailed noise assessment is required and site access needs careful consideration. Therefore a significant negative (--) effect is likely but uncertain (?) subject to technical assessments and consideration of mitigation.

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
7. Plan for the anticipated levels of climate change		
7.1 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure?	+?	There may be potential for some new green infrastructure as part of development at this location although this has not been actively promoted across the site as yet. Therefore, a minor positive but uncertain (+?) effect is likely.
7.2 Is the location at risk from flooding, taking into account of the effects of climate change?	-?	This strategic location contains areas of surface water flooding; most of these are identified of 'less' surface water risk. Therefore a minor negative (-) is likely. This effect is uncertain as it would depend on the ability of the design and layout of the particular development proposal to avoid or mitigate flood risk.
7.3 Will the development be at risk from coastal change? If so, can the Shoreline Management Plan Objectives be supported?	0	Not located in an area of coastal change therefore a negligible (0) effect is likely.
8. Minimise Eastleigh's contribution to climate change by reducing the borough's carbon footprint and minimising other greenhouse gas emissions.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
9. Reduce waste generation and disposal, encourage waste prevention and reuse and achieve the sustainable management of waste.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
10. Protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and geodiversity, improving its quality and range.		
10.1 Is the location within the HRA screening zone?	--?	There is a watercourse within the south eastern area of this strategic location, which is no further than 8km upstream of a European site. In addition, River Itchen SAC is within 200m of the eastern area of this location. Therefore a significant negative (--) effect is likely. This effect is uncertain as it depends on the potential for avoidance or mitigation measures to be included in a development proposal.
10.2 Is the location within 200m of a SSSI?	--?	The River Itchen SSSI adjoins the southern and eastern boundaries of this strategic location. Therefore a significant negative (-) effect is likely. This effect is uncertain (?) as it depends on the potential for avoidance or mitigation measures to be included in a development proposal.
10.3 Is the location within 200m of a Local Nature Reserve?	0	There are no Local Nature Reserves within 200m of this strategic location; therefore a negligible (0) effect is likely in relation to this SA objective.
10.4 Will the development adversely affect a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation? (N.B. No NNRs are present in the District)	0	Unlikely to have an adverse impact on a SINC; therefore, a negligible (0) effect is likely.
10.5 Will the development adversely affect sites with local designation of nature conservation value (e.g. Biodiversity Opportunity Areas, Biodiversity Action Plan Priority Areas, and Priority Habitat etc.)?	-?	Whilst this location is largely urban in nature it does contain what appears to be wet rough grassland associated with the Barton River. This should be retained to buffer the river and ensure no loss of important habitats. A minor negative (-) effect is likely, although this is uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information on design/layout and consideration of mitigation and enhancement opportunities.

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
10.6 Will the development adversely affect protected species?	-?	The wet grassland and river banks could harbour water vole and provide foraging and movement corridors for otter, bats and grass snake. A minor negative (-) effect is likely, although this is uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information on design/layout and consideration of mitigation and enhancement opportunities.
10.7 Will the development adversely impact the biodiversity network (e.g. Biodiversity Action Plan Priority Links)?	0	Unlikely to have an adverse impact on the biodiversity network therefore a negligible (0) effect is likely.
10.8 Will the development adversely affect ancient woodland?	0	Unlikely to have an adverse impact on ancient woodland therefore a negligible (0) effect is likely.
11. Enhance the Borough's multifunctional green infrastructure networks.		
11.1 Will the development affect TPO trees	0	There are no TPO trees in this strategic location therefore a negligible effect is likely.
11.2 Can the location be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	+	There is an existing footpath adjacent to the southern and eastern area of this strategic location, linking the location to Bishopstoke Road; therefore minor positive (+) effect is likely.
11.3 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure? (same score as 7.1)	+?	There may be potential for some new green infrastructure as part of development at this location although this has not been actively promoted. Therefore, a minor positive but uncertain (+?) effect is likely.
12. Protect, enhance and manage the character and appearance of the landscape and townscape, maintaining and strengthening distinctiveness and its special qualities.		
12.1 Will development adversely affect the separation of neighbouring settlements?	0	Development at this strategic location is not likely to have any effect on settlement identity or the gaps between settlements so a negligible impact is recorded
12.2 Will it protect the setting of the South Downs National Park?	0	Development at this strategic location is unlikely to have an impact on the National Park therefore a negligible effect is likely.
12.3 Will it protect the character of the countryside, coast, towns and/or villages?	-?	This location forms part of the landscape character area 4 which is defined by the open landscape of the airfield, enclosed to the east from the remaining part of the Itchen valley by a strong belt of vegetation. Development of the open land at the northern end of the airfield will change the character of the area, but in the context of adjoining industrial and airport related uses. A minor negative (-) effect is likely, although this is uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information on design and layout.
12.4 Will it have an impact on locally important views and settings?	-?	Views of the area are presently largely limited to

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
		airport users and rail passengers. Wider visual effects depend on the future level of site access and the scale of the buildings which may be built. A minor negative (-) effect is likely, although uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information on design and layout.
13. Protect and enhance and manage buildings, monuments, features, sites, places, areas and landscapes of archaeological, historical and cultural heritage importance.		
13.1 Will the development protect and enhance listed buildings and their settings, conservation areas, archaeological sites, historic landscapes and other sites of local importance for heritage?	-?	Two pillboxes are within this location. A minor negative effect could occur (-) however this is uncertain prior to obtaining further information on design/layout.

Fair Oak 1 – North of Fair Oak

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
1. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified local needs, including affordability and special needs		
1.1 Will the development provide a significant contribution towards meeting identified affordable housing needs?	+?	No issues have yet been raised that would suggest the typical proportion (35%) could not be achieved. Therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely. The proportion of affordable housing which could be delivered is currently uncertain (?) until further work is undertaken by the site promoter.
1.2 Will it provide other elements of identified housing need e.g. housing for older persons, self-build, support housing?	+?	There is scope in this strategic location for provision of other elements of identified housing need. The site promoter has not proposed to meet other such elements of identified housing need. A minor positive (+) effect could occur but is uncertain (?) at this stage.
2. Safeguard and improve community health, safety and wellbeing		
2.1 Are community facilities (community hall or library) available locally?	++	The south and west of the strategic location is within 400m of a range of community facilities including Fair Oak Library, Scout Hut and Social Club. The site promoter has indicated that improvements would be made to the existing local centre nearby as part of development at this strategic location. Therefore, a significant positive (++) effect is likely.
2.2 Are health facilities available locally?	+	The south west of the location (less than 3ha) is just within 1000m of Stokewood Surgery; therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely. A significant majority of the location is more than 1000m from any existing health facilities. Provision for a remote consulting room has been made at the development currently being built to the west of Winchester Road (Crowdhill). There are recognised issues regarding capacity at the GP surgery, further work will need to be undertaken.
2.3 What effect would the development have on local provision of sports pitches and facilities?	+?	This strategic location could be suitable for provision of on-site sports pitches and facilities. The site promoter has not indicated if such provision will be made as part of development at this strategic location. Therefore, a minor positive (+) effect could occur, however this is uncertain (?) at this stage.
2.4 Is public open space available locally?	++	The location within either 300m or 800m of a number of areas of public open space. Site promoters have also indicated that additional public open space would be provided as part of development at this strategic location. Therefore, a significant positive (++) effect is likely.
2.5 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network?	0	Bridleways bisect the location north to south and east to west. There are no opportunities to connect directly to the Eastleigh Cycle Network. However, a cycle route forming part of the network is approx. 600m from the edge of the location along Winchester Road and Bishopstoke Road and opportunities to improve connections could be explored. Overall, a negligible (0) effect is likely, although this is currently uncertain prior to further information about opportunities to improve links.
3. Develop a dynamic and diverse economy		
3.1(a) Is the location close to a major rail station?	-	This strategic location is more than 1200m from the

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
		nearest major rail station; therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
3.1 (b) Is the location close to a minor rail station?	-	This strategic location is more than 600m away from the nearest minor rail station; therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
3.1 (c) Is the location close to a frequent bus route?	++	The route for the Bluestar 2 Bus Route which connects Fair Oak to Southampton via Eastleigh travels adjacent to the western edge of this strategic location. Therefore, a significant positive (++) effect is likely.
3.1 (d) Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route?	-	This strategic location is more than 300m from the nearest semi-frequent bus route; therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
3.1 (e) Is the location close to a major employment centre?	-	This strategic location is more than 1000m from the nearest major employment centre; therefore a minor negative (-) effect is likely. It should be noted that a small amount of employment use (6,400 m. sq.) is being considered as part development at this strategic location.
3.2 Will the proposed development contribute towards meeting the need for new industrial, office or warehousing floorspace?	+	6,400sq.m. of employment floorspace is proposed at this strategic location; therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely. It is noted that this is quite a small amount of employment when considering the scale of development at this strategic location and likely need for employment floorspace.
3.3 Will the proposed development result in a net loss of existing employment land, or land which would be suitable for employment purposes?	0	Development at this strategic location would not result in a net loss of existing employment land. This strategic location has potential for use for employment land and site promoters have indicated a small amount of employment (6,400sq.m.) would be included as part of development at this strategic location. Overall, a negligible (0) effect is likely.
3.4 Will the proposed development increase the amount of commercial uses and other facilities in town, district or local centres?	+	Site promoters have indicated that there could be improvements to the existing Fair Oak Centre as part of development at this strategic location. Development would also increase catchment of these areas. Therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely.
3. Reduce road traffic and congestion through improved accessibility to services homes and jobs; reducing the need to travel by car/lorry and improving sustainable travel choice		
4.1 Is the location close to a major rail station? (same score as 3.1a)	-	This strategic location is more than 1200m from the nearest major rail station; therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
4.2 Is the location close to a minor rail station? (same score as 3.1b)	-	This strategic location is more than 600m away from the nearest minor rail station; therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
4.3 Is the location close to a frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1c)	++	The route for the Bluestar 2 Bus Route which connects Fair Oak to Southampton via Eastleigh travels adjacent to the western edge of this strategic location. Therefore, a significant positive (++) effect is likely.
4.4 Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1d)	-	This strategic location is more than 300m from the nearest semi-frequent bus route; therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
4.5(a) Will residential development at the location be close to a major employment centre? (same score as 3.1e)	-	This strategic location is more than 1000m from the nearest major employment centre; therefore a minor negative (-) effect is likely. It should be noted that a small amount of employment use

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
		(6,400 m. sq.) is proposed as part of development at this strategic location.
4.5(b) Will employment development at the location be close to a major population centre?	-	This strategic location is more than 1000m from the nearest major population centre; therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
4.6 Are health facilities available locally? (same score as 2.2)	+	The south west of the location (less than 3ha) is just within 1000m of Stokewood Surgery; therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely. A significant majority of the location is more than 1000m from any existing health facilities. Provision for a remote consulting room has been made at the development currently being built to the west of Winchester Road (Crowdhill). There are recognised issues regarding capacity at the GP surgery, further work will need to be undertaken.
4.7 Are shopping and related services available locally?	++	The majority of the location to the south and west is within either 400m or 800m of Fair Oak Village Centre. The site promoter has indicated that improvements would be made to the existing local centre nearby as part of development at this strategic location.
4.8 Is the location close to a Primary school?	++?	This strategic location is more than 800m from the nearest primary school. Site promoters have indicated that a new primary school could be provided with development at this strategic location. Therefore, a significant positive (++) effect is likely, albeit uncertain (?) prior to further information on development proposals for this strategic location.
4.9 Is the location close to a Secondary school?	++?	The southern part of this strategic location is within 1600m of Wyvern College. There are recognised capacity issues at Wyvern School. Site promoters have indicated that a new secondary school could be provided with development at this strategic location in combination with other options for strategic development nearby in Fair Oak and Bishopstoke. Therefore, a significant positive (++) effect is likely, albeit uncertain (?) prior to further information on development proposals for this strategic location.
4.10 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	0	Bridleways bisect the strategic location north to south and east to west. There are no opportunities to connect directly to the Eastleigh Cycle Network. However, a cycle route forming part of the network is approx. 600m from the edge of the location along Winchester Road and Bishopstoke Road and opportunities to improve connections could be explored. Overall, a negligible (0) effect is likely, although this is currently uncertain prior to further information about opportunities to improve links.
4.11 Are there Geographical barriers between the location and key facilities/ destinations?	-	Whilst the two existing roads bordering the site have pavements extending from the site to Fair Oak district centre, Winchester Road is a busy road which may require additional crossing points. Therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
5. Protect and conserve natural resources		
5.1 Will development avoid the sterilisation of mineral resources?	-?	This strategic location includes areas identified as a Minerals Consultation Area to the south and north west. A small area identified for Minerals Safeguarding is located on the western edge. Development could potentially have a minor negative (-) effect access to mineral resource is lost by development. This effect is uncertain (?) until it

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
		is determined if extraction of these minerals can or should be undertaken prior to the location being developed
5.2 Will it result in the loss of higher grade agricultural land?	0	The majority of this strategic location is located within land identified as Grade 4 agricultural land. Therefore, a negligible (0) effect is likely.
5.3 Will it use previously developed land?	-	The majority of this strategic location is located on greenfield and land; therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
5.4 Will it deliver or support allotments or community farms?	+?	This strategic location could be suitable for new allotments/community farms. The site promoter has not indicated if these facilities would be included as part of development at this strategic location. A minor positive (+) effect could occur, however this is currently uncertain (?) prior to further information.
6. Reduce air, soil, water, light and noise pollution		
6.1 Will the location be affected by significant noise generating uses or Air Quality Management Areas?	-?	There are no AQMAs which will directly affect this strategic location. To the south east of Fair Oak, there are existing and granted B2 and mineral uses, and an operational landfill gas utilisation plant at the restored Fair Oak Landfill which. Such land uses have the potential to give rise to noise impacts at night and to air pollution/odour. Such effects are however likely to be mitigated through existing environmental permitting requirements, without which such plant would not be able to operate. Therefore, any noise or odour impacts associated with the landfill site are more likely to arise during accidental conditions (i.e. plant break down) as oppose to being associated with normal operational conditions. a minor negative (-) effect could occur; however this is uncertain prior to obtaining further information on design/layout and mitigation opportunities.
6.2 Will development increase pollution?	- -?	There is likely to be land contamination from previous/current uses at this strategic location and remedial measures may be required. Given the scale of the location there is likely to be a significant impact on traffic flows and volumes on nearby roads and potentially to Eastleigh town, impacting on local air quality generally and with potential to impact the Eastleigh AQMA and the nature conservation interests of the River Itchen SAC. Therefore, a significant negative (- -) effect could occur. A new road is proposed in combination with development at other nearby strategic locations. The effect of such a road scheme is currently uncertain (?).
7. Plan for the anticipated levels of climate change		
7.1 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure?	-?	The strategic location is a greenfield site with GI assets within or adjacent to the site including bridleways and woodland. Development at this strategic location could result in a loss of GI. However, design of development including new open space and links to the wider GI network could provide mitigation and perhaps opportunities for enhancement. Therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely, although this is uncertain (?) at this stage.
7.2 Is the location at risk from flooding, taking into account of the effects of climate change?	--?	Some narrow strips of land identified as at an 'intermediate' risk of surface water flooding are present at this strategic location. Therefore, a significant negative (--) effect is likely. However,

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
		the overall effect at this strategic location is uncertain (?) as the majority of the site is not within an area of flood risk and consideration of design and mitigation options is required.
7.3 Will the development be at risk from coastal change? If so, can the Shoreline Management Plan Objectives be supported?	0	Not located in an area of coastal change; therefore a negligible (0) effect is likely.
8. Minimise Eastleigh's contribution to climate change by reducing the borough's carbon footprint and minimising other greenhouse gas emissions.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
9. Reduce waste generation and disposal, encourage waste prevention and reuse and achieve the sustainable management of waste.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
10. Protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and geodiversity, improving its quality and range.		
10.1 Is the location within the HRA screening zone?	- -?	The strategic location is within 25m of four watercourses which are tributaries of the River Itchen. A significant negative (- -) effect could occur, although this is uncertain (?) subject to the outcome of HRA screening and consideration of mitigation.
10.2 Is the location within 200m of a SSSI?	0	The location is not within 200m of a SSSI; therefore, a negligible (0) effect is likely.
10.3 Is the location within 200m of a Local Nature Reserve?	0	The location is not within 200m if a Local Nature Reserve; therefore, a negligible (0) effect is likely.
10.4 Will the development adversely affect a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation? (N.B. No NNRs are present in the District)	- -?	This strategic location is south of Chestnut Gully Woods SINC and Park Hills Wood SINC and surrounds Hall lands Copse SINC. Gore Copse SINC is located on the south eastern edge of this strategic location. These SINC are designated for their ancient woodland. These woodland SINC are generally well connected via a relatively complete hedgerow network. Development at this strategic location could block species dispersal by severing these hedgerow connections if not sensitively designed. Due to the woods' size the biodiversity value of both sites is likely to become severely impacted if fragmentation occurs. Development at this strategic location could result in a significant negative (- -) effect although this is uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information on design/layout and mitigation and enhancement opportunities.
10.5 Will the development adversely affect sites with local designation of nature conservation value (e.g. Biodiversity Opportunity Areas, Biodiversity Action Plan Priority Areas, and Priority Habitat etc.)?	-?	This strategic location is primarily comprised of agricultural land recorded as improved grassland within historic surveys. However, to the north, adjacent to the ancient woodland block semi improved grassland has been recorded. Development at this strategic location would likely result in a minor negative (-) effect although this is uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information on design/layout and mitigation and enhancement opportunities.
10.6 Will the development adversely affect protected species?	-?	Several different protected species could be present at or utilise this strategic location, including but not limited to: great crested newts, bats, otters. Due to

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
		the aquatic and hedgerow connections to the SAC, otter may use the sites. A minor negative (-) effect is likely, although uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information on design/layout and opportunities for mitigation and enhancement.
10.7 Will the development adversely impact the biodiversity network (e.g. Biodiversity Action Plan Priority Links)?	-?	The hedgerow network appears to be very complete, with a complex of small fields interspersed with woodland. This network is likely to be important under the Hedgerows Regulations and is connecting habitat for the woodlands and important to species dispersal. Development at this strategic location would likely result in a minor negative (-) effect although this is uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information on design/layout and mitigation and enhancement opportunities.
10.8 Will the development adversely affect ancient woodland?	- -?	This strategic location is south of Chestnut Gully Woods SINC and Park Hills Wood SINC and surrounds Hall lands Copse SINC. Gore Copse SINC is located on the south eastern edge of this strategic location. These SINC's are designated for their ancient woodland. These woodland SINC's are generally well connected via a relatively complete hedgerow network. Development at this strategic location could block species dispersal by severing these hedgerow connections if not sensitively designed. Due to the woods' size the biodiversity value of both sites is likely to become severely impacted if fragmentation occurs. Development at this strategic location would likely result in a significant negative (- -) effect although this is uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information on design/layout and mitigation and enhancement opportunities.
11. Enhance the Borough's multifunctional green infrastructure networks.		
11.1 Will the development affect TPO trees?	-?	A small area of TPO trees is present in the west of the strategic location. There are also a number of small areas of TPO trees adjacent to this strategic location in the south east, south west and north west. A minor negative (-) effect could occur, but uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information on design/layout.
11.2 Can the location be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	0	Bridleways bisect the location north to south and east to west. There are no opportunities to connect directly to the Eastleigh Cycle Network. However, a cycle route forming part of the network is approx. 600m from the edge of the location along Winchester Road and Bishopstoke Road and opportunities to improve connections could be explored. Overall, a negligible (0) effect is likely, although this is currently uncertain prior to obtaining further information about opportunities to improve links.
11.3 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure? (same score as 7.1)	-?	The strategic location is a greenfield site with GI assets within or adjacent to the site including bridleways and woodland. Development at this strategic location could result in a loss of GI. However, design of development including new open space and links to the wider GI network could provide mitigation and perhaps opportunities for enhancement. Therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely, although this is uncertain at this stage (?).

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
12. Protect, enhance and manage the character and appearance of the landscape and townscape, maintaining and strengthening distinctiveness and its special qualities.		
12.1 Will development adversely affect the separation of neighbouring settlements?	-	At present, existing woodland and topography creates a clear separation of settlements on their northern side. Development at this strategic location would potentially reduce the separation between the settlements of Bishopstoke and Fair Oak, and may erode the clear separation between Fair Oak/Crowdhill and Fishers Pond/Colden Common. A minor negative (-) effect is likely, although this is uncertain prior to obtaining further information on design/layout.
12.2 Will it protect the setting of the South Downs National Park?	0	Development at this strategic location is unlikely to have an impact on the National Park.
12.3 Will it protect the character of the countryside, coast, towns and/or villages?	- -?	Development at this strategic location would alter the character of the rising, open, undeveloped fields to the east of Winchester Road by increasing the sense of urbanisation in the area. A significant negative (- -) effect is likely, although this is uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information on design/layout.
12.4 Will it have an impact on locally important views and settings?	-?	New development on high ground would be highly visible from the west, from Knowle Hill Park and from rights of way in the surrounding countryside. A minor negative (-) effect is likely, although this is uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information on design/layout.
13. Protect and enhance and manage buildings, monuments, features, sites, places, areas and landscapes of archaeological, historical and cultural heritage importance.		
13.1 Will the development protect and enhance listed buildings and their settings, conservation areas, archaeological sites, historic landscapes and other sites of local importance for heritage?	-?	The Pyle Hill Cottages which have Grade II listing and a Tudor Cottage with a local listing are adjacent to this strategic location on Winchester Road. A possible prehistoric enclosure is located in the south of the location. A minor negative (-) effect could occur; however this is uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information on design/layout.

Fair Oak 2 – North East of Fair Oak, North of Mortimers Lane

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
1. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified local needs, including affordability and special needs		
1.1 Will the development provide a significant contribution towards meeting identified affordable housing needs?	+?	No issues have yet been raised that would suggest the typical proportion (35%) could not be achieved. Therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely. The proportion of affordable housing which could be delivered is currently uncertain (?) until further work is undertaken by the site promoter.
1.2 Will it provide other elements of identified housing need e.g. housing for older persons, self-build, support housing?	+?	There is scope in this strategic location for provision of other elements of identified housing need. The site promoter has not proposed to meet other such elements of identified housing need. A minor positive (+) effect could occur but is uncertain (?) at this stage.
2. Safeguard and improve community health, safety and wellbeing		
2.1 Are community facilities (community hall or library) available locally?	-	This strategic location is more than 800m from the nearest community facilities; therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
2.2 Are health facilities available locally?	--	This strategic location is more than 800m from the nearest health facilities; therefore, a significant negative (- -) effect is likely.
2.3 What effect would the development have on local provision of sports pitches and facilities?	+?	This strategic location could be suitable for provision of on-site sports pitches and facilities. The site promoter has not indicated if such provision will be made as part of development at this strategic location. Therefore, a minor positive (+) effect could occur, however this is uncertain (?) at this stage.
2.4 Is public open space available locally?	++	The location is within either 300m or 800m of a number of areas of public open space. Site promoters have also indicated that additional public open space would be provided as part of development at this strategic location. Therefore, a significant positive (++) effect is likely.
2.5 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network?	0	A footpath bisects the site broadly from east to west. A bridleway is adjacent to the north of the location. There are no opportunities to connect directly to the Eastleigh Cycle Network. Therefore, a negligible (0) effect is likely.
3. Develop a dynamic and diverse economy		
3.1(a) Is the location close to a major rail station?	-	This strategic location is more than 1,200m from the nearest major rail station; therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
3.1 (b) Is the location close to a minor rail station?	-	This strategic location is more than 600m away from the nearest minor rail station; therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
3.1 (c) Is the location close to a frequent bus route?	+	A small area of the western area of this strategic location is just within 600m of the Bluestar 2 Bus Route which connects Fair Oak to Southampton via Eastleigh travels adjacent to the western edge of this strategic location. Therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely. It is noted that the majority of this strategic location is more than 600m from the closest frequent bus route.
3.1 (d) Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route?	-	This strategic location is more than 300m from the nearest semi-frequent bus route; therefore, a minor

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
		negative (-) effect is likely.
3.1 (e) Is the location close to a major employment centre?	-	This strategic location is more than 1,000m from the nearest major employment centre; therefore a minor negative (-) effect is likely. It should be noted that a small amount of employment use (6,400 m. sq.) is being considered as part development at this strategic location.
3.2 Will the proposed development contribute towards meeting the need for new industrial, office or warehousing floorspace?	0	Location could well be suitable for employment floorspace. However, the site promoter has not stated this as part of the proposals for this strategic location. Therefore, a negligible effect is likely.
3.3 Will the proposed development result in a net loss of existing employment land, or land which would be suitable for employment purposes?	-	No net loss of existing employment land would result in development of this strategic location. Location could be suitable for employment floorspace. Therefore a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
3.4 Will the proposed development increase the amount of commercial uses and other facilities in town, district or local centres?	0	There would be no change in the amount of commercial uses in town, district and local centres. The effect on retail provision at Fair Oak Village Centre through increased catchment is likely to be limited due to the distance of this strategic location. Therefore, a negligible (0) effect is likely.
4. Reduce road traffic and congestion through improved accessibility to services homes and jobs; reducing the need to travel by car/lorry and improving sustainable travel choice		
4.1 Is the location close to a major rail station? (same score as 3.1a)	-	This strategic location is more than 1,200m from the nearest major rail station; therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
4.2 Is the location close to a minor rail station? (same score as 3.1b)	-	This strategic location is more than 600m away from the nearest minor rail station; therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
4.3 Is the location close to a frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1c)	+	A small area of the western area of this strategic location is just within 600m of the Bluestar 2 Bus Route which connects Fair Oak to Southampton via Eastleigh travels adjacent to the western edge of this strategic location. Therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely. It is noted that the majority of this strategic location is more than 600m from the closest frequent bus route.
4.4 Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1d)	-	This strategic location is more than 300m from the nearest semi-frequent bus route; therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
4.5(a) Will residential development at the location be close to a major employment centre? (same score as 3.1e)	-	This strategic location is more than 1,000m from the nearest major employment centre; therefore a minor negative (-) effect is likely. It should be noted that a small amount of employment use (6,400 m. sq.) is being considered as part development at this strategic location.
4.5(b) Will employment development at the location be close to a major population centre?	0	No significant employment use; therefore, a minor negligible (0) effect is likely.
4.6 Are health facilities available locally? (same score as 2.2)	--	This strategic location is more than 800m from the nearest health facilities; therefore, a significant negative (- -) effect is likely.
4.7 Are shopping and related services available locally?	+	A small area of the western part of this strategic location is just within 800m Fair Oak Village Centre. Therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely. However, it is noted that the majority of the site is beyond 800m.

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
4.8 Is the location close to a Primary school?	++?	This strategic location is more than 800m from the nearest primary school. The majority of the location is beyond 800m of an existing primary school. Site promoters have indicated that a new primary school could be provided with development at this strategic location. Therefore a significant positive (++) effect is likely, although uncertain (?) prior to further information.
4.9 Is the location close to a Secondary school?	0	A small area in the southern part of this strategic location is within 1600m of Wyvern College. Therefore a negligible (0) effect is likely. However, the majority of the location is beyond 1600m. There are recognised capacity issues at Wyvern School and further work will need to be undertaken regarding secondary school provision.
4.10 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	0	A footpath bisects the site broadly from east to west. A bridleway is adjacent to the north of the location. There are no opportunities to connect directly to the Eastleigh Cycle Network. Therefore, a negligible (0) effect is likely.
4.11 Are there Geographical barriers between the location and key facilities/ destinations?	-	The primary route to the nearest settlement and its facilities and services is via Mortimers Lane. The road has a pavement through to the edge of Fair Oak Village. Beyond the edge of the village, the road is a country lane and lacks sufficient lighting and pavements. There is a significant change in levels of land just to the east of Hall Lands Lane which serves to further separate this site from Fair Oak. Therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
5. Protect and conserve natural resources		
5.1 Will development avoid the sterilisation of mineral resources?	-?	Small areas identified as part of the Minerals Consultation Area are located to the eastern and western edges of this strategic location. The small area on the eastern edge is also identified as a Minerals Safeguarding area. Development could potentially have a minor negative (-) effect access to mineral resource is lost by development. This effect is uncertain (?) until it is determined if extraction of these minerals can or should be undertaken prior to the location being developed
5.2 Will it result in the loss of higher grade agricultural land?	-	The majority of this strategic location is located within land identified as Grade 4 agricultural land. A small area (approx. 1ha) to the north east is Grade 3. Therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
5.3 Will it use previously developed land?	-	The majority of the location is previously undeveloped. The location does include agricultural related buildings, including dwellings. Therefore a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
5.4 Will it deliver or support allotments or community farms?	+?	This strategic location could be suitable for new allotments/community farms. The site promoter has not indicated if these facilities would be included as part of development at this strategic location. A minor positive (+) effect could occur, however this is currently uncertain (?) prior to further information.
6. Reduce air, soil, water, light and noise pollution		
6.1 Will the location be affected by significant noise generating uses or Air Quality Management Areas?	-?	There are no AQMAs which will be directly affected by this strategic location. To the south east of Fair Oak, there are existing and granted B2 and mineral uses, and an operational landfill gas utilisation plant

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
		at the restored Fair Oak Landfill which have the potential to give rise to noise impacts at night and to air pollution / odour. Such effects are however likely to be mitigated through existing environmental permitting requirements, without which such plant would not be able to operate. Therefore, any noise or odour impacts associated with the landfill site are more likely to arise during accidental conditions (i.e. plant break down) as oppose to being associated with normal operational conditions. A minor negative (-) effect could occur; however this is uncertain prior to obtaining further information on design/layout and mitigation opportunities.
6.2 Will development increase pollution?	- -?	Given the scale of the strategic location there is likely to be a significant impact on traffic flows and volumes on nearby roads and potentially to Eastleigh town, impacting on local air quality generally and with potential to impact the Eastleigh AQMA and the nature conservation interest of the River Itchen. A significant negative (- -?) effect is likely. A new road is proposed in combination with development at other nearby strategic locations. The effect of such a road scheme is currently uncertain (?).
7. Plan for the anticipated levels of climate change		
7.1 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure?	-?	The strategic location is a greenfield site with GI assets within or adjacent to the site including bridleways and woodland. Development at this strategic location could result in a loss of GI. However, design of development including new open space and links to the wider GI network could provide mitigation and perhaps opportunities for enhancement. Therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely, although this is uncertain (?) at this stage.
7.2 Is the location at risk from flooding, taking into account of the effects of climate change?	--?	An area identified as at intermediate risk of surface water flooding is present western edge of this strategic location and also bisects the location in a narrow strip from north to south. Therefore a significant negative (--) effect is likely. However, the overall effect at this strategic location is uncertain (?) as the majority of the site is not within an area of flood risk and consideration of design and mitigation options is required.
7.3 Will the development be at risk from coastal change? If so, can the Shoreline Management Plan Objectives be supported?	0	Not located in an area of coastal change.
8. Minimise Eastleigh's contribution to climate change by reducing the borough's carbon footprint and minimising other greenhouse gas emissions.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
9. Reduce waste generation and disposal, encourage waste prevention and reuse and achieve the sustainable management of waste.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
10. Protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and geodiversity, improving its quality and range.		

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
10.1 Is the location within the HRA screening zone?	- -?	The strategic location is within 25m of three watercourses which are tributaries of the River Itchen. A significant negative (- -) effect could occur, subject (?) to the outcome of HRA screening and consideration of mitigation.
10.2 Is the location within 200m of a SSSI?	0	The strategic location is not within 200m of a SSSI; therefore, a negligible (0) effect is likely.
10.3 Is the location within 200m of a Local Nature Reserve?	0	The strategic location is not within 200m if a Local Nature Reserve; therefore, a negligible (0) effect is likely.
10.4 Will the development adversely affect a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation? (N.B. No NNRs are present in the District)	-?	This strategic location has Park Hills SINC to the South and Stroud Wood, Fair Oak and Horton Heath SINC adjacent to a tributary of the River Hamble within the location. Both these SINC are designated for their ancient woodland. At present, these sites are connected up with a relatively complete hedgerow network. Development at this strategic location could isolate the small woodland block from the wider woodland/hedgerow network. Therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely, although this is uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information on design/layout.
10.5 Will the development adversely affect sites with local designation of nature conservation value (e.g. Biodiversity Opportunity Areas, Biodiversity Action Plan Priority Areas, and Priority Habitat etc.)?	-?	This strategic location is likely to primarily contain rough and semi improved grassland. Therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely, although this is uncertain (?) subject to obtaining further information on design/layout.
10.7 Will the development adversely affect protected species?	-?	Several different protected species could be present at or utilise this strategic location, including but not limited to: great crested newts, bats, otters. Due to the aquatic and hedgerow connections to the SAC otter may use the sites. A minor negative (-) effect is likely, although uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information on design/layout and opportunities for mitigation and enhancement.
10.6 Will the development adversely impact the biodiversity network (e.g. Biodiversity Action Plan Priority Links)?	-?	A complete network of hedgerows is present which provide excellent connectivity between the woodland blocks. Development at this strategic location could isolate the small woodland block from the wider woodland/hedgerow network. Therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely, although this is uncertain (?) subject to obtaining further information on design/layout.
10.7 Will the development adversely affect ancient woodland?	-?	This option has Park Hills SINC to the South and Stroud Wood, Fair Oak and Horton Heath SINC adjacent to a tributary of the River Hamble within the location. Both these SINC are designated for their ancient woodland. At present these sites are connected up with a relatively complete hedgerow network. Development at this strategic location could isolate the small woodland block from the wider woodland/hedgerow network. Therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely, although this is uncertain (?) subject to obtaining further information on design/layout.
11. Enhance the Borough's multifunctional green infrastructure networks.		
11.1 Will the development affect TPO trees?	-?	This strategic location contains small areas of TPO trees in the centre and western areas. A minor negative (-) effect could occur, but uncertain (?) subject to obtaining further information on design/layout.

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
11.2 Can the location be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	0	Bridleways bisect the site north to south and east to west. There is no direct access to the Eastleigh Cycle Network. Therefore, a negligible (0) effect is likely.
11.3 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure? (same score as 7.1)	-?	The strategic location is a greenfield site with GI assets within or adjacent to the site including bridleways and woodland. Development at this strategic location could result in a loss of GI. However, design of development including new open space and links to the wider GI network could provide mitigation. Therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely, although this is uncertain (?) at this stage.
12. Protect, enhance and manage the character and appearance of the landscape and townscape, maintaining and strengthening distinctiveness and its special qualities.		
12.1 Will development adversely affect the separation of neighbouring settlements?	-	Development at this strategic location would erode the gap between settlements of Fair Oak and Lower Upham. A minor negative (-) effect is likely.
12.2 Will it protect the setting of the South Downs National Park?	-?	Development at this strategic location could be visible from the South Downs National Park. A minor negative (-) effect could occur; however this is uncertain (?) subject to obtaining further information on design/layout.
12.3 Will it protect the character of the countryside, coast, towns and/or villages?	- -?	Development at this strategic location is likely to erode the gap between settlements, impact rural views, and alter the distinctive parliamentary enclosure field pattern which is unique in the borough. A significant negative (- -) effect is likely, however the scale of this effect is uncertain (?) subject to obtaining further information on design/layout.
12.4 Will it have an impact on locally important views and settings?	-?	Development at this strategic location would affect rural views from the high ground at Hall Lands Lane and linking rights of way, and from Mortimers Lane opposite Mortimers Farm. A minor negative (-) effect is likely, however the scale of this effect is uncertain (?) subject to obtaining further information on design/layout.
13. Protect and enhance and manage buildings, monuments, features, sites, places, areas and landscapes of archaeological, historical and cultural heritage importance.		
13.1 Will the development protect and enhance listed buildings and their settings, conservation areas, archaeological sites, historic landscapes and other sites of local importance for heritage?	-?	This strategic location includes Little Dower House which is a locally listed building and Fair Oak Park to the south west area which is identified as a Historic Park and Garden. A minor negative (-) effect could occur, although this is uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information on layout/design.

Fair Oak 3 – North east of Fair Oak, south of Mortimers Lane

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
1. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified local needs, including affordability and special needs		
1.1 Will the development provide a significant contribution towards meeting identified affordable housing needs?	+?	No issues have yet been raised that would suggest the typical proportion (35%) could not be achieved. Therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely. The proportion of affordable housing which could be delivered is currently uncertain (?) until further work is undertaken by the site promoter.
1.2 Will it provide other elements of identified housing need e.g. housing for older persons, self-build, support housing?	+?	There is scope in this strategic location for provision of other elements of identified housing need. The site promoter has not proposed to meet other such elements of identified housing need. A minor positive (+) effect could occur but is uncertain (?) at this stage.
2. Safeguard and improve community health, safety and wellbeing		
2.1 Are community facilities (community hall or library) available locally?	-	This strategic location is more than 800m from the nearest community facilities; therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
2.2 Are health facilities available locally?	--	This strategic location is more than 800m from the nearest health facilities; therefore, a significant negative (- -) effect is likely.
2.3 What effect would the development have on local provision of sports pitches and facilities?	+?/- -	The scale of development proposed at this strategic location would result in the loss of part or all of East Horton Golf Course. There is scope in this strategic location for some provision of sports facilities, although site promoters have not indicated that there would be any facilities as part of development at this strategic location. Therefore, there is potential for a minor positive effect or a significant negative effect (- -) effect.
2.4 Is public open space available locally?	++	The west of the location is within 300m of Knowle Hill Park. Site promoters have also indicated that additional public open space would be provided as part of development at this strategic location. Therefore, a significant positive (++) effect is likely. It is noted that there is no direct access to this open space however so walking distance to the open space would be more than 300m
2.5 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network?	0	A footpath bisects the site broadly from north-west to south-east. There are no opportunities to connect directly to the cycle routes which are part of the Eastleigh Cycle Network. Therefore, a negligible (0) effect is likely.
3. Develop a dynamic and diverse economy		
3.1(a) Is the location close to a major rail station?	-	This strategic location is more than 1,200m from the nearest major rail station; therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
3.1 (b) Is the location close to a minor rail station?	-	This strategic location is more than 600m away from the nearest minor rail station; therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
3.1 (c) Is the location close to a frequent bus route?	-	This strategic location is more than 600m from the nearest frequent bus route; therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
3.1 (d) Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route?	-	This strategic location is more than 300m from the nearest semi-frequent bus route; therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
3.1 (e) Is the location close to a major employment centre?	-	This strategic location is more than 1,000m from the nearest major employment centre; therefore a minor negative (-) effect is likely. It should be noted that a small amount of employment use (6,400 m. sq.) is being considered as part development at this strategic location.
3.2 Will the proposed development contribute towards meeting the need for new industrial, office or warehousing floorspace?	0	Location could well be suitable for employment floorspace as part of significant new development at this strategic location. However the site promoter has not stated this as part of the proposals for this strategic location. Therefore, a negligible (0) effect is likely.
3.3 Will the proposed development result in a net loss of existing employment land, or land which would be suitable for employment purposes?	-	No net loss of existing employment land would result in development of this strategic location. Location could be suitable for employment floorspace. Therefore a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
3.4 Will the proposed development increase the amount of commercial uses and other facilities in town, district or local centres?	0	No change in the amount of commercial uses in town, district and local centres. Effect on retail provision at Fair Oak Village Centre through increased catchment is likely to be limited due to the distance of this strategic location. Therefore, a negligible (0) effect is likely.
4. Reduce road traffic and congestion through improved accessibility to services homes and jobs; reducing the need to travel by car/lorry and improving sustainable travel choice		
4.1 Is the location close to a major rail station? (same score as 3.1a)	-	This strategic location is more than 1,200m from the nearest major rail station; therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
4.2 Is the location close to a minor rail station? (same score as 3.1b)	-	This strategic location is more than 600m away from the nearest minor rail station; therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
4.3 Is the location close to a frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1c)	-	This strategic location is more than 600m from the nearest frequent bus route; therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
4.4 Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1d)	-	This strategic location is more than 300m from the nearest semi-frequent bus route; therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
4.5(a) Will residential development at the location be close to a major employment centre? (same score as 3.1e)	-	This strategic location is more than 1000m from the nearest major employment centre; therefore a minor negative (-) effect is likely. It should be noted that a small amount of employment use (6,400 m. sq.) is being considered as part development at this strategic location.
4.5(b) Will employment development at the location be close to a major population centre?	0	No significant employment use; therefore, a minor negligible (0) effect is likely.
4.6 Are health facilities available locally? (same score as 2.2)	- -	This strategic location is more than 800m from the nearest health facilities; therefore, a significant negative (- -) effect is likely.
4.7 Are shopping and related services available locally?	-	This strategic location is more than 800m from the nearest shopping and related facilities. Therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
4.8 Is the location close to a Primary school?	-	This strategic location is more than 800m from the nearest primary school; therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely. The majority of the location is beyond 800m of an existing primary school. It is noted that site promoters have indicated that a new primary school could be provided with development

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
		to the north of Mortimers Lane (strategic location: Fair Oak 2), adjacent to this strategic location.
4.9 Is the location close to a Secondary school?	-	The southern part of this strategic location is more than 1,600m of Wyvern College. Therefore a minor negative (-) effect is likely. There are recognised capacity issues at Wyvern School and further work will need to be undertaken regarding secondary school provision.
4.10 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	0	A footpath bisects the site broadly from north-west to south-east. There are no opportunities to connect directly to the cycle routes which are part of the Eastleigh Cycle Network. Therefore, a negligible (0) effect is likely.
4.11 Are there Geographical barriers between the location and key facilities/ destinations?	-	The primary route to the nearest settlement and its facilities and services is via Mortimers Lane. The road has a pavement running from the junction of Winchester Road up to the urban edge of Fair Oak village. Beyond, the road is a country lane and lacks sufficient lighting and pavements. Therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
5. Protect and conserve natural resources		
5.1 Will development avoid the sterilisation of mineral resources?	-?	A small area at the western edge of this strategic location is identified for Minerals Safeguarding and as a Minerals Consultation Area. Development could potentially have a minor negative (-) effect access to mineral resource is lost by development. This effect is uncertain (?) until it is determined if extraction of these minerals can or should be undertaken prior to the location being developed
5.2 Will it result in the loss of higher grade agricultural land?	0	The majority of this strategic location is located within land identified as Grade 4 agricultural land. Therefore, a negligible (0) effect is likely.
5.3 Will it use previously developed land?	-	The majority of the location is previously undeveloped. The location does include agricultural related buildings and part of East Horton Golf Club. Therefore a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
5.4 Will it deliver or support allotments or community farms?	+?	This strategic location could be suitable for new allotments/community farms. The site promoter has not indicated if these facilities would be included as part of development at this strategic location. A minor positive (+) effect could occur, however this is currently uncertain (?) prior to further information.
6. Reduce air, soil, water, light and noise pollution		
6.1 Will the location be affected by significant noise generating uses or Air Quality Management Areas?	-?	There are no AQMAs which will be directly affected by this strategic location. The southern part of this location however is located in close proximity to existing and granted B2 and mineral uses, and an operational landfill gas utilisation plant at the restored Fair Oak Landfill site. The landfill gas utilisation plant has the potential to give rise to noise impacts at night and to air pollution / odour. Such effects are however likely to be mitigated through existing environmental permitting requirements, without which such plant would not be able to operate. Therefore, any noise or odour impacts associated with the landfill site are more likely to arise during accidental conditions (i.e. plant break down) as oppose to being associated with normal operational conditions. A minor negative (-) effect could occur; however this is uncertain prior to obtaining further information on design/layout and

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
		mitigation opportunities.
6.2 Will development increase pollution?	--?	Given the scale of the location there is likely to be a significant impact on traffic flows and volumes on nearby roads and potentially to Eastleigh town, impacting on local air quality generally and with potential to impact the Eastleigh AQMA and the nature conservation interest of the River Itchen. A minor negative (-) effect could occur. A new road is proposed in combination with development at other nearby strategic locations. The effect of such a road scheme is currently uncertain (?).
7. Plan for the anticipated levels of climate change		
7.1 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure?	-?	The strategic location is a greenfield site with GI assets within or adjacent to the site including bridleways, woodland and parts of East Horton Golf Club. Development at this strategic location would result in a loss of GI. However, design of development including new open space and links to the wider GI network could provide mitigation. Therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely, although the scale of this is uncertain at this stage (?) prior to further information about design/layout.
7.2 Is the location at risk from flooding, taking into account of the effects of climate change?	--?	An area identified as at intermediate risk of surface water flooding is present on the eastern edges of this strategic location. Therefore a significant negative (--) effect is likely. However, the overall effect at this strategic location is uncertain (?) as the majority of the site is not within an area of flood risk and consideration of design and mitigation options is required. It is noted that the ground slopes to the east so the effect is limited by topography.
7.3 Will the development be at risk from coastal change? If so, can the Shoreline Management Plan Objectives be supported?	0	Not located in an area of coastal change; therefore, a negligible (0) effect is likely.
8. Minimise Eastleigh's contribution to climate change by reducing the borough's carbon footprint and minimising other greenhouse gas emissions.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
9. Reduce waste generation and disposal, encourage waste prevention and reuse and achieve the sustainable management of waste.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
10. Protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and geodiversity, improving its quality and range.		
10.1 Is the location within the HRA screening zone?	--?	The strategic location is within 25m of a watercourse which is at the eastern and north eastern edges of this strategic location which are tributaries of the River Itchen. A significant negative (- -) effect could occur, subject (?) to the outcome of HRA screening and consideration of mitigation.
10.2 Is the location within 200m of a SSSI?	0	The location is not within 200m of a SSSI; therefore, a negligible (0) effect is likely.
10.3 Is the location within 200m of a Local Nature Reserve?	0	The location is not within 200m of a Local Nature Reserve; therefore, a negligible (0) effect is likely.

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
10.4 Will the development adversely affect a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation? (N.B. No NNRs are present in the District)	-?	Moplands Copse SINC is designated for its ancient woodland. There is a danger that this woodland could become isolated from the wider network if the hedgerows are lost. A minor negative (-) effect is likely, although the scale of effect is uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information on design/layout and consideration of mitigation or enhancement opportunities.
10.5 Will the development adversely affect sites with local designation of nature conservation value (e.g. Biodiversity Opportunity Areas, Biodiversity Action Plan Priority Areas, and Priority Habitat etc.)?	-?	This strategic location is likely to primarily contain rough and semi improved grassland. Therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely, although this is uncertain (?) subject to obtaining further information on design/layout.
10.6 Will development adversely affect protected species?	-?	Several different protected species could be present at or utilise this strategic location, including but not limited to: great crested newts, bats, otters. Due to the aquatic and hedgerow connections to the SAC otter may use the sites. A minor negative (-) effect is likely, although uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information on design/layout and opportunities for mitigation and enhancement.
10.6 Will the development adversely impact the biodiversity network (e.g. Biodiversity Action Plan Priority Links)?	-?	A complete network of hedgerows is present which provide excellent connectivity between the woodland blocks. Development at this strategic location could isolate the small woodland block from the wider woodland/hedgerow network. Therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely, although this is uncertain (?) subject to obtaining further information on design/layout.
10.7 Will the development adversely affect ancient woodland?	-?	Moplands Copse SINC is designated for its ancient woodland. There is a danger that this woodland could become isolated from the wider network if the hedgerows are lost. A minor negative (-) effect is likely, although the scale of effect is uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information on design/layout and consideration of mitigation or enhancement opportunities.
11. Enhance the Borough's multifunctional green infrastructure networks.		
11.1 Will the development affect TPO trees or ancient woodland?	0	No TPO trees present within or in the vicinity of this strategic location; therefore a negligible (0) effect is likely.
11.2 Can the location be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	0	A footpath bisects the site broadly from north-west to south-east. There are no opportunities to connect directly to the cycle routes which are part of the Eastleigh Cycle Network. Therefore, a negligible (0) effect is likely.
11.3 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure? (same score as 7.1)	-?	The strategic location is a greenfield site with GI assets within or adjacent to the site including bridleways, woodland and parts of East Horton Golf Club. Development at this strategic location would result in a loss of GI. However, design of development including new open space and links to the wider GI network could provide mitigation. Therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely, although the scale of this is uncertain at this stage (?) prior to obtaining further information about design/layout.
12. Protect, enhance and manage the character and appearance of the landscape and townscape, maintaining and strengthening distinctiveness and its		

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
special qualities.		
12.1 Will development adversely affect the separation of neighbouring settlements?	-	Development at this strategic location would partially erode the gap between the settlements of Fair Oak and Lower Upham. Therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
12.2 Will it protect the setting of the South Downs National Park?	-?	Development at this strategic location could be visible from the South Downs National Park. A minor negative (-) effect could occur; however this is uncertain (?) subject to obtaining further information on design/layout.
12.3 Will it protect the character of the countryside, coast, towns and/or villages?	- -?	Development at this strategic location would result in loss of open and predominantly undeveloped landscape. Development could be highly visible across the valley from vantage points on Alma Lane and public rights of way. A significant negative effect (- -) is likely; however the scale of effect is uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information on design/layout.
12.4 Will it have an impact on locally important views and settings?	-?	Development could be highly visible across the valley from vantage points on Alma Lane and public rights of way. A minor negative effect (-) is likely; however the scale of effect is uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information on design/layout.
13. Protect and enhance and manage buildings, monuments, features, sites, places, areas and landscapes of archaeological, historical and cultural heritage importance.		
13.1 Will the development protect and enhance listed buildings and their settings, conservation areas, archaeological sites, historic landscapes and other sites of local importance for heritage?	-?	This strategic location includes land identified as the Fair Oak Park Historic Park and Garden. A minor negative (-) effect could occur, but is uncertain prior to obtaining further information about design/layout.

Fair Oak 4 – East of Allington Lane and Fir Tree Farm

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
1. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified local needs, including affordability and special needs		
1.1 Will the development provide a significant contribution towards meeting identified affordable housing needs?	+?	No issues have yet been raised that would suggest the typical proportion (35%) could not be achieved. Therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely. The proportion of affordable housing which could be delivered is currently uncertain (?) until further work is undertaken by the site promoter.
1.2 Will it provide other elements of identified housing need e.g. housing for older persons, self-build, support housing?	+?	There would appear to be scope in this strategic location for provision of other elements of identified housing need. However, the site promoter has not specified whether they propose to meet other such elements of identified housing need. Therefore a minor positive effect (+) is likely, but is uncertain (?) at this stage.
2. Safeguard and improve community health, safety and wellbeing		
2.1 Are community facilities (community hall or library) available locally?	0	The northern part of this strategic location is within 800m from the nearest community facility: the Youth Centre at Blackberry Drive in Fair Oak. Therefore, a negligible (0) effect is likely. It is noted that a new local centre as part of development west of Horton Heath, immediately to the east of this strategic location, has a resolution to permit.
2.2 Are health facilities available locally?	+	The northern part of this strategic location is within 1,000m of Stokewood GP surgery. Therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely. There are recognised issues regarding capacity at the GP surgery, further work will need to be undertaken.
2.3 What effect would the development have on local provision of sports pitches and facilities?	+?	There could be is scope in this strategic location for provision of sports pitches and facilities; therefore a minor positive (+) effect could occur. Site promoters have not indicated that sports pitches would be provided as part of development at this strategic location, therefore the effect is currently uncertain (?)
2.4 Is public open space available locally?	++	The northern part of the location is within 300m of existing open space at Blackberry Drive. The location as a whole is within 800m of a range of public open space in Fair Oak and Horton Heath. Site promoters have also indicated that additional public open space would be provided as part of development at this strategic location. Therefore, a significant positive (++) effect is likely.
2.5 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network?	0	A footpath bisects the site broadly from east to west. A footpath terminates just short of this strategic location to the west, separated by a short stretch of road to the bisecting footpath. Opportunities to link these two paths could be explored. There is a footpath at the edge of this strategic location to the south. A cycle route forming part of the Eastleigh Cycle Network crosses the northern most part of Allington Lane, approximately 400m north of the location. Whilst there are no direct opportunities to link the location with the network, consideration could be given to providing a new cycle route along Allington Lane, serving to extend the Eastleigh Cycle Network to this strategic location. Therefore, a negligible (0) effect is likely, with some uncertainties about

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
		possible opportunities to provide connections into the footpath and cycle network.
3. Develop a dynamic and diverse economy		
3.1(a) Is the location close to a major rail station?	-	This strategic location is more than 1,200m from the nearest major rail station; therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
3.1 (b) Is the location close to a minor rail station?	-	This strategic location is more than 600m away from the nearest minor rail station; therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
3.1 (c) Is the location close to a frequent bus route?	+	The northern most part of this strategic location (less than 1ha) is within 600m of the Bluestar 2 service which connects Fair Oak to Southampton via Eastleigh. Therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely. It is noted that the majority of the location is more than 600m from the nearest frequent bus route. In addition, a re-route of the bus route would be likely to require wider infrastructure/development to support.
3.1 (d) Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route?	-	This strategic location is more than 300m from the nearest semi-frequent bus route; therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
3.1 (e) Is the location close to a major employment centre?	-	This strategic location is more than 1,000m from a major employment centre. Therefore a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
3.2 Will the proposed development contribute towards meeting the need for new industrial, office or warehousing floorspace?	0	There are some small employment premises along Allington Lane. This strategic location could well be suitable for further employment floorspace. However, the site promoter has not indicated if the existing employment would be retained or if any new employment would be included as part of development. Overall, a negligible (0) effect is likely, although this is uncertain at this stage.
3.3 Will the proposed development result in a net loss of existing employment land, or land which would be suitable for employment purposes?	-	Small scale and low cost employment units currently along Allington Lane likely to be lost; therefore a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
3.4 Will the proposed development increase the amount of commercial uses and other facilities in town, district or local centres?	0	No change in the amount of commercial uses in town, district and local centres; therefore, a negligible (0) effect is likely. It is noted that development in this strategic location could increase the catchment of existing centres and the new local centre proposed on land east of Horton Heath, however this is uncertain due to distance from these centres.
4. Reduce road traffic and congestion through improved accessibility to services homes and jobs; reducing the need to travel by car/lorry and improving sustainable travel choice		
4.1 Is the location close to a major rail station? (same score as 3.1a)	-	This strategic location is more than 1,200m from the nearest major rail station; therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
4.2 Is the location close to a minor rail station? (same score as 3.1b)	-	This strategic location is more than 600m away from the nearest minor rail station; therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
4.3 Is the location close to a frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1c)	+	The northern most part of this strategic location (less than 1ha) is within 600m of the Bluestar 2 service which connects Fair Oak to Southampton via Eastleigh. Therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely. It is noted that the majority of the location is more than 600m from the nearest frequent bus

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
		route. In addition, a re-route of the bus route would be likely to require wider infrastructure/development to support.
4.4 Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1d)	-	This strategic location is more than 300m from the nearest semi-frequent bus route; therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
4.5(a) Will residential development at the location be close to a major employment centre? (same score as 3.1e)	-	This strategic location is more than 1000m from a major employment centre. Therefore a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
4.5(b) Will employment development at the location be close to a major population centre?	0	No significant employment use; therefore, a minor negligible (0) effect is likely.
4.6 Are health facilities available locally? (same score as 2.2)	+	The northern part of this strategic location is within 1000m of Stokewood GP surgery. Therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely. There are recognised issues regarding capacity at the GP surgery, further work will need to be undertaken.
4.7 Are shopping and related services available locally?	-	This strategic location is more than 800m from the nearest shopping and related facilities. Therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely. It is noted that a new local centre as part of development west of Horton Heath, immediately to the east of this strategic location, has a resolution to permit.
4.8 Is the location close to a Primary school?	0	The north and east of this strategic location is within 800m of Fair Oak Primary School. Therefore, a negligible (0) effect is likely. It is noted that a new primary school as part of development west of Horton Heath, immediately to the east of this strategic location, has a resolution to permit.
4.9 Is the location close to a Secondary school?	+	The north and east of this strategic location is within 800m of Wyvern College. Therefore a minor positive (+) effect is likely. There are recognised capacity issues at Wyvern School and further work will need to be undertaken regarding secondary school provision. It is noted that a new secondary school as part of development west of Horton Heath, immediately to the east of this strategic location, has a resolution to permit.
4.10 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	0	A footpath bisects the site broadly from east to west. A footpath terminates just short of this strategic location to the west, separated by a short stretch of road to the bisecting footpath. Opportunities to link these two paths could be explored. There is a footpath at the edge of this strategic location to the south. A cycle route forming part of the Eastleigh Cycle Network crosses the northern most part of Allington Lane, approximately 400m north of the location. Whilst there are no direct opportunities to link the location with the network, consideration could be given to providing a new cycle route along Allington Lane, serving to extend the Eastleigh Cycle Network to this strategic location. Therefore, a negligible (0) effect is likely, with some uncertainties about possible opportunities to provide connections into the footpath and cycle network.
4.11 Are there Geographical barriers between the location and key facilities/ destinations?	-	The primary route to the nearest settlement and its facilities and services is via Allington Lane to Fair Oak. This route has fast traffic along a narrow lane, with limited lighting and pavements. Therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
5. Protect and conserve natural resources		
5.1 Will development avoid the sterilisation of	-?	A small area at the western edge of this strategic

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
mineral resources?		location is identified for Minerals Safeguarding for potential sharp sand and gravel resource. Development could potentially have a minor negative (-) effect access to mineral resource is lost by development. This effect is uncertain (?) until it is determined if extraction of these minerals can or should be undertaken prior to the location being developed
5.2 Will it result in the loss of higher grade agricultural land?	0	The majority of this strategic location is located within land identified as Grade 4 agricultural land. Therefore, a negligible (0) effect is likely.
5.3 Will it use previously developed land?	+/-	The majority of the location is previously undeveloped. The location does include small scale employment uses. Therefore a mixed (+/-) effect is likely.
5.4 Will it deliver or support allotments or community farms?	+?	This strategic location could be suitable for new allotments/community farms. The site promoter has not indicated if these facilities would be included as part of development at this strategic location. A minor positive (+) effect could occur, however this is currently uncertain (?) prior to further information.
6. Reduce air, soil, water, light and noise pollution		
6.1 Will the location be affected by significant noise generating uses or Air Quality Management Areas?	0	Based on information currently available, there would be no significant noise generating uses which would impact on development at this strategic location. There are no AQMAs which would be affected by or affect this strategic location. A negligible (0) effect is likely.
6.2 Will development increase pollution?	--?	Given the scale of the location there is likely to be a significant impact on traffic flows and volumes on nearby roads and potentially to Eastleigh town. Pollution from a significant increase in vehicles could impact local air quality generally, the Eastleigh AQMA, and the nature conservation interests of the River Itchen SAC. A new road is proposed in combination with development at other nearby strategic locations. The effect of such a road scheme is currently uncertain. A significant negative (-) effect could occur, although is currently uncertain (?) prior to further transport assessment work and consideration of mitigation opportunities.
7. Plan for the anticipated levels of climate change		
7.1 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure?	+?	The strategic location is a greenfield site with some GI assets within or adjacent to the site (e.g. footpaths, woodland). Development at this strategic location could result in a loss of GI. However, the design of development including new open space and links to the wider GI network has potential for improvements to GI. A minor positive (+) effect could occur, however this is uncertain (?) at this stage prior to further information on design/layout and enhancement opportunities.
7.2 Is the location at risk from flooding, taking into account of the effects of climate change?	--?	Two narrow areas of flood risk are identified at this strategic location. The first along the western edge and the second bisecting the site broadly east to west. These areas are in flood zone 2 and 3, and are at a 'less' and 'intermediate' risk of surface water flooding. Therefore a significant negative (--) effect is likely. However, the overall effect at this strategic location is uncertain (?) as the majority of the site is not within an area of flood risk and

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
		consideration of design and mitigation options is required.
7.3 Will the development be at risk from coastal change? If so, can the Shoreline Management Plan Objectives be supported?	0	Not located in an area of coastal change; therefore a negligible (0) effect is likely.
8. Minimise Eastleigh's contribution to climate change by reducing the borough's carbon footprint and minimising other greenhouse gas emissions.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
9. Reduce waste generation and disposal, encourage waste prevention and reuse and achieve the sustainable management of waste.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
10. Protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and geodiversity, improving its quality and range.		
10.1 Is the location within the HRA screening zone?	- -?	Watercourses are identified along the eastern edge of this strategic location and bisecting the site broadly from east to west. A significant negative (-) effect could occur, although this is uncertain (?) subject to the outcome of HRA screening and consideration of mitigation.
10.2 Is the location within 200m of a SSSI?	0	The strategic location is not within 200m of a SSSI; therefore, a negligible (0) effect is likely.
10.3 Is the location within 200m of a Local Nature Reserve?	0	The strategic location is not within 200m of a Local Nature Reserve; therefore, a negligible (0) effect is likely.
10.4 Will the development adversely affect a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation? (N.B. No NNRs are present in the District)	-?	This strategic location incorporates the western arm of Quobleigh Ponds Woods SINC which contains a defunct pond. The site is designated for its ancient alder carr and its large population of great crested newts. The ecological value of the site is being compromised by lack of management and dense Himalayan balsam invasion. Development at this strategic location, in combination with development west of Horton Heath (with resolution to permit), there is risk that species dispersal would be blocked. There is scope for enhancement of biodiversity and habitat at this strategic location. Overall, a negative effect (-) is likely, however this is uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information of design/layout and consideration of mitigation and enhancement opportunities.
10.5 Will the development adversely affect sites with local designation of nature conservation value (e.g. Biodiversity Opportunity Areas, Biodiversity Action Plan Priority Areas, and Priority Habitat etc.)?	-?	The Wyvern PBA is within the north eastern part of this strategic location. The Itchen Valley PBA then runs adjacent to the Northern boundary, incorporating a sliver of Fir Tree Farm land before joining the Chalcroft Priority Biodiversity Link which is located on the northern and western boundaries. Important migration routes for great crested newts are also likely in this strategic location. A minor negative (-) effect is likely, however this is uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information of design/layout and consideration of mitigation and enhancement opportunities.
10.6 Will the development adversely affect protected species?	-?	Protected species likely to be present at this strategic location include, but are not limited to: otters, dormice, great crested newts, bats, water voles, and reptiles. A minor negative (-) effect is

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
		likely but is uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information on layout/design and consideration of mitigation and enhancement opportunities.
10.7 Will the development adversely impact the biodiversity network (e.g. Biodiversity Action Plan Priority Links)?	-?	The Itchen Valley Priority Biodiversity Area runs adjacent to the Northern boundary, incorporating a sliver of Fir Tree Farm land before joining the Chalcroft Priority Biodiversity Link which is located on the northern and western boundaries. Important migration routes for great crested newts are also likely in this strategic location. A minor negative (-) effect is likely, however this is uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information of design/layout and consideration of mitigation and enhancement opportunities.
10.8 Will the development adversely affect ancient woodland?	0	No adverse impact on ancient woodland; therefore a negligible (0) effect is likely.
11. Enhance the Borough's multifunctional green infrastructure networks.		
11.1 Will the development affect TPO trees?	0	No TPO trees within this strategic location; therefore a negligible (0) effect is likely.
11.2 Can the location be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	0?	A footpath bisects the site broadly from east to west. A footpath terminates just short of this strategic location to the west, separated by a short stretch of road to the bisecting footpath. Opportunities to link these two paths could be explored. There is a footpath at the edge of this strategic location to the south. A cycle route forming part of the Eastleigh Cycle Network crosses the northern most part of Allington Lane, approximately 400m north of the location. Whilst there are no direct opportunities to link the location with the network, consideration could be given to providing a new cycle route along Allington Lane, serving to extend the Eastleigh Cycle Network to this strategic location. Therefore, a negligible (0) effect is likely, with some uncertainties (?) about possible opportunities to provide connections into the footpath and cycle network.
11.3 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure? (same score as 7.1)	+?	The strategic location is a greenfield site with some GI assets within or adjacent to the site (e.g. footpaths, woodland). Development at this strategic location could result in a loss of GI. However, the design of development including new open space and links to the wider GI network has potential for improvements to GI. A minor positive (+) effect could occur, however this is uncertain (?) at this stage prior to obtaining further information on design/layout and enhancement opportunities.
12. Protect, enhance and manage the character and appearance of the landscape and townscape, maintaining and strengthening distinctiveness and its special qualities.		
12.1 Will development adversely affect the separation of neighbouring settlements?	-?	Development of this strategic location may erode any remaining separation between development west of Horton Heath and Bishopstoke /Fair Oak. A minor negative (-) effect is likely, however the scale of this effect is uncertain (?) subject to obtaining further information on design/layout.
12.2 Will it protect the setting of the South Downs National Park?	0	Development at this strategic location is unlikely to have an impact on the National Park.

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
12.3 Will it protect the character of the countryside, coast, towns and/or villages?	-	The distinctive setting of the wooded Quobleigh Pond, the adjoining footpaths and the lower stream course are all likely to be impacted by development. The rising open landscape below Allington Lane would also be affected. A minor negative (-) effect is likely, however this is uncertain subject to obtaining further information on design/layout.
12.4 Will it have an impact on locally important views and settings?	-	New development is likely to be visible from Allington Lane, Fir Tree Lane, land around Quobleigh Pond and from high ground north west of Allington Lane. A minor negative (-) effect is likely, however this is uncertain subject to obtaining further information on design/layout.
13. Protect and enhance and manage buildings, monuments, features, sites, places, areas and landscapes of archaeological, historical and cultural heritage importance.		
13.1 Will the development protect and enhance listed buildings and their settings, conservation areas, archaeological sites, historic landscapes and other sites of local importance for heritage?	-?	Fir Tree Farmhouse, a Grade II listed building is present at this strategic location at the end of West Horton Lane. Part of the Lakesmere House School Historic Park and Garden is within the north eastern area of this strategic location. A minor negative (-) effect is likely, although this is uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information about design/layout.

Fair Oak 5 – Fir Tree Farm

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
1. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified local needs, including affordability and special needs		
1.1 Will the development provide a significant contribution towards meeting identified affordable housing needs?	+?	No issues have yet been raised that would suggest the typical proportion (35%) could not be achieved. Therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely. The proportion of affordable housing which could be delivered is currently uncertain (?) until further work is undertaken by the site promoter.
1.2 Will it provide other elements of identified housing need e.g. housing for older persons, self-build, support housing?	+?	There would appear to be scope in this strategic location for provision of other elements of identified housing need. However, the site promoter has not specified whether they propose to meet other such elements of identified housing need. Therefore a positive effect (+) is likely, but is uncertain (?) at this stage.
2. Safeguard and improve community health, safety and wellbeing		
2.1 Are community facilities (community hall or library) available locally?	-	The location is more than 800m from the nearest community facilities; therefore a minor negative (-) effect is likely. It is noted that a new local centre as part of development west of Horton Heath, immediately to the east of this strategic location, has a resolution to permit.
2.2 Are health facilities available locally?	+	The northern part of this strategic location is within 1,000m of Stokewood GP surgery. Therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely. There are recognised issues regarding capacity at the GP surgery, further work will need to be undertaken.
2.3 What effect would the development have on local provision of sports pitches and facilities?	+?	There could be is scope in this strategic location for provision of sports pitches and facilities; therefore a minor positive (+) effect could occur. Site promoters have not indicated that sports pitches would be provided as part of development at this strategic location, therefore the effect is currently uncertain (?)
2.4 Is public open space available locally?	++	The location as a whole is within 800m of a range of public open space in Fair Oak and Horton Heath. Site promoters have also indicated that additional public open space would be provided as part of development at this strategic location. Therefore, a significant positive (++) effect is likely.
2.5 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network?	0	A footpath bisects the site broadly from east to west. A footpath terminates just short of this strategic location to the west, separated by a short stretch of road to the bisecting footpath. Opportunities to link these two paths could be explored. There is a footpath at the edge of this strategic location to the south. The cycle route which is part of the Eastleigh Cycle Network crosses Allington Lane approximately 400m north of the location. Whilst there are no direct opportunities to link the location with the network, consideration could be given to extending the cycle routes which are part of the Eastleigh Cycle Network to this strategic location along Allington Lane. Therefore, a negligible (0) effect is likely, with some uncertainties about possible opportunities to provide connections into the footpath and cycle network.

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
3. Develop a dynamic and diverse economy		
3.1(a) Is the location close to a major rail station?	-	This strategic location is more than 1,200m from the nearest major rail station; therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
3.1 (b) Is the location close to a minor rail station?	-	This strategic location is more than 600m away from the nearest minor rail station; therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
3.1 (c) Is the location close to a frequent bus route?	-	The strategic location is more than 600m to the nearest frequent bus route. Therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
3.1 (d) Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route?	-	This strategic location is more than 300m from the nearest semi-frequent bus route; therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
3.1 (e) Is the location close to a major employment centre?	-	This strategic location is more than 1000m from a major employment centre. Therefore a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
3.2 Will the proposed development contribute towards meeting the need for new industrial, office or warehousing floorspace?	0	This strategic location could be suitable for employment floorspace. However, the site promoter has not stated this as part of the proposals for this strategic location. Therefore, a negligible (0) effect is likely.
3.3 Will the proposed development result in a net loss of existing employment land, or land which would be suitable for employment purposes?	-	Small scale employment units on the corner of Allington Lane and Fir Tree Lane likely to be lost; therefore a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
3.4 Will the proposed development increase the amount of commercial uses and other facilities in town, district or local centres?	0	No change in the amount of commercial uses in town, district and local centres; therefore, a negligible (0) effect is likely. It is noted that development in this strategic location could increase the catchment of existing centres and the new local centre proposed east of Horton Heath, however this is uncertain due to distance from these centres.
4. Reduce road traffic and congestion through improved accessibility to services homes and jobs; reducing the need to travel by car/lorry and improving sustainable travel choice		
4.1 Is the location close to a major rail station? (same score as 3.1a)	-	This strategic location is more than 1200m from the nearest major rail station; therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
4.2 Is the location close to a minor rail station? (same score as 3.1b)	-	This strategic location is more than 600m away from the nearest minor rail station; therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
4.3 Is the location close to a frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1c)	-	The location is more than 600m to the nearest frequent bus route. Therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
4.4 Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1d)	-	This strategic location is more than 300m from the nearest semi-frequent bus route; therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
4.5(a) Will residential development at the location be close to a major employment centre? (same score as 3.1e)	-	This strategic location is more than 1000m from a major employment centre. Therefore a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
4.5(b) Will employment development at the location be close to a major population centre?	0	No significant employment use; therefore, a negligible (0) effect is likely.
4.6 Are health facilities available locally? (same score as 2.2)	+	The northern part of this strategic location is within 1000m of Stokewood GP surgery. Therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely. There are recognised issues regarding capacity at the GP surgery, further work will need to be undertaken.

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
4.7 Are shopping and related services available locally?	-	This strategic location is more than 800m from the nearest shopping and related facilities. Therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely. It is noted that a new local centre as part of development west of Horton Heath, immediately to the east of this strategic location, has a resolution to permit.
4.8 Is the location close to a Primary school?	0	The north and east of this strategic location is within 800m of Fair Oak Primary School. Therefore, a negligible (0) effect is likely. It is noted that a new primary school as part of development west of Horton Heath, immediately to the east of this strategic location, has a resolution to permit.
4.9 Is the location close to a Secondary school?	+	The north and east of this strategic location is within 800m of Wyvern College. Therefore a minor positive (+) effect is likely. There are recognised capacity issues at Wyvern School and further work will need to be undertaken regarding secondary school provision. It is noted that a new secondary school as part of development west of Horton Heath, immediately to the east of this strategic location, has a resolution to permit.
4.10 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	0?	A footpath bisects the site broadly from east to west. A footpath terminates just short of this strategic location to the west, separated by a short stretch of road to the bisecting footpath. Opportunities to link these two paths could be explored. There is a footpath at the edge of this strategic location to the south. The cycle route which is part of the Eastleigh Cycle Network crosses Allington Lane approximately 400m north of the location. Whilst there are no direct opportunities to link the location with the network, consideration could be given to extending the cycle routes which are part of the Eastleigh Cycle Network to this strategic location along Allington Lane. Therefore, a negligible (0) effect is likely, with some uncertainties (?) about possible opportunities to provide connections into the footpath and cycle network.
4.11 Are there Geographical barriers between the location and key facilities/ destinations?	-	The primary route to the nearest settlement and its facilities and services is via Allington Lane to Fair Oak. This route has fast traffic along a narrow lane, with limited lighting and pavements. Therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
5. Protect and conserve natural resources		
5.1 Will development avoid the sterilisation of mineral resources?	-?	A small area at the western edge of this strategic location is identified for Minerals Safeguarding for potential sharp sand and gravel resource. Development could potentially have a minor negative (-) effect if access to this potential mineral resource is lost by development. This effect is uncertain (?) until it is determined if extraction of these potential minerals can or should be undertaken prior to the location being developed.
5.2 Will it result in the loss of higher grade agricultural land?	0	The majority of this strategic location is located within land identified as Grade 4 agricultural land. Therefore, a negligible (0) effect is likely.
5.3 Will it use previously developed land?	+/-	The majority of the location is previously undeveloped. The location does include agricultural related buildings. Therefore a mixed (+/-) effect is likely.
5.4 Will it deliver or support allotments or community farms?	+?	This strategic location could be suitable for new allotments/community farms. The site promoter

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
		has not indicated if these facilities would be included as part of development at this strategic location. A minor positive (+) effect could occur, however this is currently uncertain (?) prior to further information.
6. Reduce air, soil, water, light and noise pollution		
6.1 Will the location be affected by significant noise generating uses or Air Quality Management Areas?	0	Based on information currently available, there would be no significant noise generating uses which would impact on development at this strategic location. There are no AQMAs which would be affected by or affect this strategic location. A negligible (0) effect is likely.
6.2 Will development increase pollution?	- -?	Given the scale of the location there is likely to be a significant impact on traffic flows and volumes on nearby roads and potentially to Eastleigh town. Pollution from a significant increase in vehicles could impact local air quality generally, the Eastleigh AQMA, and the nature conservation interests of the River Itchen SAC. A new road is proposed in combination with development at other nearby strategic locations. The effect of such a road scheme is currently uncertain. A significant negative (- -) effect could occur, although is currently uncertain (?) prior to further transport assessment work and consideration of mitigation opportunities.
7. Plan for the anticipated levels of climate change		
7.1 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure?	+?	The strategic location is a greenfield site with some GI assets within or adjacent to the site (e.g. footpaths, woodland). Development at this strategic location could result in a loss of GI. However, the design of development including new open space and links to the wider GI network has potential for improvements to GI. A minor positive (+) effect could occur, however this is uncertain (?) at this stage prior to further information on design/layout and enhancement opportunities.
7.2 Is the location at risk from flooding, taking into account of the effects of climate change?	--?	Two narrow areas of flood risk are identified at this strategic location. The first along the western edge and the second bisecting the site broadly east to west. These areas are in flood zone 2 and 3, and are at a 'less' and 'intermediate' risk of surface water flooding. Therefore a significant negative (--) effect is likely. However, the overall effect at this strategic location is uncertain (?) as the majority of the site is not within an area of flood risk and consideration of design and mitigation options is required.
7.3 Will the development be at risk from coastal change? If so, can the Shoreline Management Plan Objectives be supported?	0	Not located in an area of coastal change; therefore a negligible (0) effect is likely.
8. Minimise Eastleigh's contribution to climate change by reducing the borough's carbon footprint and minimising other greenhouse gas emissions.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
9. Reduce waste generation and disposal, encourage waste prevention and reuse and achieve the sustainable management of waste.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
10. Protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and geodiversity, improving its quality and range.		
10.1 Is the location within the HRA screening zone?	- -?	Watercourses are identified along the eastern edge of this strategic location and bisecting the site broadly from east to west. A significant negative (-) effect could occur, although this is uncertain (?) subject to the outcome of HRA screening and consideration of mitigation.
10.2 Is the location within 200m of a SSSI?	0	The location is not within 200m of a SSSI; therefore, a negligible (0) effect is likely.
10.3 Is the location within 200m of a Local Nature Reserve?	0	The location is not within 200m if a Local Nature Reserve; therefore, a negligible (0) effect is likely.
10.4 Will the development adversely affect a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation? (N.B. No NNRs are present in the District)	-?	This strategic location incorporates the western arm of Quobleigh Ponds Woods SINC which contains a defunct pond. The site is designated for its ancient alder carr and its large population of great crested newts. The ecological value of the site is being compromised by lack of management and dense Himalayan balsam invasion. Development at this strategic location, in combination with development west of Horton Heath (with resolution to permit), there is risk that species dispersal would be blocked. There is scope for enhancement of biodiversity and habitat at this strategic location. Overall, a negative effect (-) is likely, however this is uncertain (?) prior obtaining to further information of design/layout and consideration of mitigation and enhancement opportunities.
10.5 Will the development adversely affect sites with local designation of nature conservation value (e.g. Biodiversity Opportunity Areas, Biodiversity Action Plan Priority Areas, and Priority Habitat etc.)?	-?	The Wyvern PBA is within the north eastern part of this strategic location. The Itchen Valley PBA then runs adjacent to the Northern boundary, incorporating a sliver of Fir Tree Farm land before joining the Chalcroft PBL which is located on the northern and western boundaries. Important migration routes for great crested newts are also likely in this strategic location. A minor negative (-) effect is likely, however this is uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information of design/layout and consideration of mitigation and enhancement opportunities.
10.6 Will the development adversely affect protected species?	-?	Protected species likely to be present at this strategic location include, but are not limited to: otters, dormice, great crested newts, bats, water voles, and reptiles. A minor negative (-) effect is likely but is uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information on layout/design and consideration of mitigation and enhancement opportunities.
10.7 Will the development adversely impact the biodiversity network (e.g. Biodiversity Action Plan Priority Links)?	-?	The Itchen Valley PBA then runs adjacent to the Northern boundary, incorporating a sliver of Fir Tree Farm land before joining the Chalcroft PBL which is located on the northern and western boundaries. Important migration routes for great crested newts are also likely in this strategic location. A minor negative (-) effect is likely, however this is uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information of design/layout and consideration of mitigation and enhancement opportunities.
10.8 Will the development adversely affect ancient woodland?	0	No adverse impact on ancient woodland; therefore a negligible (0) effect is likely.
11. Enhance the Borough's multifunctional green		

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
infrastructure networks.		
11.1 Will the development affect TPO trees?	0	No TPO trees within this strategic location; therefore a negligible (0) effect is likely.
11.2 Can the location be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	0?	A footpath bisects the site broadly from east to west. A footpath terminates just short of this strategic location to the west, separated by a short stretch of road to the bisecting footpath. Opportunities to link these two paths could be explored. There is a footpath at the edge of this strategic location to the south. The cycle route which is part of the Eastleigh Cycle Network crosses Allington Lane approximately 400m north of the location. Whilst there are no direct opportunities to link the location with the network, consideration could be given to extending the cycle routes which are part of the Eastleigh Cycle Network to this strategic location along Allington Lane. Therefore, a negligible (0) effect is likely, with some uncertainties (?) about possible opportunities to provide connections into the footpath and cycle network.
11.3 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure? (same score as 7.1)	+?	The strategic location is a greenfield site with some GI assets within or adjacent to the site (e.g. footpaths, woodland). Development at this strategic location could result in a loss of GI. However, the design of development including new open space and links to the wider GI network has potential for improvements to GI. A minor positive (+) effect could occur, however this is uncertain (?) at this stage prior to obtaining further information on design/layout and enhancement opportunities.
12. Protect, enhance and manage the character and appearance of the landscape and townscape, maintaining and strengthening distinctiveness and its special qualities.		
12.1 Will development adversely affect the separation of neighbouring settlements?	-?	Development of this strategic location may erode any remaining separation between development west of Horton Heath and Bishopstoke /Fair Oak. A minor negative (-) effect is likely, however the scale of this effect is uncertain (?) subject to obtaining further information on design/layout.
12.2 Will it protect the setting of the South Downs National Park?	0	Development at this strategic location is unlikely to have an impact on the National Park.
12.3 Will it protect the character of the countryside, coast, towns and/or villages?	-?	The distinctive setting of the wooded Quobleigh Pond, the adjoining footpaths and the lower stream course are all likely to be impacted by development. The rising open landscape below Allington Lane would also be affected. A minor negative (-) effect is likely, however the scale of this effect is uncertain (?) subject to obtaining further information on design/layout.
12.4 Will it have an impact on locally important views and settings?	-?	New development is likely to be visible from Allington Lane, Fir Tree Lane, land around Quobleigh Pond and from high ground north west of Allington Lane. A minor negative (-) effect is likely, however this is uncertain (?) subject to obtaining further information on design/layout.
13. Protect and enhance and manage buildings, monuments, features, sites, places, areas and landscapes of archaeological, historical and cultural heritage importance.		

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
13.1 Will the development protect and enhance listed buildings and their settings, conservation areas, archaeological sites, historic landscapes and other sites of local importance for heritage?	-?	Fir Tree Farmhouse, a Grade II listed building is present at this strategic location at the end of West Horton Lane. Part of the Lakesmere House School Historic Park and Garden is within the north eastern area of this strategic location. A minor negative (-) effect is likely, although this is uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information about design/layout.

Fair Oak 6 – North of Fair Oak (Option A)

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
1. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified local needs, including affordability and special needs		
1.1 Will the development provide a significant contribution towards meeting identified affordable housing needs?	+?	No issues have yet been raised that would suggest the typical proportion (35%) could not be achieved. Therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely. The proportion of affordable housing which could be delivered is currently uncertain (?) until further work is undertaken by the site promoter.
1.2 Will it provide other elements of identified housing need e.g. housing for older persons, self-build, support housing?	+?	There is scope in this strategic location for provision of other elements of identified housing need. The site promoter has not proposed to meet other such elements of identified housing need. A minor positive (+) effect could occur but is uncertain (?) at this stage.
2. Safeguard and improve community health, safety and wellbeing		
2.1 Are community facilities (community hall or library) available locally?	++	The south and west of the location is within 800m and 400m of a range of community facilities including Fair Oak Library, Scout Hut and Social Club. The site promoter has indicated that improvements would be made to the existing local centre nearby as part of development at this strategic location. Therefore, a significant positive (++) effect is likely.
2.2 Are health facilities available locally?	+	The south west of the location (less than 3ha) is just within 1,000m of Stokewood Surgery; therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely. A significant majority of the location is more than 1000m from any existing health facilities. Provision for a remote consulting room has been made at the development currently being built to the west of Winchester Road (Crowdhill). There are recognised issues regarding capacity at the GP surgery, further work will need to be undertaken.
2.3 What effect would the development have on local provision of sports pitches and facilities?	+?	This strategic location could be suitable for provision of on-site sports pitches and facilities. The site promoter has not indicated if such provision will be made as part of development at this strategic location. Therefore, a minor positive (+) effect could occur, however this is uncertain (?) at this stage.
2.4 Is public open space available locally?	++	The location within either 300m or 800m of a number of areas of public open space. Site promoters have also indicated that additional public open space would be provided as part of development at this strategic location. Therefore, a significant positive (++) effect is likely.
2.5 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network?	0	A bridleway runs adjacent to the location to the north and a footpath runs adjacent to the location to the south. There are no opportunities to connect directly to the Eastleigh Cycle Network. However a route forming part of the network is approx. 600m from the edge of the location along Winchester Road and Bishopstoke Road. Therefore, a negligible (0) effect is likely.
3. Develop a dynamic and diverse economy		
3.1(a) Is the location close to a major rail station?	-	This strategic location is more than 1,200m from the nearest major rail station; therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
3.1 (b) Is the location close to a minor rail station?	-	This strategic location is more than 600m away from the nearest minor rail station; therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
3.1 (c) Is the location close to a frequent bus route?	++	The route for the Bluestar 2 Bus Route which connects Fair Oak to Southampton via Eastleigh travels adjacent to the western edge of this strategic location. Therefore, a significant positive (++) effect is likely.
3.1 (d) Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route?	-	This strategic location is more than 300m from the nearest semi-frequent bus route; therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
3.1 (e) Is the location close to a major employment centre?	-	This strategic location is more than 1,000m from the nearest major employment centre; therefore a minor negative (-) effect is likely. It should be noted that a small amount of employment use (6,400 m. sq.) is proposed as part of a larger version of development at this strategic location.
3.2 Will the proposed development contribute towards meeting the need for new industrial, office or warehousing floorspace?	0	Location could well be suitable for employment floorspace. A small cluster of employment is located at Crowdhill. However, the site promoter has not stated this as part of the proposals for this strategic location. Therefore, a negligible (0) effect is likely.
3.3 Will the proposed development result in a net loss of existing employment land, or land which would be suitable for employment purposes?	0	No net loss of existing employment land would result in development of this strategic location. Location could well be suitable for employment floorspace, therefore, a negligible (0) effect is likely.
3.4 Will the proposed development increase the amount of commercial uses and other facilities in town, district or local centres?	+	Site promoters have indicated that there could be improvements to the existing Fair Oak Centre as part of development at this strategic location. Development would also increase catchment of these areas. Therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely.
4. Reduce road traffic and congestion through improved accessibility to services homes and jobs; reducing the need to travel by car/lorry and improving sustainable travel choice		
4.1 Is the location close to a major rail station? (same score as 3.1a)	-	This strategic location is more than 1,200m from the nearest major rail station; therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
4.2 Is the location close to a minor rail station? (same score as 3.1b)	-	This strategic location is more than 600m away from the nearest minor rail station; therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
4.3 Is the location close to a frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1c)	++	The route for the Bluestar 2 Bus Route which connects Fair Oak to Southampton via Eastleigh travels adjacent to the western edge of this strategic location. Therefore, a significant positive (++) effect is likely.
4.4 Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1d)	-	This strategic location is more than 300m from the nearest semi-frequent bus route; therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
4.5(a) Will residential development at the location be close to a major employment centre? (same score as 3.1e)	-	This strategic location is more than 1,000m from the nearest major employment centre; therefore a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
4.5(b) Will employment development at the location be close to a major population centre?	-	This strategic location is more than 1,000m from the nearest major population centre; therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely. It should be noted that a small amount of employment use (6,400 m. sq.) is proposed as part of a larger

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
		version of development at this strategic location.
4.6 Are health facilities available locally? (same score as 2.2)	+	The south west of the location (less than 3ha) is just within 1000m of Stokewood Surgery; therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely. A significant majority of the location is more than 1000m from any existing health facilities. Provision for a remote consulting room has been made at the development currently being built to the west of Winchester Road (Crowdhill). There are recognised issues regarding capacity at the GP surgery, further work will need to be undertaken.
4.7 Are shopping and related services available locally?	++	The majority of the location to the south and west is within either 400m or 800m of Fair Oak Village Centre. The site promoter has indicated that improvements would be made to the existing local centre nearby as part of development at this strategic location.
4.8 Is the location close to a Primary school?	-	This strategic location is more than 800m from the nearest primary school; therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely. It is noted that site promoters have indicated that a new primary school could be provided with larger scale development at this strategic location.
4.9 Is the location close to a Secondary school?	0	The southern part of this strategic location is within 1,600m of Wyvern College. Therefore a negligible (0) effect is likely. There are recognised capacity issues at Wyvern School and further work will need to be undertaken regarding secondary school provision. Site promoters have indicated that a new secondary school could be provided with larger scale development at this strategic location in combination with other options for strategic development nearby in Fair Oak and Bishopstoke.
4.10 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	0	A bridleway runs adjacent to the location to the north and a footpath runs adjacent to the location to the south. There are no opportunities to connect directly to the Eastleigh Cycle Network. However a route forming part of the network is approx. 600m from the edge of the location along Winchester Road and Bishopstoke Road. Therefore, a negligible (0) effect is likely.
4.11 Are there Geographical barriers between the location and key facilities/ destinations?	-	The route to Fair Oak centre is along Winchester Road which has footpaths along its length but traffic travels fairly fast along this stretch. Therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
5. Protect and conserve natural resources		
5.1 Will development avoid the sterilisation of mineral resources?	-?	Location includes small areas identified as a Minerals Consultation Area to the northern and southern edges of this strategic location. A small area identified for Minerals Safeguarding is located on the western edge. Development could potentially have a minor negative (-) effect access to mineral resource is lost by development. This effect is uncertain (?) until it is determined if extraction of these minerals can or should be undertaken prior to the location being developed
5.2 Will it result in the loss of higher grade agricultural land?	0	This strategic location is identified as Grade 4 agricultural land. Therefore, a negligible (0) effect is likely.
5.3 Will it use previously developed land?	-	The majority of this strategic location is located on greenfield and land; therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
5.4 Will it deliver or support allotments or community farms?	+?	This strategic location could be suitable for new allotments/community farms. The site promoter has not indicated if these facilities would be included as part of development at this strategic location. A minor positive (+) effect could occur, however this is currently uncertain (?) prior to further information.
6. Reduce air, soil, water, light and noise pollution		
6.1 Will the location be affected by significant noise generating uses or Air Quality Management Areas?	0	Based on information currently available, there would be no significant noise generating uses which would impact on development at this strategic location. There are no AQMAs which would affect future development at this strategic location. A negligible (0) effect is likely.
6.2 Will development increase pollution?	- -?	There is likely to be land contamination from previous/current uses at this strategic location and remedial measures may be required. Given the scale of the location there is likely to be an impact on traffic flows and volumes on nearby roads and potentially to Eastleigh town, impacting on local air quality generally and with potential to impact the Eastleigh AQMA and the nature conservation interest of the River Itchen. A significant negative (- -) effect is likely. A new road is proposed in combination with development at other nearby strategic locations. The effect of such a road scheme is currently uncertain (?).
7. Plan for the anticipated levels of climate change		
7.1 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure?	-?	The strategic location is a greenfield site with GI assets within or adjacent to the site including bridleways and woodland. Development at this strategic location would result in a loss of GI. However, design of development including new open space and links to the wider GI network could provide mitigation and opportunities for enhancement. Therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely, although this is uncertain at this stage (?).
7.2 Is the location at risk from flooding, taking into account of the effects of climate change?	- -?	Some narrow strips of land identified at an intermediate risk of surface water flooding are present at this strategic location. Therefore a significant negative (- -) effect is likely. However, the overall effect at this strategic location is uncertain (?) as the majority of the site is not within an area of flood risk and consideration of design and mitigation options is required.
7.3 Will the development be at risk from coastal change? If so, can the Shoreline Management Plan Objectives be supported?	0	Not located in an area of coastal change; therefore a negligible (0) effect is likely.
8. Minimise Eastleigh's contribution to climate change by reducing the borough's carbon footprint and minimising other greenhouse gas emissions.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
9. Reduce waste generation and disposal, encourage waste prevention and reuse and achieve the sustainable management of waste.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		

SA objective/ criterion	Justification
10. Protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and geodiversity, improving its quality and range.	
10.1 Is the location within the HRA screening zone?	<p style="text-align: center; background-color: red; color: black;">- - ?</p> <p>The strategic location is within 25m of four watercourses which are tributaries of the River Itchen. A significant negative (- -) effect could occur, subject (?) to the outcome of HRA screening and consideration of mitigation.</p>
10.2 Is the location within 200m of a SSSI?	<p style="text-align: center;">0</p> <p>The strategic location is not within 200m of a SSSI; therefore, a negligible (0) effect is likely.</p>
10.3 Is the location within 200m of a Local Nature Reserve?	<p style="text-align: center;">0</p> <p>The strategic location is not within 200m if a Local Nature Reserve; therefore, a negligible (0) effect is likely.</p>
10.4 Will the development adversely affect a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation? (N.B. No NNRs are present in the District)	<p style="text-align: center;">- ?</p> <p>This strategic location is adjacent to Hall Lands Copse designated for its ancient woodland. Woodland SINCs in this area are generally well connected via a relatively complete hedgerow network. Development at this strategic location could block species dispersal by severing these hedgerow connections if not sensitively designed. Development at this strategic location would likely result in a minor negative (-) effect although this is uncertain (?) subject to obtaining further information on design/layout.</p>
10.5 Will the development adversely affect sites with local designation of nature conservation value (e.g. Biodiversity Opportunity Areas, Biodiversity Action Plan Priority Areas, and Priority Habitat etc.)?	<p style="text-align: center;">- ?</p> <p>This strategic location is primarily comprised of agricultural land recorded as improved grassland within historic surveys. Development at this strategic location would likely result in a minor negative (-) effect although this is uncertain (?) subject to obtaining further information on design/layout.</p>
10.6 Will the development adversely affect protected species?	<p style="text-align: center;">- ?</p> <p>Several different protected species could be present at or utilise this strategic location, including but not limited to: great crested newts, bats, otters. Due to the aquatic and hedgerow connections to the SAC otter may use the sites. A minor negative (-) effect is likely, although uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information on design/layout and opportunities for mitigation and enhancement.</p>
10.7 Will the development adversely impact the biodiversity network (e.g. Biodiversity Action Plan Priority Links)?	<p style="text-align: center;">- ?</p> <p>The hedgerow network appears to be very complete, with a complex of small fields interspersed with woodland. This network is likely to be important under the Hedgerows Regulations and is connecting habitat for the woodlands and important to species dispersal. Development at this strategic location would likely result in a minor negative (-) effect although this is uncertain (?) subject to obtaining further information on design/layout.</p>
10.8 Will the development adversely affect ancient woodland?	<p style="text-align: center;">- ?</p> <p>This strategic location is adjacent to Hall Lands Copse designated for its ancient woodland. Woodland SINCs in this area are generally well connected via a relatively complete hedgerow network. Development at this strategic location could block species dispersal by severing these hedgerow connections if not sensitively designed. Development at this strategic location would likely result in a minor negative (-) effect although this is uncertain (?) subject to obtaining further information on design/layout.</p>
11. Enhance the Borough's multifunctional green infrastructure networks.	

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
11.1 Will the development affect TPO trees?	-?	A small area of TPO trees is present in the west of the location. A minor negative (-) effect could occur, but uncertain (?) subject to obtaining further information on design/layout.
11.2 Can the location be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	0	A bridleway runs adjacent to the location to the north and a footpath runs adjacent to the location to the south. There are no opportunities to connect directly to the Eastleigh Cycle Network. However, a route forming part of the network is approx. 600m from the edge of the location along Winchester Road and Bishopstoke Road. Therefore, a negligible (0) effect is likely.
11.3 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure? (same score as 7.1)	-?	The strategic location is a greenfield site with GI assets within or adjacent to the site including bridleways and woodland. Development at this strategic location would result in a loss of GI. However, design of development including new open space and links to the wider GI network could provide mitigation and opportunities for enhancement. Therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely, although this is uncertain at this stage (?).
12. Protect, enhance and manage the character and appearance of the landscape and townscape, maintaining and strengthening distinctiveness and its special qualities.		
12.1 Will development adversely affect the separation of neighbouring settlements?	-?	Further intensification of existing sporadic development between Fair Oak and Crowdhill may contribute to erosion of the clear separation between Fair Oak/Crowdhill and Fishers Pond/Colden Common. A minor negative (-) effect is likely, however this is uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information on design/layout.
12.2 Will it protect the setting of the South Downs National Park?	0	Development at this strategic location is unlikely to have an impact on the National Park.
12.3 Will it protect the character of the countryside, coast, towns and/or villages?	-?	Development at this strategic location would erode the remaining rural character to the east of Winchester Road. Open fields and woodland blocks are sensitive to the erosion of the contrast between enclosure and openness through development. A minor negative (-) effect is likely, although this is uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information on design/layout
12.4 Will it have an impact on locally important views and settings?	-?	Development at this strategic location is likely to be visible from the west, from Winchester Road and from rights of way in the surrounding countryside. A minor negative (-) effect is likely, although this is uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information on design/layout
13. Protect and enhance and manage buildings, monuments, features, sites, places, areas and landscapes of archaeological, historical and cultural heritage importance.		
13.1 Will the development protect and enhance listed buildings and their settings, conservation areas, archaeological sites, historic landscapes and other sites of local importance for heritage?	-?	The Pyle Hill Cottages which have Grade II listing and a Tudor Cottage with a local listing are adjacent to this strategic location on Winchester Road. A possible prehistoric enclosure is located in the south of the location. A minor negative (-) effect could occur; however this is uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information on design/layout.

Fair Oak 7 – Extension east of Fair Oak

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
1. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified local needs, including affordability and special needs		
1.1 Will the development provide a significant contribution towards meeting identified affordable housing needs?	+?	No issues have yet been raised that would suggest the typical proportion (35%) could not be achieved. Therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely. The proportion of affordable housing which could be delivered is currently uncertain (?) until further work is undertaken by the site promoter.
1.2 Will it provide other elements of identified housing need e.g. housing for older persons, self-build, support housing?	+?	There is scope in this strategic location for provision of other elements of identified housing need. The site promoter has not proposed to meet other such elements of identified housing need. A minor positive (+) effect could occur but is uncertain (?) at this stage.
2. Safeguard and improve community health, safety and wellbeing		
2.1 Are community facilities (community hall or library) available locally?	-	This strategic location is more than 800m from the nearest community facilities; therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
2.2 Are health facilities available locally?	--	This strategic location is more than 800m from the nearest health facilities; therefore, a significant negative (- -) effect is likely.
2.3 What effect would the development have on local provision of sports pitches and facilities?	--	Development at this strategic location would result in the loss of part or all of East Horton Golf Course. There is scope in this strategic location for some provision of sports facilities, although site promoters have not indicated that there would be any facilities as part of development at this strategic location. Therefore, a significant negative effect (- -) effect is likely.
2.4 Is public open space available locally?	+	The west of the strategic location is within 300m of Knowle Hill Park. Therefore a minor positive (+) effect is likely. It is noted that there is no direct access to this open space however so walking distance to the open space would be more than 300m.
2.5 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network?	-	A footpath is located less than 100m east along Mortimers Lane from this site. There are no opportunities to connect directly to cycle routes which are part of the Eastleigh Cycle Network. Therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
3. Develop a dynamic and diverse economy		
3.1(a) Is the location close to a major rail station?	-	This strategic location is more than 1,200m from the nearest major rail station; therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
3.1 (b) Is the location close to a minor rail station?	-	This strategic location is more than 600m away from the nearest minor rail station; therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
3.1 (c) Is the location close to a frequent bus route?	-	This strategic location is more than 600m from the nearest frequent bus route; therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
3.1 (d) Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route?	-	This strategic location is more than 300m from the nearest semi-frequent bus route; therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
3.1 (e) Is the location close to a major employment centre?	-	This strategic location is more than 1,000m from the nearest major employment centre; therefore a

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
		minor negative (-) effect is likely. It should be noted that a small amount of employment use (6,400 m. sq.) is being considered as part development at this strategic location.
3.2 Will the proposed development contribute towards meeting the need for new industrial, office or warehousing floorspace?	0	This strategic location could be suitable for employment floorspace. However, the site promoter has not stated this as part of the proposals for this strategic location. Therefore, a negligible (0) effect is likely.
3.3 Will the proposed development result in a net loss of existing employment land, or land which would be suitable for employment purposes?	-	No net loss of existing employment land would result in development of this strategic location, however the location could be suitable for employment land; therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
3.4 Will the proposed development increase the amount of commercial uses and other facilities in town, district or local centres?	0	There would be no change in the amount of commercial uses in town, district and local centres. The effect on retail provision at Fair Oak Village Centre through increased catchment is likely to be limited due to the distance of this strategic location. Therefore, a negligible (0) effect is likely.
4. Reduce road traffic and congestion through improved accessibility to services homes and jobs; reducing the need to travel by car/lorry and improving sustainable travel choice		
4.1 Is the location close to a major rail station? (same score as 3.1a)	-	This strategic location is more than 1,200m from the nearest major rail station; therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
4.2 Is the location close to a minor rail station? (same score as 3.1b)	-	This strategic location is more than 600m away from the nearest minor rail station; therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
4.3 Is the location close to a frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1c)	-	This strategic location is more than 600m from the nearest frequent bus route; therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
4.4 Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1d)	-	This strategic location is more than 300m from the nearest semi-frequent bus route; therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
4.5(a) Will residential development at the location be close to a major employment centre? (same score as 3.1e)	-	This strategic location is more than 1000m from the nearest major employment centre; therefore a minor negative (-) effect is likely. It should be noted that a small amount of employment use (6,400 m. sq.) is being considered as part development at this strategic location.
4.5(b) Will employment development at the location be close to a major population centre?	0	There is no significant employment use at this strategic location; therefore, a minor negligible (0) effect is likely.
4.6 Are health facilities available locally? (same score as 2.2)	-	This strategic location is more than 800m from the nearest health facilities; therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
4.7 Are shopping and related services available locally?	-	This strategic location is more than 800m from the nearest shopping and related facilities. Therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
4.8 Is the location close to a Primary school?	-	This strategic location is more than 800m from the nearest primary school; therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely. The majority of the location is beyond 800m of an existing primary school. Site promoters have indicated that a new primary school could be provided with development to the north of Mortimers Lane (strategic location: Fair Oak 2), adjacent to this strategic location.

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
4.9 Is the location close to a Secondary school?	-	The southern part of this strategic location is more than 1600m from Wyvern College. Therefore a minor negative (-) effect is likely. There are recognised capacity issues at Wyvern School and further work will need to be undertaken regarding secondary school provision.
4.10 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	-	A footpath is located less than 100m east along Mortimers Lane from this site. There are no opportunities to connect directly to cycle routes which are part of the Eastleigh Cycle Network. Therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
4.11 Are there Geographical barriers between the location and key facilities/ destinations?	-	The primary route to the nearest settlement and its facilities and services is via Mortimers Lane. The road has a pavement running from the junction of Winchester Road up to the urban edge of Fair Oak village. Beyond, the road is a country lane and lacks sufficient lighting and pavements. A minor negative (-) effect is likely.
5. Protect and conserve natural resources		
5.1 Will development avoid the sterilisation of mineral resources?	-?	A small area at the south western edge of this strategic location is identified for Minerals Safeguarding and as a Minerals Consultation Area. Development could potentially have a minor negative (-) effect as access to mineral resource is lost by development. This effect is uncertain (?) until it is determined if extraction of these minerals can or should be undertaken prior to the location being developed.
5.2 Will it result in the loss of higher grade agricultural land?	0	This strategic location is identified as Grade 4 agricultural land. Therefore, a negligible (0) effect is likely.
5.3 Will it use previously developed land?	-	The majority of the location is previously undeveloped. The location does include agricultural related buildings and part of East Horton Golf Club. Therefore a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
5.4 Will it deliver or support allotments or community farms?	+?	This strategic location could be suitable for new allotments/community farms. The site promoter has not indicated if these facilities would be included as part of development at this strategic location. A minor positive (+) effect could occur, however this is currently uncertain (?) prior to further information.
6. Reduce air, soil, water, light and noise pollution		
6.1 Will the location be affected by significant noise generating uses or Air Quality Management Areas?	-?	There are no AQMAs which would be directly affected by this strategic location. To the south east of Fair Oak, there are existing and granted B2 and mineral uses, and an operational landfill gas utilisation plant at the restored Fair Oak Landfill which have the potential to give rise to noise impacts at night and to air pollution / odour. Such effects are however likely to be mitigated through existing environmental permitting requirements, without which, such plant would not be able to operate. Therefore, any noise or odour impacts associated with the landfill site are more likely to arise during accidental conditions (i.e. plant break down) as opposed to being associated with normal operational conditions. A minor negative (-) effect could occur; however this is uncertain prior to obtaining further information on design/layout and mitigation opportunities.

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
6.2 Will development increase pollution?	0	The development does not raise concerns which cannot be addressed by mitigation; therefore a negligible (0) effect is likely.
7. Plan for the anticipated levels of climate change		
7.1 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure?	-?	The strategic location is a greenfield site and development at this strategic location could result in a loss of GI. However, design of development including new open space and links to the wider GI network could provide mitigation. Therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely, although this is uncertain at this stage (?).
7.2 Is the location at risk from flooding, taking into account of the effects of climate change?	-?	An area identified as at 'less' risk of surface water flooding is present on the eastern edges of this strategic location. Therefore a negative (-) effect is likely. However, the overall effect at this strategic location is uncertain (?) as the majority of the site is not within an area of flood risk and consideration of design and mitigation options is required.
7.3 Will the development be at risk from coastal change? If so, can the Shoreline Management Plan Objectives be supported?	0	Not located in an area of coastal change; therefore a negligible (0) effect is likely.
8. Minimise Eastleigh's contribution to climate change by reducing the borough's carbon footprint and minimising other greenhouse gas emissions.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
9. Reduce waste generation and disposal, encourage waste prevention and reuse and achieve the sustainable management of waste.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
10. Protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and geodiversity, improving its quality and range.		
10.1 Is the location within the HRA screening zone?	- -?	The location is within 25m of a watercourse which is at the eastern and north eastern edges of this strategic location which are tributaries of the River Itchen. A significant negative (- -) effect could occur, subject (?) to the outcome of HRA screening and consideration of mitigation.
10.2 Is the location within 200m of a SSSI?	0	The location is not within 200m of a SSSI; therefore, a negligible (0) effect is likely.
10.3 Is the location within 200m of a Local Nature Reserve?	0	The location is not within 200m if a Local Nature Reserve; therefore, a negligible (0) effect is likely.
10.4 Will the development adversely affect a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation? (N.B. No NNRs are present in the District)	-?	Gore Copse SINC is adjacent to the north of this strategic location and land at Knowle Lane SINC is adjacent to the south. Connectivity of SINC via hedgerows is important. A minor negative (-) effect could occur but is uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information about design/layout.
10.5 Will the development adversely affect sites with local designation of nature conservation value (e.g. Biodiversity Opportunity Areas, Biodiversity Action Plan Priority Areas, and Priority Habitat etc.)?	-?	This strategic location is likely to primarily contain rough and semi improved grassland. Therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely, although this is uncertain (?) subject to obtaining further information on design/layout.
10.6 Will development adversely affect protected species?	-?	Several different protected species could be present at or utilise this strategic location, including but not limited to: great crested newts, bats, otters. Due to

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
		the aquatic and hedgerow connections to the SAC otter may use the sites. A minor negative (-) effect is likely, although uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information on design/layout and opportunities for mitigation and enhancement.
10.6 Will the development adversely impact the biodiversity network (e.g. Biodiversity Action Plan Priority Links)?	-?	Development at this strategic location could isolate the small woodland block from the wider woodland/hedgerow network. Therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely, although this is uncertain (?) subject to obtaining further information on design/layout.
10.7 Will the development adversely affect ancient woodland?	0	There is no ancient woodland within or in the vicinity of this strategic location. Therefore a negligible (0) effect is likely.
11. Enhance the Borough's multifunctional green infrastructure networks.		
11.1 Will the development affect TPO trees?	0	No TPO trees present within or in the vicinity of this strategic location; therefore a negligible (0) effect is likely.
11.2 Can the location be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	-	A footpath is located less than 100m east along Mortimers Lane from this site. There are no opportunities to connect directly to cycle routes which are part of the Eastleigh Cycle Network. Therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
11.3 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure? (same score as 7.1)	-?	The strategic location is a greenfield site and development at this strategic location could result in a loss of GI. However, design of development including new open space and links to the wider GI network could provide mitigation. Therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely, although this is uncertain at this stage (?).
12. Protect, enhance and manage the character and appearance of the landscape and townscape, maintaining and strengthening distinctiveness and its special qualities.		
12.1 Will development adversely affect the separation of neighbouring settlements?	0	There are no significant effects on gaps expected from development at this strategic location; therefore, a negligible (0) effect is likely.
12.2 Will it protect the setting of the South Downs National Park?	0	Development at this strategic location is unlikely to have significant impacts on views or the setting of the National Park; therefore, a negligible (0) effect is likely.
12.3 Will it protect the character of the countryside, coast, towns and/or villages?	-?	Development north of Mortimers Lane the urbanising effect on the landscape character of the lower lying land is likely to be localised. Development of land south of Mortimers Lane is likely to have a more significant urbanising effect on the open landscape. A minor negative (-) effect is likely, but is uncertain (?) at this stage prior to obtaining further information on design/layout.
12.4 Will it have an impact on locally important views and settings?	-?	The development south of Mortimers lane is likely to be visible across the valley from the east. A minor negative (-) effect is likely, but is uncertain (?) at this stage prior to obtaining further information on design/layout.
13. Protect and enhance and manage buildings, monuments, features, sites, places, areas and landscapes of archaeological, historical and cultural		

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
heritage importance.		
13.1 Will the development protect and enhance listed buildings and their settings, conservation areas, archaeological sites, historic landscapes and other sites of local importance for heritage?	-?	This strategic location includes land identified as the Fair Oak Park Historic Park and Garden. A minor negative (-) effect could occur, but is uncertain prior to obtaining further information about design/layout.

Hamble 1 - Hamble Airfield

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
1. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified local needs, including affordability and special needs		
1.1 Will the development provide a significant contribution towards meeting identified affordable housing needs?	+?	No issues have yet been raised that would suggest the typical proportion (35%) could not be achieved. Therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely. The proportion of affordable housing which could be delivered is currently uncertain (?) until further work is undertaken by the site promoter.
1.2 Will it provide other elements of identified housing need e.g. housing for older persons, self-build, support housing?	+?	There is scope in this strategic location for provision other elements of identified housing need. The site promoter has not proposed to meet other such elements of identified housing need. A minor positive (+) effect could occur but is uncertain (?) at this stage.
2. Safeguard and improve community health, safety and wellbeing		
2.1 Are community facilities (community hall or library) available locally?	+	The north, west and eastern part of this strategic location are within 400m of HYPE Youth Centre, the Sea Scout Hut and Hamble Village Memorial Hall. The rest of this location is within 800m of these community facilities and Hound Parish Hall to the north. Therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely.
2.2 Are health facilities available locally?	+	This location is within 1.0km of the Blackthorn healthcare facility; therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely.
2.3 What effect would the development have on local provision of sports pitches and facilities?	+++	Site promoters have indicated that sports pitches would be provided as part of development at this location. Therefore a significant positive (++) effect could occur although this is uncertain (?) at this stage.
2.4 Is public open space available locally?	+++	The development proposed in this strategic location includes an additional large scale open space. However, the delivery of this open space is still uncertain and will depend upon the development proposals put forward for this location. In addition, the southern part of this location is within 300m of a number of small open spaces. Overall, the location is therefore assessed as having a significant positive effect with uncertainty (+++).
2.5 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network?	+	There is a footpath which bisects this location going north to south in the eastern area connecting Hamble House Gardens and the bridleway at Mallards Moor. A route which is part of the Eastleigh Cycle Network passes through the west of the site on Hamble Lane. Given these opportunities to connect to the footpath and cycle network, a positive (+) effect is likely.
3. Develop a dynamic and diverse economy		
3.1(a) Is the location close to a major rail station?	-	This location is over 1.2km from a major railway station; therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
3.1 (b) Is the location close to a minor rail station?	+	Hamble railway station is immediately adjacent to the north western part of this location; therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely.
3.1 (c) Is the location close to a frequent bus route?	-	This strategic location is over 600m from a frequent bus route. Therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
		likely.
3.1 (d) Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route?	+	The First Bus route 6 serving Hamble-Netley-Woolston-Southampton is directly adjacent to the western part of this location and most of this location is within 600m of this bus service; therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely.
3.1 (e) Is the location close to a major employment centre?	++	The south western area of this location is within 400m of GE Aviation. Therefore, a significant positive (++) effect is likely. It should be noted that if development is based in the northern part of this site then it is likely that new householders will be within 1.0km of this location, which would result in a minor positive (+) effect instead.
3.2 Will the proposed development contribute towards meeting the need for new industrial, office or warehousing floorspace?	+	10,000sq.m. of employment floorspace is proposed at this strategic location; therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely.
3.3 Will the proposed development result in a net loss of existing employment land, or land which would be suitable for employment purposes?	0	Although there is a small amount of employment floorspace on the south-western part of the strategic location, new floorspace is being proposed and the development of this strategic location will not result in any net loss of existing employment land. Therefore a negligible (0) effect is likely.
3.4 Will the proposed development increase the amount of commercial uses and other facilities in town, district or local centres?	0	This strategic location is identified for residential use only and is located outside district and local centres. It will therefore not result in any loss of a primary shopping area. Therefore a negligible (0) effect is likely.
4. Reduce road traffic and congestion through improved accessibility to services homes and jobs; reducing the need to travel by car/lorry and improving sustainable travel choice		
4.1 Is the location close to a major rail station? (same score as 3.1a)	-	This location is over 1.2km from a major railway station; therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
4.2 Is the location close to a minor rail station? (same score as 3.1b)	+	Hamble railway station is immediately adjacent to the north western part of this location; therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely.
4.3 Is the location close to a frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1c)	-	This strategic location is over 600m from a frequent bus route. Therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
4.4 Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1d)	+	The First Bus route 6 serves Hamble-Netley-Woolston-Southampton and runs directly adjacent to the western part of this location and most of this location is within 600m of this bus service; therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely.
4.5(a) Will residential development at the location be close to a major employment centre? (same score as 3.1e)	++	The south western area of this location is within 400m to GE Aviation. Therefore, a significant positive (++) effect is likely. It should be noted that if development is based in the northern part of this site then it is likely that new householders would only be within 1.0km of this location, which would result in a minor positive (+) effect instead.
4.5(b) Will employment development at the location be close to a major population centre?	-	This location is over 1.0km from a major population centre, therefore if the southern half of this location is developed for mixed uses (which includes 10,000m ² of new employment space), then a minor negative (-) effect is likely. However, if only the northern part of this strategic

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
		location is taken forward for solely residential development, then a negligible (0) effect is likely.
4.6 Are health facilities available locally? (same score as 2.2)	+	This location is within 1.0km of the Blackthorn healthcare facility; therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely.
4.7 Are shopping and related services available locally?	+	A very small part of the western area of this location is within 400m of Coronation Parade local centre. Most of the southern area is within 800m of this local centre and Hamble village centre. Overall, a minor positive (+) effect is likely.
4.8 Is the location close to a Primary school?	+	The western part of this location is adjacent to Hamble Primary School; therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely. The rest of this location is within 800m of this school facility.
4.9 Is the location close to a Secondary school?	+	Hamble Community Sports College is located to the immediate north of the railway line. Access routes are available via Hamble Lane and Satchel Lane. Therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely.
4.10 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	+	There is a footpath which bisects this location going north to south in the eastern area connecting Hamble House Gardens and the bridleway at Mallards Moor. A route which is part of the Eastleigh Cycle Network passes through the west of the site on Hamble Lane. Given these opportunities to connect to the footpath and cycle network, a positive (+) effect is likely.
4.11 Are there Geographical barriers between the location and key facilities/ destinations?	-	The strategic location is separated from a number of key facilities including a secondary school and doctor's surgery by the Fareham-Southampton railway line. Pedestrian routes to Hamble village are of a reasonable standard in terms of width and lighting. On balance a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
5. Protect and conserve natural resources		
5.1 Will development avoid the sterilisation of mineral resources?	-?	This strategic location is in an area of potential Sharp Sand and Gravel Resource. This has been specifically allocated for its extraction in the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan 2013. This strategic location is also within an area identified for River Terrace Deposits included as a Mineral Consultation Area in the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan 2013. Development which does not involve the prior extraction of the minerals would prevent future mineral extraction therefore a minor negative (-) effect is identified. This effect is uncertain (?) as the potential for effects will depend on the scale and design of development proposals and whether minerals can be extracted prior to development within the Local Plan period.
5.2 Will it result in the loss of higher grade agricultural land?	--	Most of this strategic location is not classified as agricultural, aside from a small area in the north east, which is located on higher quality (Grade 1) agricultural land and therefore a significant negative (--) effect is likely.
5.3 Will it use previously developed land?	-	The strategic location is located on greenfield land; therefore a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
5.4 Will it deliver or support allotments or community farms?	+?	This strategic location could be suitable for new allotments/community farms. The site promoter has not indicated if these facilities would be included as part of development at this location. A minor positive (+) effect could occur, however this is currently uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
		information.
6. Reduce air, soil, water, light and noise pollution		
6.1 Will the location be affected by significant noise generating uses or Air Quality Management Areas?	-?	Noise from road traffic and the railway line is likely in this location. This location is not within an AQMA. Therefore a minor negative (-) effect is likely but uncertain (?) subject to technical assessments and consideration of mitigation.
6.2 Will development increase pollution?	--?	This location was a former airfield and a detailed site investigation, including detailed remedial measures, would be required. Due to the scale of the location and associated vehicle use, there is also likely to be a significant impact on a nearby existing Air Quality Management Area (Hamble Lane). A detailed air quality assessment would be required to determine impacts on existing air quality. The proposed employment uses are likely to have a significant impact on adjacent existing residential properties, and the combination of employment and residential uses proposed on site are likely to adversely impact on each other. A detailed noise assessment would be required to establish an appropriate site layout. Therefore a significant negative (--) effect is likely but uncertain (?) subject to technical assessments and consideration of mitigation.
7. Plan for the anticipated levels of climate change		
7.1 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure?	+?	The strategic location is a greenfield site with some GI assets within or adjacent to the site (e.g. footpaths, woodland). Development at this location could result in a loss of GI. However, the design of development including new open space and links to the wider GI network has potential for improvements to GI. A minor positive (+) effect could occur, however this is uncertain (?) at this stage prior to obtaining further information on design/layout and enhancement opportunities.
7.2 Is the location at risk from flooding, taking into account of the effects of climate change?	--?	There are two specific areas of intermediate surface water flood risk in the north western area of this location close to Hamble railway station. Therefore a significant negative (--) effect is likely. However, the overall effect at this location is uncertain (?) as the majority of the site is not within an area of flood risk and consideration of design and mitigation options is required.
7.3 Will the development be at risk from coastal change? If so, can the Shoreline Management Plan Objectives be supported?	0	Not located in an area of coastal change; therefore a negligible change is likely.
8. Minimise Eastleigh's contribution to climate change by reducing the borough's carbon footprint and minimising other greenhouse gas emissions.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
9. Reduce waste generation and disposal, encourage waste prevention and reuse and achieve the sustainable management of waste.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
10. Protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and geodiversity, improving its quality and range.		
10.1 Is the location within the HRA screening zone?	0	This location is not within the HRA screening area; therefore a negligible (0) effect is likely.
10.2 Is the location within 200m of a SSSI?	0	The location is not within 200m of a SSSI; therefore,
10.3 Is the location within 200m of a Local Nature Reserve?	0	The location is not within 200m if a Local Nature Reserve; therefore,
10.4 Will the development adversely affect a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation? (N.B. No NNRs are present in the District)	0	No SINCs within or adjacent to the strategic location. Badman Copse SINC and West Wood SINC designated for ancient oak and alder woodland are 170m to the north east and 270m to the west respectively. Due to distance from location unlikely to have an adverse impact therefore a negligible (0) effect is likely.
10.5 Will the development adversely affect sites with local designation of nature conservation value (e.g. Biodiversity Opportunity Areas, Biodiversity Action Plan Priority Areas, and Priority Habitat etc.)?	-?	Habitats throughout the site compromise tussock grassland and scrub. A minor negative (-) effect is likely, although this is uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information on design/layout and consideration of mitigation and enhancement opportunities.
10.6 Will the development adversely affect protected species?	-?	This location contains mature rough grassland and is therefore likely to foster good populations of reptiles. Due to the wet habitats adjacent to the location there is a possibility of rare amphibians such as great crested newts. A minor negative (-) effect could occur, but is uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information on design/layout.
10.6 Will the development adversely impact the biodiversity network (e.g. Biodiversity Action Plan Priority Links)?	-?	The whole location is identified as Airfield Priority Biodiversity Link due to its tussocky grassland and scrub and as it is connecting habitat for two PBAs. Links between the ancient woodland and the PBAs would need to remain open. A minor negative (-) effect is likely, although this is uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information on design/layout and consideration of mitigation and enhancement opportunities.
10.7 Will the development adversely affect ancient woodland?	0	Unlikely to have an adverse impact on ancient woodland; therefore, a negligible (0) effect is likely.
11. Enhance the Borough's multifunctional green infrastructure networks.		
11.1 Will the development affect TPO trees?	0	No TPO trees are present within or adjacent to this strategic location; therefore a negligible (0) effect is likely.
11.2 Can the location be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	+	There is a footpath which bisects this location going north to south in the eastern area connecting Hamble House Gardens and the bridleway at Mallards Moor. A route which is part of the Eastleigh Cycle Network passes through the west of the site on Hamble Lane. Given these opportunities to connect to the footpath and cycle network, a positive (+) effect is likely.

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
11.3 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure? (same score as 7.1)	+?	The strategic site is a greenfield site with some GI assets within or adjacent to the site (e.g. footpaths, woodland). Development at this location could result in a loss of GI. However, the design of development including new open space and links to the wider GI network has potential for improvements to GI. A minor positive (+) effect could occur, however this is uncertain (?) at this stage prior to obtaining further information on design/layout and enhancement opportunities.
12. Protect, enhance and manage the character and appearance of the landscape and townscape, maintaining and strengthening distinctiveness and its special qualities.		
12.1 Will development adversely affect the separation of neighbouring settlements?	-?	The effect of development in this strategic location on the gap between Hamble and Hound is likely to be limited to land to the north of the former airfield because of the existing ribbon development on Hamble Lane, the location of the college and the presence of the railway line. The effect of development in this location on the gap between Hamble and Bursledon south of the railway is likely to be limited because of the location of the railway and intervening vegetation, although the north eastern edge is close to Old Bursledon. A minor negative (-) effect is likely, although uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information on design and layout.
12.2 Will it protect the setting of the South Downs National Park?	0	Development at this strategic location is unlikely to have an impact on the National Park.
12.3 Will it protect the character of the countryside, coast, towns and/or villages?	-?	Development in this strategic location would change the predominately open character of the landscape between Hamble Lane and Satchell Lane. A minor negative (-) effect is likely, although uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information on design and layout.
12.4 Will it have an impact on locally important views and settings?	-?	There are clear views from parts of Hamble Lane, Satchell Lane and the local footpath network. Visual mitigation through new screen planting is likely to reduce the open nature and character of this location as seen from the surrounding roads and footpaths. A minor negative (-) effect is likely, although uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information on design and layout.
13. Protect and enhance and manage buildings, monuments, features, sites, places, areas and landscapes of archaeological, historical and cultural heritage importance.		
13.1 Will the development protect and enhance listed buildings and their settings, conservation areas, archaeological sites, historic landscapes and other sites of local importance for heritage?	0	Development at this strategic location is unlikely to have an impact on heritage assets (0).

Hamble 2 – West of Hamble Lane (south of Hamble Primary School)

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
1. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified local needs, including affordability and special needs		
1.1 Will the development provide a significant contribution towards meeting identified affordable housing needs?	+?	No issues have yet been raised that would suggest the typical proportion (35%) could not be achieved. Therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely. The proportion of affordable housing which could be delivered is currently uncertain (?) until further work is undertaken by the site promoter.
1.2 Will it provide other elements of identified housing need e.g. housing for older persons, self-build, support housing?	+?	There is scope in this strategic location for provision of other elements of identified housing need. The site promoter has not proposed to meet other such elements of identified housing need. A minor positive (+) effect could occur but is uncertain (?) at this stage.
2. Safeguard and improve community health, safety and wellbeing		
2.1 Are community facilities (community hall or library) available locally?	0	The northern area of this strategic location is within 400m of the Sea Scout Hut. The rest of this location is within 800m of this community facility and Hamble Village Memorial Hall to the south east of this location; therefore, a negligible (0) effect is likely.
2.2 Are health facilities available locally?	--	This strategic site is over 1.0km distance to any existing healthcare facility; therefore, a significant negative (--) effect is likely.
2.3 What effect would the development have on local provision of sports pitches and facilities?	--?	The strategic location currently comprises a significant area of sports pitches which would be lost if this area was development. Therefore a significant negative effect is likely. It is possible that replacement pitches may be identified, therefore an uncertain effect is identified.
2.4 Is public open space available locally?	--/+	This strategic location is within 300m of Royal Victoria Country Park adjacent to the north western area of this location and a small area of open space at Sydney Avenue to the east. However, development at this strategic location will result in the loss of Mount Pleasant Recreational site. Therefore a mixed (minor positive and significant negative (+/--)) effect is likely.
2.5 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network?	+	There is a footpath crossing the central area of this strategic location, linking it to Colledge Copse and Hamble Lane. A cycle route forming part of the Eastleigh Cycle Network also passes the eastern part of this location on Hamble Lane; therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely.
3. Develop a dynamic and diverse economy		
3.1(a) Is the location close to a major rail station?	-	This strategic location is over 1.2km from a major rail station; therefore a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
3.1 (b) Is the location close to a minor rail station?	0	Hamble station is 590m north of this strategic location; therefore a negligible (0) effect is likely.
3.1 (c) Is the location close to a frequent bus route?	-	This strategic location is over 600m from any frequent bus route; therefore a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
3.1 (d) Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route?	+	This strategic location is adjacent to the semi-frequent bus service. First Bus operate route 6 serving Hamble-Netley-Hedge End. Therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely.

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
3.1 (e) Is the location close to a major employment centre?	++	The southern area is adjacent to GE Aviation major employment centre and this strategic location is within 390m of Ensign major employment centre to the south east. Therefore a significant positive (++) effect is likely.
3.2 Will the proposed development contribute towards meeting the need for new industrial, office or warehousing floorspace?	0	This strategic location could be suitable for employment floorspace. However, the site promoter has not stated this as part of the proposals for this location. Therefore, a negligible (0) effect is likely.
3.3 Will the proposed development result in a net loss of existing employment land, or land which would be suitable for employment purposes?	0	The development of this strategic location will not result in any loss of existing employment land therefore a negligible (0) effect is likely.
3.4 Will the proposed development increase the amount of commercial uses and other facilities in town, district or local centres?	0	This strategic location is identified for residential use only, is located outside district and local centres and will therefore not result in any loss of a primary shopping area. Therefore a negligible (0) effect is likely.
4. Reduce road traffic and congestion through improved accessibility to services homes and jobs; reducing the need to travel by car/lorry and improving sustainable travel choice		
4.1 Is the location close to a major rail station? (same score as 3.1a)	-	This strategic location is over 1200m from a major rail station; therefore a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
4.2 Is the location close to a minor rail station? (same score as 3.1b)	0	Hamble station is 590m north of this strategic location; therefore a negligible (0) effect is likely.
4.3 Is the location close to a frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1c)	-	This strategic location is over 600m from any frequent bus route; therefore a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
4.4 Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1d)	+	This strategic location is adjacent to a semi-frequent bus service. First Bus operate route 6 serving Hamble-Netley-Hedge End, to the east. Therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely.
4.5(a) Will residential development at the location be close to a major employment centre? (same score as 3.1e)	++	The southern area of this strategic location is adjacent to GE Aviation major employment centre, while the Ensign Way major employment centre is 390m to the south east. Therefore a significant positive (++) effect is likely.
4.5(b) Will employment development at the location be close to a major population centre?	0	The strategic location is for residential uses only and therefore a negligible (0) effect is likely, in relation to this objective.
4.6 Are health facilities available locally? (same score as 2.2)	--	This strategic site is over 1.0km distance to any existing healthcare facility; therefore, a significant negative (--) effect is likely.
4.7 Are shopping and related services available locally?	+	Most of this strategic location is adjacent to the Coronation Parade local centre to the south east; therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely.
4.8 Is the location close to a Primary school?	+	The north eastern area of this location is adjacent of Hamble Primary School. The rest of this location is within 400m of this primary school facility, therefore a minor positive (+) effect is likely.
4.9 Is the location close to a Secondary school?	+	The northern part of this strategic location is within 800m of Hamble Community Sports College, to the north west of this location; therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely.
4.10 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as	+	There is a footpath crossing the central area of this strategic location, linking it to College Copse and

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
2.5)		Hamble Lane. A cycle route forming part of the Eastleigh Cycle Network also passes the eastern part of this location on Hamble Lane; therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely.
4.11 Are there Geographical barriers between the location and key facilities/ destinations?	+	There are no significant geographical barriers on the most direct walking route to any destination. Therefore a minor positive (+) effect is likely.
5. Protect and conserve natural resources		
5.1 Will development avoid the sterilisation of mineral resources?	-?	Most of this strategic location is within an area of potential Sharp Sand and Gravel resource. The whole site is also within an area of River Terrace Deposit, identified as a Mineral Consultation Area in the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan 2013. Development at this location could prevent future mineral extraction therefore a minor negative (-) effect is likely. This effect is uncertain as the potential for effects will depend on the scale and design of development proposals and whether minerals can be extracted prior to development within the Local Plan period.
5.2 Will it result in the loss of higher grade agricultural land?	0	This strategic location is not classified as agricultural land therefore a negligible (0) effect is likely.
5.3 Will it use previously developed land?	-	This strategic location is located on greenfield and land; therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
5.4 Will it deliver or support allotments or community farms?	+?	This location could be suitable for new allotments/community farms. The site promoter has not indicated if these facilities would be included as part of development at this location. A minor positive (+) effect could occur, however this is currently uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information.
6. Reduce air, soil, water, light and noise pollution		
6.1 Will the location be affected by significant noise generating uses or Air Quality Management Areas?	-?	This strategic location could be affected by the noise and traffic movements at GE Aviation located adjacent. This location does not fall within an AQMA. Therefore a minor negative (-) effect is likely but uncertain (?) subject to technical assessments and consideration of mitigation.
6.2 Will development increase pollution?	-?	Development at this location is likely to impact traffic flows and volumes on nearby roads such as Hamble Lane. Local air quality could be affected, including the Hamble Lane AQMA. A detailed air quality assessment is required to determine impacts on existing air quality. Therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely but uncertain (?) subject to technical assessments and consideration of mitigation.
7. Plan for the anticipated levels of climate change		
7.1 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure?	+?	The strategic location is a greenfield site with some GI assets within or adjacent to the site (e.g. footpaths, woodland). Development at this location could result in a loss of GI. However, the design of development including new open space and links to the wider GI network has potential for improvements to GI. A minor positive (+) effect could occur, however this is uncertain (?) at this stage prior to obtaining further information on design/layout and

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
		enhancement opportunities.
7.2 Is the location at risk from flooding, taking into account of the effects of climate change?	-?	The eastern area of this strategic location contains a small area that is mostly subject to 'less' surface water flooding. Therefore a minor negative (-) effect is likely. This effect is uncertain as it would depend on the ability of the design and layout of the particular development proposal to avoid or mitigate flood risk.
7.3 Will the development be at risk from coastal change? If so, can the Shoreline Management Plan Objectives be supported?	0	Not located in an area of coastal change. Therefore a negligible effect is likely.
8. Minimise Eastleigh's contribution to climate change by reducing the borough's carbon footprint and minimising other greenhouse gas emissions.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
9. Reduce waste generation and disposal, encourage waste prevention and reuse and achieve the sustainable management of waste.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
10. Protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and geodiversity, improving its quality and range.		
10.1 Is the location within the HRA screening zone?	0	This strategic location is over 200m from any HRA screening zone; therefore a negligible (0) effect is likely.
10.2 Is the location within 200m of a SSSI?	0	This strategic location is over 200m from any SSSI designation; therefore a negligible (0) effect is likely.
10.3 Is the location within 200m of a Local Nature Reserve?	0	This strategic location is over 200m from any Local Nature Reserve; therefore a negligible (0) effect is likely.
10.4 Will the development adversely affect a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation? (N.B. No NNRs are present in the District)	-?	West Wood SINC lies adjacent to the west of the strategic location. A minor negative (-) effect is likely, although this is uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information on design/layout and consideration of mitigation and enhancement opportunities.
10.5 Will the development adversely affect sites with local designation of nature conservation value (e.g. Biodiversity Opportunity Areas, Biodiversity Action Plan Priority Areas, and Priority Habitat etc.)?	-?	Solent Biodiversity Opportunity Area lies adjacent to the west of this location. A minor negative (-) effect is likely, although this is uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information on design/layout and consideration of mitigation and enhancement opportunities.
10.6 Will the development adversely affect protected species?	-?	There is a large area of ancient woodland within the West Wood SINC. The hedgerows on site could harbour dormice and be used as a foraging corridor by badger, reptiles, and bat species. A negative (-) effect could occur, but is uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information on existence of species and the design/layout of any development proposals.
10.7 Will the development adversely impact the biodiversity network (e.g. Biodiversity Action Plan Priority Links)?	-?	Solent Biodiversity Opportunity Area adjacent to west. A minor negative (-) effect is likely, although this is uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information on design/layout and consideration of mitigation and enhancement opportunities.

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
10.8 Will the development adversely affect ancient woodland?	-?	West Wood (ancient woodland) lies adjacent to the west. A minor negative (-) effect is likely, although this is uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information on design/layout and consideration of mitigation and enhancement opportunities.
11. Enhance the Borough's multifunctional green infrastructure networks.		
11.1 Will the development affect TPO trees?	-?	There are TPOs within the site. A minor negative (-) effect is likely, although this is uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information on design/layout and consideration of mitigation and enhancement opportunities.
11.2 Can the location be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	+	There is a footpath crossing the central area of this strategic location, linking it to College Copse and Hamble Lane. A cycle route forming part of the Eastleigh Cycle Network also passes the eastern part of this location on Hamble Lane; therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely.
11.3 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure? (same score as 7.1)	+?	The strategic location is a greenfield site with some GI assets within or adjacent to the site (e.g. footpaths, woodland). Development at this location could result in a loss of GI. However, the design of development including new open space and links to the wider GI network has potential for improvements to GI. A minor positive (+) effect could occur, however this is uncertain (?) at this stage prior to obtaining further information on design/layout and enhancement opportunities.
12. Protect, enhance and manage the character and appearance of the landscape and townscape, maintaining and strengthening distinctiveness and its special qualities.		
12.1 Will development adversely affect the separation of neighbouring settlements?	-?	Development in this strategic location would extend the settlement of Hamble westwards towards the Royal Victoria Country Park but would still leave a substantial gap between the settlements of Hamble and Hound. There would not be an impact on the gap between Hamble and Bursledon. A minor negative (-) effect is likely, although uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information on design and layout.
12.2 Will it protect the setting of the South Downs National Park?	0	Development at this location is unlikely to have an impact on the National Park.
12.3 Will it protect the character of the countryside, coast, towns and/or villages?	-?	There would be an urbanisation of predominately open recreation land on the western edge of Hamble. A minor negative (-) effect is likely, although uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information on design and layout.
12.4 Will it have an impact on locally important views and settings?	-?	This strategic location is highly visible from Hamble Lane and adjoining rights of way and minor access roads. A minor negative (-) effect is likely, although uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information on design and layout.

SA objective/ criterion	Justification	
13. Protect and enhance and manage buildings, monuments, features, sites, places, areas and landscapes of archaeological, historical and cultural heritage importance.		
13.1 Will the development protect and enhance listed buildings and their settings, conservation areas, archaeological sites, historic landscapes and other sites of local importance for heritage?	-?	There is a Grade II* listed building (Sydney Lodge) to the south of the site. There is therefore a potential but uncertain (?) negative (-) impact that may require mitigation.

Hedge End 1 – West of Woodhouse Lane

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
1. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified local needs, including affordability and special needs		
1.1 Will the development provide a significant contribution towards meeting identified affordable housing needs?	+?	No issues have yet been raised that would suggest the typical proportion (35%) could not be achieved. Therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely. The proportion of affordable housing which could be delivered is currently uncertain (?) until further work is undertaken by the site promoter.
1.2 Will it provide other elements of identified housing need e.g. housing for older persons, self-build, support housing?	+?	There would appear to be scope in this location for provision of other elements of identified housing need. However, the site promoter has not specified whether they propose to meet other such elements of identified housing need. Therefore a minor positive effect (+) is likely, but is uncertain (?) at this stage.
2. Safeguard and improve community health, safety and wellbeing		
2.1 Are community facilities (community hall or library) available locally?	++	This strategic location is within 800m of four community halls including Botley Centre to the south and Drummond Community Centre to the north-west. There is also potential to provide a new community facility within this site. Therefore, a significant positive (++) effect is likely.
2.2 Are health facilities available locally?	+	The northern part of this strategic location is within 1.0km of St Lukes Surgery in the north west. The south eastern area of the location is also within 1.0km of Botley Health Centre. Therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely.
2.3 What effect would the development have on local provision of sports pitches and facilities?	+?	There is scope in this location for provision of sports pitches and facilities therefore a minor positive effect (+) could occur. However, site promoters have not indicated that sports pitches would be provided as part of development at this location. Therefore, this effect is uncertain (?) at this stage.
2.4 Is public open space available locally?	++	This strategic location is for mixed use development, including 11ha of new open space. In addition, most of the western area of this strategic location is within 300m of public open space in the form of a series of corridors along Watkin Road, Giles Close, Locke Road and Bottom Copse. The far southern part of this location is also within 300m of the Pavilion Way recreational facility. The rest of this strategic location is within 800m of these public open space facilities. Therefore a significant positive (++) effect is likely.
2.5 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network?	+	There is a bridleway in the central area of this strategic location, which links the location through to Holmesland Lane, Botley to the south-east and to the settlement of Hedge End at Shamblehurst Lane in the north-west. A cycle route forming part of the Eastleigh cycle network is also located adjacent to the western area of the site linking the location to the settlement at Shamblehurst Lane and to Woodhouse Lane. Given these opportunities to connect to the footpath and cycle network, a positive (+) effect is likely.
3. Develop a dynamic and diverse economy		
3.1(a) Is the location close to a major rail station?	+	Hedge End station is approximately 680m to the north of this strategic location; therefore a minor positive (+) effect is likely.

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
3.1 (b) Is the location close to a minor rail station?	-	This strategic location is over 600m from a minor rail station; therefore a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
3.1 (c) Is the location close to a frequent bus route?	-	This site is over 600m from a frequent bus service; therefore a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
3.1 (d) Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route?	+	The north western area of this location is within 300m of First Bus route 8 serving Hedge End-West End-Townhill Park-Southampton (the Hedge End to West End section is likely to be withdrawn in the short to medium term due to low usage). The rest of this strategic location is over 300m distance to a semi-frequent bus service. Therefore a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
3.1 (e) Is the location close to a major employment centre?	+	This strategic location includes residential development and the western area is located within 1.0km of Hedge End Industrial Area. Therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely.
3.2 Will the proposed development contribute towards meeting the need for new industrial, office or warehousing floorspace?	-	The location would be unsuitable for additional employment floorspace and no new floorspace is being considered. Therefore a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
3.3 Will the proposed development result in a net loss of existing employment land, or land which would be suitable for employment purposes?	0	The development of this strategic location will not result in any loss of existing employment land therefore a negligible (0) effect is likely.
3.4 Will the proposed development increase the amount of commercial uses and other facilities in town, district or local centres?	+?	This strategic location is identified for residential use, primary school and the potential for a new local centre. Therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely. Although, the effect of this provision on existing services is uncertain at this time.
4. Reduce road traffic and congestion through improved accessibility to services homes and jobs; reducing the need to travel by car/lorry and improving sustainable travel choice		
4.1 Is the location close to a major rail station? (same score as 3.1a)	+	Hedge End station is approximately 680m to the north of this strategic location; therefore a minor positive (+) effect is likely.
4.2 Is the location close to a minor rail station? (same score as 3.1b)	-	This strategic location is over 600m from a minor rail station; therefore a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
4.3 Is the location close to a frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1c)	-	This strategic location is over 600m from a frequent bus service; therefore a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
4.4 Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1d)	+	The north western area of this location is within 300m of First bus route 8 serving Hedge End-West End-Townhill Park-Southampton (the Hedge End to West End section is likely to be withdrawn in short to medium term due to low usage). The rest of this strategic location is over 300m to a semi-frequent bus service. Therefore a minor positive (+) effect is likely.
4.5(a) Will residential development at the location be close to a major employment centre? (same score as 3.1e)	+	This strategic location could accommodate a significant amount of residential development. The north western area is located between 400-1.0km of Hedge End Industrial Area. Therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely.
4.5(b) Will employment development at the location be close to a major population centre?	0	Employment is not currently proposed at this strategic location; a negligible (0) effect is likely.
4.6 Are health facilities available locally? (same score as 2.2)	+	The northern part of this strategic location is within 1.0km of St Lukes Surgery in the north west. The south eastern area of the location is also within 1.0km of Botley Healthcare Centre. Therefore, a

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
		minor positive (+) effect is likely.
4.7 Are shopping and related services available locally?	+++	<p>The north western area of this strategic location is within 800m of St Lukes Close/ Shamblehurst Lane local centre. The rest of this location is over 800m distance from a town, district or local centre.</p> <p>There is however potential within this site to make provision for a new local centre although at this time delivery is uncertain and it will depend upon the development proposals put forward.</p> <p>Overall, the location is therefore assessed as having a significant positive effect with uncertainty (++?).</p>
4.8 Is the location close to a Primary school?	++	This strategic location is for mixed use , including the provision of new primary school facilities. In addition, the western area is adjacent to Berrywood Primary School. Aside from the far eastern edge of this location, most of this site is within 800m to Berrywood Primary School to the west. Therefore, a significant positive (++) effect is likely.
4.9 Is the location close to a Secondary school?	+	Wildern Secondary School is located just under 800m from the south-western part of this strategic location. There are recognised capacity issues at Wildern School and further work will need to be undertaken regarding secondary school provision. Therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely.
4.10 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	+	There is a bridleway in the central area of this strategic location, which links the location through to Holmesland Lane, Botley to the south-east and to the settlement of Hedge End at Shamblehurst Lane in the north-west. A cycle route forming part of the Eastleigh Cycle Network is also located adjacent to the western area of the site linking the location to the settlement at Shamblehurst Lane and to Woodhouse Lane. Given these opportunities to connect to the footpath and cycle network, a positive (+) effect is likely.
4.11 Are there Geographical barriers between the location and key facilities/ destinations?	+	There are no significant geographical barriers on the most direct walking route from the strategic location to the key destinations and facilities of Hedge End and Botley. Lighting and width of footpaths are not ideal at present but capable of improvement. A minor positive effect is likely.
5. Protect and conserve natural resources		
5.1 Will development avoid the sterilisation of mineral resources?	-?	The southern area of this strategic location contains two areas of potential Sharp Sand and Gravel Resource. These have been safeguarded in the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan 2013. These sites are also River Terrace Deposit areas identified as Consultation Areas in the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan 2013. Development at this strategic location could prevent future mineral extraction therefore a minor negative (-) effect is likely. This effect is uncertain as the potential for effects will depend on the scale and design of development proposals and whether minerals can be extracted prior to development within the Local Plan period.
5.2 Will it result in the loss of higher grade agricultural land?	-	Most of this strategic site is located on medium quality (Grade 3a or 3b) agricultural land, aside from a small area in the south west which is located on higher agricultural quality land (Grade 2). Therefore a minor negative (-) effect is likely.

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
5.3 Will it use previously developed land?	-	This strategic location is located on greenfield land; therefore a minor negative (-) is likely.
5.4 Will it deliver or support allotments or community farms?	+?	This location could be suitable for new allotments/community farms. The site promoter has not indicated if these facilities would be included as part of development at this location. A minor positive (+) effect could occur, however this is currently uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information.
6. Reduce air, soil, water, light and noise pollution		
6.1 Will the location be affected by significant noise generating uses or Air Quality Management Areas?	-?	This location could be affected by noise from the railway line. It is noted that railway is largely in a cutting at the point and effects are likely to be minor. Botley Cleansing Services is located nearby; therefore an odour assessment would need to be carried out to consider the impacts to the development from this established use. This location is not within an AQMA. Overall, a minor negative (-) effect is likely but uncertain (?) subject to technical assessments and consideration of mitigation.
6.2 Will development increase pollution?	-?	Development at this location is likely to impact traffic flow and volume on nearby roads and could impact on air quality including nearby existing Air Quality Management Area (Botley). A detailed air quality assessment would be required to determine impacts on existing air quality. Therefore a minor negative (-) effect is likely but uncertain (?) subject to technical assessments and consideration of mitigation.
7. Plan for the anticipated levels of climate change		
7.1 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure?	+?	This strategic location is a greenfield site with some green infrastructure assets within or adjacent to the site (e.g. footpaths, woodland). Development at this location could result in a loss of green infrastructure. However, the design of development including new open space and links to the wider green infrastructure network has potential to achieve improvements to green infrastructure. A minor positive (+) effect could occur, however this is uncertain (?) at this stage prior to obtaining further information on design/layout and enhancement opportunities.
7.2 Is the location at risk from flooding, taking into account of the effects of climate change?	--?	This strategic location contains areas of Flood Zones 2 and 3 focussed around a watercourse. Therefore a minor negative (-) effect is likely. However, there are also areas of 'intermediate' surface water flooding risk, which increases the potential negative effects in relation to flood risks, albeit that these are also focussed around the watercourse. Therefore overall a significant negative (--) effect is likely. This effect is uncertain as it would depend on the ability of the design and layout of the particular development proposal to avoid or mitigate flood risk.
7.3 Will the development be at risk from coastal change? If so, can the Shoreline Management Plan Objectives be supported?	0	Not located in an area of coastal change therefore a negligible (0) effect is likely.

SA objective/ criterion	Justification	
8. Minimise Eastleigh's contribution to climate change by reducing the borough's carbon footprint and minimising other greenhouse gas emissions.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
9. Reduce waste generation and disposal, encourage waste prevention and reuse and achieve the sustainable management of waste.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
10. Protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and geodiversity, improving its quality and range.		
10.1 Is the location within the HRA screening zone?	--?	This strategic location contains a watercourse, which is no further than 8km upstream of a European site. Therefore a significant negative (--) effect is likely. This effect is uncertain as it depends on the potential for avoidance or mitigation measures to be included in a development proposal.
10.2 Is the location within 200m of a SSSI?	0	This strategic location is not within 200m of any SSSI designated sites; therefore a negligible (0) effect is likely.
10.3 Is the location within 200m of a Local Nature Reserve?	0	This strategic location is not within 200m of any Local Nature Reserve; therefore a negligible (0) effect is likely.
10.4 Will the development adversely affect a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation? (N.B. No NNRs are present in the District)	-?	Bushy Copse SINC is incorporated within this strategic location dissecting the site through the middle. A minor negative (-) effect is likely, although this is uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information on design/layout and consideration of mitigation and enhancement opportunities.
10.5 Will the development adversely affect sites with local designation of nature conservation value (e.g. Biodiversity Opportunity Areas, Biodiversity Action Plan Priority Areas, and Priority Habitat etc.)?	-?	Other than the SINC habitats within this strategic location, it appears to be agricultural with little biodiversity benefit. The exception to this is the bushy hedgerows / woodland strips present along some of the boundaries that link into and extend the habitats within the SINC.
10.6 Will the development adversely affect protected species?	-?	Due to the woodland and hedgerow network and the long grass habitat adjacent to the hedgerows and within the SINC, there are opportunities for badger, reptiles, and bat species to be using this complex. Dormice are known to be present within the locality. A minor negative (-) effect is likely, although this is uncertain (?) at this stage and is subject to consideration of design/layout and mitigation measures.
10.7 Will the development adversely impact the biodiversity network (e.g. Biodiversity Action Plan Priority Links)?	-?	The Wildern Priority Biodiversity Link incorporates the SINC and provides buffering. A minor negative (-) effect is likely, although this is uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information on design/layout and consideration of mitigation and enhancement opportunities.
10.8 Will the development adversely affect ancient	-?	Ancient woodland is identified within this location, although there is no indication that loss of this

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
woodland?		ancient woodland is proposed. A minor negative (-) effect is likely, although this is uncertain (?) at this stage and is subject to consideration of design/layout and mitigation measures.
11. Enhance the Borough's multifunctional green infrastructure networks.		
11.1 Will the development affect TPO trees?	0	There are no TPO trees within the site therefore a negligible effect is likely (0)
11.2 Can the location be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	+	There is a bridleway in the central area of this strategic location, which links the location to Holmesland Lane, Botley to the south-east and to the settlement of Hedge End at Shamblehurst Lane in the north-west. A cycle route forming part of the Eastleigh Cycle Network is also located adjacent to the south-western area of the site, linking the location to Hedge End at Shamblehurst Lane and to Woodhouse Lane. Given these opportunities to connect to the footpath and cycle network, a positive (+) effect is likely.
11.3 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure? (same score as 7.1)	+?	This strategic location is a greenfield site with some green infrastructure assets within or adjacent to the site (e.g. footpaths, woodland). Development at this location could result in a loss of green infrastructure. However, the design of development including new open space and links to the wider green infrastructure network has potential to achieve improvements to green infrastructure. A minor positive (+) effect could occur, however this is uncertain (?) at this stage prior to obtaining further information on design/layout and enhancement opportunities.
12. Protect, enhance and manage the character and appearance of the landscape and townscape, maintaining and strengthening distinctiveness and its special qualities.		
12.1 Will development adversely affect the separation of neighbouring settlements?	-?	Development in this strategic location is likely to diminish the separation between the settlements of Hedge End, Boorley Green and Botley. The eastern part of this location is located at the narrowest part of the gap between settlements which may be further eroded by the construction of a new bypass. A negative (-) effect is likely, although uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information on design and layout.
12.2 Will it protect the setting of the South Downs National Park?	0	Development at this location is unlikely to have an impact on the National Park. Therefore a negligible (0) effect is likely.
12.3 Will it protect the character of the countryside, coast, towns and/or villages?	-?	Development in this location will have an effect on the open undeveloped character of the landscape north and south of the vegetation lining the stream course running through the site. A minor negative (-) effect is likely, although uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information on design and layout.
12.4 Will it have an impact on locally important views	-?	Development is likely to be evident from the road

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
and settings?		bridge crossing the railway, from Woodhouse Lane and public rights of way as well as from the edge of the settlement. A minor negative (-) effect is likely, although uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information on design and layout.
13. Protect and enhance and manage buildings, monuments, features, sites, places, areas and landscapes of archaeological, historical and cultural heritage importance.		
13.1 Will the development protect and enhance listed buildings and their settings, conservation areas, archaeological sites, historic landscapes and other sites of local importance for heritage?	0	Whilst the historic park/garden of Botleigh Grange is to the south, there are no heritage assets within the strategic location. Therefore a negligible (0) effect is likely.

Hound 1 – South of Bursledon

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
1. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified local needs, including affordability and special needs		
1.1 Will the development provide a significant contribution towards meeting identified affordable housing needs?	+?	No issues have yet been raised that would suggest the typical proportion (35%) could not be achieved. Therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely. The proportion of affordable housing which could be delivered is currently uncertain (?) until further work is undertaken by the site promoter.
1.2 Will it provide other elements of identified housing need e.g. housing for older persons, self-build, support housing?	+?	There is scope in this location for provision other elements of identified housing need. Site promoter has not proposed to meet other such elements of identified housing need. A minor positive (+) effect could occur but is uncertain (?) at this stage.
2. Safeguard and improve community health, safety and wellbeing		
2.1 Are community facilities (community hall or library) available locally?	+	The north eastern area of this strategic location is within 400m of two community halls including The Pilands Wood Centre and Bursledon Scout and Guide Headquarters. The rest of this location is within 800m of these community facilities plus Hound Parish Hall to the west and Hype Youth Centre to the south. Therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely.
2.2 Are health facilities available locally?	+	This strategic location is within 1.0km of several healthcare facilities including the Blackthorn Health Centre to the south and the Lowford Centre to the north of this location. Therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely.
2.3 What effect would the development have on local provision of sports pitches and facilities?	+?	There is scope in this location for provision of sports pitches and facilities therefore a minor positive effect (+) could occur. Site promoters have not indicated that sports pitches would be provided as part of development at this location. Therefore, the effect is uncertain (?) at this stage.
2.4 Is public open space available locally?	+	The northern and eastern area of this strategic location is within 400m of three open spaces including Mallards Moor adjacent to the far eastern edge of this location, Hungerford public open space further to the east and Cunningham Gardens to the north-west. The rest of this strategic location is within 800m of these public open space facilities. Therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely.
2.5 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network?	+	There is a footpath bisecting the western boundary of this strategic location linking it to Pound Road and Hound Way. A cycle route forming part of the Eastleigh Cycle Network crosses this location, providing routes to the north and south along Hamble Lane. Therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely.
3. Develop a dynamic and diverse economy		
3.1(a) Is the location close to a major rail station?	-	This strategic location is over 1200m from a major rail station; therefore a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
3.1 (b) Is the location close to a minor rail station?	-	This strategic location is over 600m from a minor rail station; therefore a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
3.1 (c) Is the location close to a frequent bus route?	+	The far northern edge of this strategic location is within 600m of the First Bus route serving X4/X5

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
		Southampton-Bursledon-Fareham- Portsmouth/ Gosport; therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely.
3.1 (d) Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route?	-	This strategic location is over 300m from a semi-frequent bus service. Therefore a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
3.1 (e) Is the location close to a major employment centre?	-	This strategic location is over 1.0km from a major employment centre; therefore a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
3.2 Will the proposed development contribute towards meeting the need for new industrial, office or warehousing floorspace?	-	This location has not been favourably considered for employment as part of the SLAA. The site promoter has not stated if employment would be part of development at this location. Therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
3.3 Will the proposed development result in a net loss of existing employment land, or land which would be suitable for employment purposes?	0	The development of this strategic location will not result in any loss of existing employment land therefore a negligible (0) effect is likely.
3.4 Will the proposed development increase the amount of commercial uses and other facilities in town, district or local centres?	0	This strategic location is identified for residential use only and is located outside district and local centres and will therefore not result in any loss of a primary shopping area. Therefore a negligible (0) effect is likely.
4. Reduce road traffic and congestion through improved accessibility to services homes and jobs; reducing the need to travel by car/lorry and improving sustainable travel choice		
4.1 Is the location close to a major rail station? (same score as 3.1a)	-	This strategic location is over 1200m from a major rail station; therefore a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
4.2 Is the location close to a minor rail station? (same score as 3.1b)	-	This Strategic location is over 600m from a minor rail station; therefore a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
4.3 Is the location close to a frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1c)	+	The far northern edge of this strategic location is within 600m of the First Bus route X4/X5 serving Southampton-Bursledon-Fareham- Portsmouth/ Gosport; therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely.
4.4 Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1d)	-	This strategic location is over 300m from a semi-frequent bus service. Therefore a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
4.5(a) Will residential development at the location be close to a major employment centre? (same score as 3.1e)	-	This strategic location is over 1.0km from a major employment centre; therefore a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
4.5(b) Will employment development at the location be close to a major population centre?	0	This strategic location is for residential use only; therefore a negligible (0) effect is likely.
4.6 Are health facilities available locally? (same score as 2.2)	+	This strategic location is within 1.0km of several healthcare facilities including both sites of the Blackthorn Health Centre to the south of this location. Therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely.
4.7 Are shopping and related services available locally?	+	The eastern half of this strategic location is within 400m of Pilands Wood local centre in Bursledon and within 800m of Lowford village centre in Bursledon. The rest of this location is within 800m of Pilands Wood in Bursledon. Therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely.
4.8 Is the location close to a Primary school?	0	The north eastern area of this location is within 800m of Bursledon Junior School and Bursledon Church Of England Infant School. The rest of this location is

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
		over 800m from any primary school facility, therefore a negligible (0) effect is likely.
4.9 Is the location close to a Secondary school?	+	Most of this strategic location is within 800m of Hamble Community Sports College, to the south. The rest of this location is within 1.6km of this secondary school facility, therefore a minor positive (+) effect is likely.
4.10 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	+	There is a footpath bisecting the western boundary of this strategic location linking it to Pound Road and Hound Way. A cycle route forming part of the Eastleigh Cycle Network crosses this location, providing routes to the north and south along Hamble Lane. Therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely.
4.11 Are there Geographical barriers between the location and key facilities/ destinations?	+	There are no geographical barriers on the most direct walking route to any destination. Therefore a minor positive (+) effect is likely.
5. Protect and conserve natural resources		
5.1 Will development avoid the sterilisation of mineral resources?	-?	Most of this strategic location is within an area of potential Sharp Sand and Gravel Resource, which has been safeguarded in the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan 2013. This is also a River Terrace Depository Consultation Area, identified in the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan. Development at this location could prevent future mineral extraction therefore a minor negative (-) effect is likely. This effect is uncertain as the potential for effects will depend on the scale and design of development proposals and whether minerals can be extracted prior to development within the Local Plan period.
5.2 Will it result in the loss of higher grade agricultural land?	-	This strategic site is located on medium quality (Grade 3a or 3b) agricultural land; therefore a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
5.3 Will it use previously developed land?	+/-	This strategic location is located on both greenfield and previously developed land; therefore, a mixed-minor positive and minor negative (+/-) effect is likely.
5.4 Will it deliver or support allotments or community farms?	+?	This location could be suitable for new allotments/community farms. The site promoter has not indicated if these facilities would be included as part of development at this location. A minor positive (+) effect could occur, however this is currently uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information.
6. Reduce air, soil, water, light and noise pollution		
6.1 Will the location be affected by significant noise generating uses or Air Quality Management Areas?	-?	This strategic location could be significantly affected by noise from road traffic on Hamble Lane. It is in proximity to a restored former landfill site and a detailed site investigation is required but should be able to manage potential pollution effects through remedial measures. This location is not within the Hamble Lane AQMA. Overall, a minor negative (-) effect is likely but uncertain (?) subject to technical assessments and consideration of mitigation.
6.2 Will development increase pollution?	--?	Due to the scale of the proposed development, increases in car use are likely to significantly impact on a nearby existing Air Quality Management Area. A

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
		detailed air quality assessment would be required to determine impacts on existing air quality. Therefore a significant negative (--) effect is likely but uncertain (?) subject to technical assessments and consideration of mitigation.
7. Plan for the anticipated levels of climate change		
7.1 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure?	+?	This strategic location is a greenfield site with some GI assets within or adjacent to the site (e.g. footpaths, woodland). Development at this location could result in a loss of GI. However, the design of development including new open space and links to the wider GI network has potential for improvements to GI. A minor positive (+) effect could occur, however this is uncertain (?) at this stage prior to obtaining further information on design/layout and enhancement opportunities.
7.2 Is the location at risk from flooding, taking into account of the effects of climate change?	-?	This strategic location contains areas of 'less' surface water risk. Therefore a minor negative (-) effect is likely. This effect is uncertain as it would depend on the ability of the design and layout of the particular development proposal to avoid or mitigate flood risk.
7.3 Will the development be at risk from coastal change? If so, can the Shoreline Management Plan Objectives be supported?	0	Not located in an area of coastal change therefore a negligible (0) effect is likely.
8. Minimise Eastleigh's contribution to climate change by reducing the borough's carbon footprint and minimising other greenhouse gas emissions.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
9. Reduce waste generation and disposal, encourage waste prevention and reuse and achieve the sustainable management of waste.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
10. Protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and geodiversity, improving its quality and range.		
10.1 Is the location within the HRA screening zone?	0	This strategic location is not within the HRA screening zone; therefore a negligible (0) effect is likely.
10.2 Is the location within 200m of a SSSI?	0	This strategic location is not within 200m of any SSSI designated sites; therefore a negligible (0) effect is likely.
10.3 Is the location within 200m of a Local Nature Reserve?	0	This strategic location is not within 200m of any Local Nature Reserve; therefore a negligible (0) effect is likely.
10.4 Will the development adversely affect a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation? (N.B. No NNRs are present in the District)	-?	The western part of this location is adjacent to Priors Hill Brickworks SINC and Priors Hill Reservoir SINC with a small section adjacent to Priors Hill Copse/Hound Grove SINC. Priors Hill Brickworks SINC is designated for its rush pasture, and wet willow and oak woodland. Priors Hill Reservoir contains a reservoir surrounded by oak and hazel woodland which is probably ancient in origin. Finally Priors Hill Copse/Hound Grove SINC is designated for its oak, birch and ash ancient woodland and wet willow Carr. Spear Pond Gully runs throughout the SINC network. The eastern part of this strategic location is adjacent to Lower Pilands Woods SINC which is designated for its ancient Oak/ hazel

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
		woodland and alder Carr. This is part of a larger complex of ancient woodland which incorporates the Hungerford Stream. A minor negative (-) effect is likely, although this is uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information on design/layout and consideration of mitigation and enhancement opportunities.
10.5 Will the development adversely affect sites with local designation of nature conservation value (e.g. Biodiversity Opportunity Areas, Biodiversity Action Plan Priority Areas, and Priority Habitat etc.)?	-?	All SINCs within the complexes detailed above are incorporated into the Hamble Estuary Priority Biodiversity Areas (PBA). However, this does not extend into the strategic location. To enhance the adjacent PBA there are opportunities to establish woodland connections through this location. A minor negative (-) effect is likely, although this is uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information on design/layout and consideration of mitigation and enhancement opportunities.
10.6 Will the development adversely affect protected species?	-?	Reptiles may be present at the boundaries of the strategic location. A minor negative (-) effect could occur but this is uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information on design/layout.
10.6 Will the development adversely impact the biodiversity network (e.g. Biodiversity Action Plan Priority Links)?	-?	Hamble Estuary PBA lies to east and west of this strategic location. A minor negative (-) effect is likely, although this is uncertain (?) at this stage and is subject to consideration of design/layout and mitigation measures.
10.7 Will the development adversely affect ancient woodland?	-?	Ancient woodland is identified adjacent to this strategic location, although there is no indication that loss of this ancient woodland is proposed. A minor negative (-) effect is likely, although this is uncertain (?) at this stage and is subject to consideration of design/layout and mitigation measures.
11. Enhance the Borough's multifunctional green infrastructure networks.		
11.1 Will the development affect TPO trees?	-?	There are tree preservation orders on the western boundary of the strategic location. A minor negative (-) effect is likely, although this is uncertain (?) at this stage and is subject to consideration of design/layout and mitigation measures.
11.2 Can the location be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	+	There is a footpath bisecting the western boundary of this strategic location linking it to Pound Road and Hound Way. A cycle route forming part of the Eastleigh Cycle Network crosses this location, providing routes to the north and south along Hamble Lane. Therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely.
11.3 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure? (same score as 7.1)	+?	This strategic location is a greenfield site with some GI assets within or adjacent to the site (e.g. footpaths, woodland). Development at this location could result in a loss of GI. However, the design of development including new open space and links to the wider GI network has potential for improvements to GI. A minor positive (+) effect could occur, however this is uncertain (?) at this stage prior to

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
		obtaining further information on design/layout and enhancement opportunities.
12. Protect, enhance and manage the character and appearance of the landscape and townscape, maintaining and strengthening distinctiveness and its special qualities.		
12.1 Will development adversely affect the separation of neighbouring settlements?	-?	Development in this strategic location will have the effect of extending the Bursledon settlement edge further south and development either side of Hamble Lane is likely to reduce the perceived separation between Hamble, Bursledon and Hound when viewed from Hamble Lane, Hound Road and public footpaths in the area. The effect on the gap between Bursledon and Hound is likely to be more significant because of the closer proximity of these settlements. A minor negative (-) effect is likely, although uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information on design and layout.
12.2 Will it protect the setting of the South Downs National Park?	0	Development at this strategic location is unlikely to have an impact on the National Park. Therefore a negligible effect is likely.
12.3 Will it protect the character of the countryside, coast, towns and/or villages?	-?	Development in this strategic location will have an impact on the predominantly open character of the coastal plain landscape although the land slopes downwards towards the north eastern corner which helps to mitigate the impact. The land on both sides of Hamble Lane includes a mix of hedgerows and small buildings within the surrounding more open landscape. A minor negative (-) effect is likely, although uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information on design and layout.
12.4 Will it have an impact on locally important views and settings?	-?	Development in this location is likely to be evident from Hamble Lane, local footpaths and the urban edge. A minor negative (-) effect is likely, although uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information on design and layout.
13. Protect and enhance and manage buildings, monuments, features, sites, places, areas and landscapes of archaeological, historical and cultural heritage importance.		
13.1 Will the development protect and enhance listed buildings and their settings, conservation areas, archaeological sites, historic landscapes and other sites of local importance for heritage?	-?	The eastern boundary of this strategic location adjoins the Old Bursledon Conservation Area. A bunker is also located at the southern boundary of this location. A minor negative (-) effect is likely, although uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information on design and layout.

West End 1 - Land east and west of Allington Lane, north of the railway line

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
1. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified local needs, including affordability and special needs		
1.1 Will the development provide a significant contribution towards meeting identified affordable housing needs?	+?	No issues have yet been raised that would suggest the typical proportion (35%) could not be achieved. Therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely. The proportion of affordable housing which could be delivered is currently uncertain (?) until further work is undertaken by the site promoter.
1.2 Will it provide other elements of identified housing need e.g. housing for older persons, self-build, support housing?	+?	There is scope in this strategic location for provision of other elements of identified housing need. The site promoter has not proposed to meet other such elements of identified housing need. A minor positive (+) effect could occur but is uncertain (?) at this stage.
2. Safeguard and improve community health, safety and wellbeing		
2.1 Are community facilities (community hall or library) available locally?	-	The location is more than 800m from the nearest community facilities; therefore a minor negative (-) effect is likely. It is noted that a new local centre as part of development west of Horton Heath, immediately to the east of this strategic location, has a resolution to permit.
2.2 Are health facilities available locally?	--	The location is more than 1,000m from the nearest health facilities; therefore a significant negative (- -) effect is likely.
2.3 What effect would the development have on local provision of sports pitches and facilities?	+?	There is scope in this strategic location for provision of sports pitches and facilities therefore a positive effect (+) could occur. Site promoters have not indicated that sports pitches would be provided as part of development at this strategic location. Therefore effect is uncertain (?) at this stage.
2.4 Is public open space available locally?	++	The northern, eastern and western areas of this strategic location are within 800m of public open space. Site promoters have also indicated that additional public open space would be provided as part of development at this strategic location. Therefore, a significant positive (++) effect is likely.
2.5 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network?	0	In the eastern half of this strategic location two footpaths bisect from east to west. There are not public rights of way to the west of Allington Lane at this strategic location. There are no opportunities, in isolation, to connect directly to cycle paths which form part of the Eastleigh Cycle Network to this strategic location along Allington Lane. Therefore, a negligible (0) effect is likely.
3. Develop a dynamic and diverse economy		
3.1(a) Is the location close to a major rail station?	-	This strategic location is more than 1,200m from the nearest major rail station; therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
3.1 (b) Is the location close to a minor rail station?	-	This strategic location is more than 600m away from the nearest minor rail station; therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
3.1 (c) Is the location close to a frequent bus route?	-	The location is more than 600m to the nearest frequent bus route. Therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
3.1 (d) Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route?	-	This strategic location is more than 300m from the nearest semi-frequent bus route; therefore, a minor

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
		negative (-) effect is likely.
3.1 (e) Is the location close to a major employment centre?	-	This strategic location is more than 1000m from the nearest major employment centre; therefore a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
3.2 Will the proposed development contribute towards meeting the need for new industrial, office or warehousing floorspace?	0	There are some small employment premises along Allington Lane. Location could well be suitable for further employment floorspace. However, the site promoter has not indicated if the existing employment would be retained or if any new employment would be included as part of development. Overall, a negligible (0) effect is likely, although this is uncertain at this stage.
3.3 Will the proposed development result in a net loss of existing employment land, or land which would be suitable for employment purposes?	-	Small scale and low cost employment units currently along Allington Lane likely to be lost; therefore a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
3.4 Will the proposed development increase the amount of commercial uses and other facilities in town, district or local centres?	0	There would be no change in the amount of commercial uses in town, district and local centres; therefore, a negligible (0) effect is likely. It is noted that development in this strategic location could increase the catchment of existing centres and the new local centre proposed on land east of Horton Heath, however this is uncertain due to distance from these centres.
4. Reduce road traffic and congestion through improved accessibility to services homes and jobs; reducing the need to travel by car/lorry and improving sustainable travel choice		
4.1 Is the location close to a major rail station? (same score as 3.1a)	-	This strategic locations is more than 1,200m from the nearest major rail station; therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
4.2 Is the location close to a minor rail station? (same score as 3.1b)	-	This strategic location is more than 600m away from the nearest minor rail station; therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
4.3 Is the location close to a frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1c)	-	The location is more than 600m to the nearest frequent bus route. Therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
4.4 Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1d)	-	This strategic location is more than 300m from the nearest semi-frequent bus route; therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
4.5(a) Will residential development at the location be close to a major employment centre? (same score as 3.1e)	-	This strategic location is more than 1,000m from the nearest major employment centre. Therefore a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
4.5(b) Will employment development at the location be close to a major population centre?	0	There is no significant employment use; therefore, a minor negligible (0) effect is likely.
4.6 Are health facilities available locally? (same score as 2.2)	--	The strategic location is more than 1,000m from the nearest health facilities; therefore a significant negative (-) effect is likely.
4.7 Are shopping and related services available locally?	-	This strategic location is more than 800m from the nearest shopping and related facilities. Therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely. It is noted that a new local centre as part of development west of Horton Heath, immediately to the east of this strategic location, has a resolution to permit.
4.8 Is the location close to a Primary school?	-	The location is more than 800m from the nearest primary school. Therefore a minor negative (-) effect is likely. It is noted that a new primary school as part of development west of Horton Heath, immediately to the east of this strategic location, has a resolution to permit

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
4.9 Is the location close to a Secondary school?	0	This majority of this strategic location is within 1600m of Wyvern College. Therefore a negligible (0) effect is likely. There are recognised capacity issues at Wyvern School and further work will need to be undertaken regarding secondary school provision. It is noted that a new secondary school as part of development west of Horton Heath, immediately to the east of this strategic location, has a resolution to permit.
4.10 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	0	In the eastern half of this strategic location two footpaths bisect from east to west. There are not public rights of way to the west of Allington Lane at this strategic location. There are no opportunities, in isolation, to connect directly to cycle paths which form part of the Eastleigh Cycle Network to this strategic location along Allington Lane. Therefore, a negligible (0) effect is likely.
4.11 Are there Geographical barriers between the location and key facilities/ destinations?	-	The primary route to the nearest settlement and its facilities and services is via Allington Lane to Fair Oak. This route has fast traffic along a narrow lane, with limited lighting and pavements. A minor negative (-) effect is likely.
5. Protect and conserve natural resources		
5.1 Will development avoid the sterilisation of mineral resources?	-?	Areas designated for HCC Minerals Safeguarding and as part of the HCC Minerals Consultation Area are identified at the boundary of the site to the north, east and west. Development could potentially have a minor negative (-) effect access to the potential mineral resource is lost by development. This effect is uncertain (?) until it is determined if extraction of these potential minerals can or should be undertaken prior to the location being developed
5.2 Will it result in the loss of higher grade agricultural land?	-	The strategic location is predominantly Grade 4 agricultural land to the west of Allington Lane and to the east of Allington Lane it is predominantly Grade 3 agricultural land. Overall, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
5.3 Will it use previously developed land?	+/-	The majority of the strategic location is previously undeveloped. However, the location does include agricultural related buildings and has uses including a fruit farm, garden centre and Allington Manor Business Centre. Therefore a mixed (+/-) effect is likely.
5.4 Will it deliver or support allotments or community farms?	+?	This strategic location could be suitable for new allotments/community farms. The site promoter has not indicated if these facilities would be included as part of development at this strategic location. A minor positive (+) effect could occur, however this is currently uncertain (?) prior to further information.
6. Reduce air, soil, water, light and noise pollution		
6.1 Will the location be affected by significant noise generating uses or Air Quality Management Areas?	-?	There are no AQMAs which would be affected by this strategic location. The railway line is adjacent to the south of this strategic location which would have the potential to have an adverse noise impact upon development at this strategic location. A minor negative (-) effect is likely, but is uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information on design/layout and consideration of mitigation measures.

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
6.2 Will development increase pollution?	- -?	Given the scale of the strategic location there is likely to be a significant impact on traffic flows and volumes on nearby roads and potentially to Eastleigh town. Pollution from a significant increase in vehicles could impact local air quality generally, the Eastleigh AQMA, and the nature conservation interests of the River Itchen SAC. A new road is proposed in combination with development at other nearby strategic locations. The effect of such a road scheme is currently uncertain. A significant negative (- -) effect could occur, although is currently uncertain (?) prior to further transport assessment work and consideration of mitigation opportunities.
7. Plan for the anticipated levels of climate change		
7.1 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure?	+?	The strategic location is a greenfield site with some GI assets within or adjacent to the site (e.g. footpaths, woodland). Development at this strategic location could result in a loss of GI. However, the design of development including new open space and links to the wider GI network has potential for improvements to GI. A minor positive (+) effect could occur, however this is uncertain (?) at this stage prior to further information on design/layout and enhancement opportunities.
7.2 Is the location at risk from flooding, taking into account of the effects of climate change?	--?	Areas identified in Flood Zones 1 and 2 are on the north, east and west edges of this strategic location. Areas of 'less' or 'intermediate' risk of surface water flooding are found in small areas across this strategic location. Therefore, a significant negative (--) effect is likely. However, the overall effect at this strategic location is uncertain (?) as the majority of the site is not within an area of flood risk and consideration of design and mitigation options is required.
7.3 Will the development be at risk from coastal change? If so, can the Shoreline Management Plan Objectives be supported?	0	Not located in an area of coastal change; therefore a negligible (0) effect is likely.
8. Minimise Eastleigh's contribution to climate change by reducing the borough's carbon footprint and minimising other greenhouse gas emissions.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
9. Reduce waste generation and disposal, encourage waste prevention and reuse and achieve the sustainable management of waste.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
10. Protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and geodiversity, improving its quality and range.		
10.1 Is the location within the HRA screening zone?	- -?	Watercourses are identified along the edges of this strategic location and into the location in the western part of the location. A significant negative (- -) effect could occur, subject (?) to the outcome of HRA screening and consideration of mitigation.
10.2 Is the location within 200m of a SSSI?	- -?	The River Itchen SSSI is adjacent to the west of this strategic location; therefore, a significant negative (- -) effect is likely and mitigation may be required (?).

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
10.3 Is the location within 200m of a Local Nature Reserve?	0	The location is not within 200m of a Local Nature Reserve; therefore, a negligible (0) effect is likely.
10.4 Will the development adversely affect a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation? (N.B. No NNRs are present in the District)	-?	Allington Lane Pond SINC which contains a woodland pond situated on the southern boundary of a neutral meadow. Hearts Copse SINC is designated for its ancient woodland which is currently unmanaged. Hearts Copse is likely to be important for great crested newts. A minor negative (-) effect is likely, although this is uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information on design/layout and consideration of mitigation and enhancement opportunities.
10.5 Will the development adversely affect sites with local designation of nature conservation value (e.g. Biodiversity Opportunity Areas, Biodiversity Action Plan Priority Areas, and Priority Habitat etc.)?	-?	Historic surveys indicate that the grassland within the site contains areas of herb rich, damp or rush dominated grassland. The hedgerow network within these sites appears damaged but there is potential for restoration. A minor negative (-) effect is likely, although this is uncertain (?) prior to further obtaining information on design/layout and consideration of mitigation and enhancement opportunities.
10.6 Will the development adversely affect protected species?	-?	Protected species likely to be present at this strategic location include, but are not limited to: otters, dormice, great crested newts, bats, water voles, and reptiles. A minor negative (-) effect is likely but is uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information on layout/design and consideration of mitigation and enhancement opportunities.
10.7 Will the development adversely impact the biodiversity network (e.g. Biodiversity Action Plan Priority Links)?	-?	The Chalcroft Priority Biodiversity Link runs along the eastern and south western edges of this strategic location. A minor negative (-) effect is likely, although this is uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information on design/layout and consideration of mitigation and enhancement opportunities.
10.8 Will the development adversely affect ancient woodland?	-?	Hearts Copse SINC is designated for its ancient woodland which is currently unmanaged. There could be opportunities for enhancement by improved management. A minor negative (-) effect is likely, although this is uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information on design/layout and consideration of mitigation and enhancement opportunities.
11. Enhance the Borough's multifunctional green infrastructure networks.		
11.1 Will the development affect TPO trees?	0	There are no TPO trees present within or in the vicinity of this strategic location; therefore, a negligible (0) effect is likely.
11.2 Can the location be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	0	In the eastern half of this strategic location two footpaths bisect from east to west. There are no public rights of way to the west of Allington Lane at this strategic location. There are no opportunities, in isolation, to connect directly to cycle paths which form part of the Eastleigh Cycle Network to this strategic location along Allington Lane. Therefore, a negligible (0) effect is likely.
11.3 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure? (same score as 7.1)	+?	The strategic location is a greenfield site with some GI assets within or adjacent to the site (e.g. footpaths, woodland). Development at this strategic location could result in a loss of GI. However, the design of development including new open space and links to the wider GI network has potential for improvements to GI. A minor positive

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
		(+) effect could occur, however this is uncertain (?) at this stage prior to obtaining further information on design/layout and enhancement opportunities.
12. Protect, enhance and manage the character and appearance of the landscape and townscape, maintaining and strengthening distinctiveness and its special qualities.		
12.1 Will development adversely affect the separation of neighbouring settlements?	-	Development at this strategic location could contribute to the coalescence of development west of Horton Heath with Bishopstoke/Fair Oak. A minor negative (-) effect is likely, although uncertain prior to obtaining further information on design/layout.
12.2 Will it protect the setting of the South Downs National Park?	0	Development at this strategic location is unlikely to have an impact on the National Park.
12.3 Will it protect the character of the countryside, coast, towns and/or villages?	-	The open land in the Itchen Valley would be affected and the open land east of Allington Lane north of the railway. A minor negative (-) effect is likely, although uncertain prior to obtaining further information on design/layout.
12.4 Will it have an impact on locally important views and settings?	-	Visibility of development within the open land on both sides of Allington Lane and possibly across the Itchen Valley is likely. A minor negative (-) effect is likely, although uncertain prior to obtaining further information on design/layout.
13. Protect and enhance and manage buildings, monuments, features, sites, places, areas and landscapes of archaeological, historical and cultural heritage importance.		
13.1 Will the development protect and enhance listed buildings and their settings, conservation areas, archaeological sites, historic landscapes and other sites of local importance for heritage?	-?	Allington Manor Historic Park and Garden is present within in the south western area of this strategic location. There are also two prehistoric enclosures located toward the centre of the location. A minor negative (-) effect could occur, but is uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information on design/layout.

West End 2 - North of Moorgreen Road and between Bubb Lane and Burnetts Lane

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
1. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified local needs, including affordability and special needs		
1.1 Will the development provide a significant contribution towards meeting identified affordable housing needs?	+?	No issues have yet been raised that would suggest the typical proportion (35%) could not be achieved. Therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely. The proportion of affordable housing which could be delivered is currently uncertain (?) until further work is undertaken by the site promoter.
1.2 Will it provide other elements of identified housing need e.g. housing for older persons, self-build, support housing?	+?	There is scope in this strategic location for provision of other elements of identified housing need. The site promoter has not proposed to meet other such elements of identified housing need. A minor positive (+) effect could occur but is uncertain (?) at this stage.
2. Safeguard and improve community health, safety and wellbeing		
2.1 Are community facilities (community hall or library) available locally?	0	The west of this strategic location is within 800m of Moorgreen Youth Club; therefore a negligible (0) effect is likely.
2.2 Are health facilities available locally?	+	The west of the strategic location is within 1000m of West End GP Surgery. Therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely.
2.3 What effect would the development have on local provision of sports pitches and facilities?	+?	There is scope in this strategic location for provision of sports pitches and facilities, therefore a positive effect (+) could occur. Site promoters have not indicated that sports pitches would be provided as part of development at this strategic location. Therefore effect is uncertain (?) at this stage.
2.4 Is public open space available locally?	0	The strategic location is within 800m of a number of areas of public open space including: Moorgreen Recreational ground, Dowds Farm and Moorgreen Meadows. Therefore, a negligible (0) effect is likely.
2.5 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network?	+	Two footpaths bisect the strategic location from north west to south east. The footpath further to the north east connects to a cycle route which is part of the Eastleigh Cycle Network. The potential to explore an upgrade to the existing footpath or providing a new connection to the nearby cycle route. Therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely.
3. Develop a dynamic and diverse economy		
3.1(a) Is the location close to a major rail station?	++	This strategic locations is within 1,200m of Hedge End rail station; therefore a significant positive (++) effect is likely.
3.1 (b) Is the location close to a minor rail station?	-	This strategic location is more than 600m away from the nearest minor rail station; therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
3.1 (c) Is the location close to a frequent bus route?	-	This strategic location is more than 600m to the nearest frequent bus route. Therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
3.1 (d) Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route?	-	The south east edge of this strategic location is just within 300m of the First 8 bus service connecting Hedge End to Southampton via West End. Because the significant majority of the location is further

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
		than 300m, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
3.1 (e) Is the location close to a major employment centre?	-	This strategic location is more than 1000m from the nearest major employment centre; therefore a minor negative (-) negative effect is likely.
3.2 Will the proposed development contribute towards meeting the need for new industrial, office or warehousing floorspace?	-	This strategic location has not been considered for employment as part of the SLAA. The site promoter has not stated if employment would be part of development at this strategic location. Therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
3.3 Will the proposed development result in a net loss of existing employment land, or land which would be suitable for employment purposes?	0	No net loss of existing employment land would result in development of this strategic location; therefore, a negligible (0) effect is likely.
3.4 Will the proposed development increase the amount of commercial uses and other facilities in town, district or local centres?	0	There would be no change in the amount of commercial uses in town, district and local centres; therefore, a negligible (0) effect is likely.
4. Reduce road traffic and congestion through improved accessibility to services homes and jobs; reducing the need to travel by car/lorry and improving sustainable travel choice		
4.1 Is the location close to a major rail station? (same score as 3.1a)	++	This strategic location is within 1,200m of Hedge End rail station; therefore a significant positive (++) effect is likely.
4.2 Is the location close to a minor rail station? (same score as 3.1b)	-	This strategic location is more than 600m away from the nearest minor rail station; therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
4.3 Is the location close to a frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1c)	-	The location is more than 600m to the nearest frequent bus route. Therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
4.4 Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1d)	-	The south east edge of this strategic location is just within 300m of the First 8 bus service connecting Hedge End to Southampton via West End. Because the significant majority is further than 300m, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
4.5(a) Will residential development at the location be close to a major employment centre? (same score as 3.1e)	-	The strategic location is more than 1,000m from the nearest major employment centre; therefore a minor negative (-) negative effect is likely.
4.5(b) Will employment development at the location be close to a major population centre?	0	There is no significant employment use; therefore, a negligible (0) effect is likely.
4.6 Are health facilities available locally? (same score as 2.2)	+	The west of the location is within 1,000m of West End GP Surgery. Therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely.
4.7 Are shopping and related services available locally?	-	This strategic location is more than 800m from the nearest shopping and related facilities. Therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
4.8 Is the location close to a Primary school?	+	The west of this strategic location is within 400m of St James Church of England Primary School. Therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely. The majority of the rest of this location is within 800m of either St James Church of England Primary School or Wellstead Primary School.
4.9 Is the location close to a Secondary school?	0	This strategic location is more than 1,600m from the nearest secondary school; therefore a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
4.10 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	+	Two footpaths bisect this strategic location from north west to south east. The footpath further to the north east connects to a cycle route which is part of the Eastleigh Cycle Network. There is potential to explore an upgrade to the existing

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
		footpath or providing a new connection to the nearby cycle route. Therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely.
4.11 Are there Geographical barriers between the location and key facilities/ destinations?	--	The M27 to the south and railway line to the north are somewhat of a barrier to facilities and services in West End and new facilities expected to come forward as part of development to the west of Horton Heath. Main roads run broadly north east to south west and act as a barrier to direct east-west movement between this strategic location and the facilities and services of Hedge End. Footpaths connect through from this strategic location to Hedge End, but poor lighting and lack of natural surveillance limit these routes for regular day-to-day use. Therefore, a significant negative (--) effect is likely.
5. Protect and conserve natural resources		
5.1 Will development avoid the sterilisation of mineral resources?	0	This strategic location is not an area safeguarded for minerals extraction or in a minerals and waste consultation area; therefore a negligible (0) effect is likely.
5.2 Will it result in the loss of higher grade agricultural land?	--?	The majority of the strategic location is grade 3 agricultural land, however there is a small area (less than 0.5ha) of grade 2 land is present at the eastern edge of this strategic location. Therefore there is potential for a significant negative (--) effect, however this is uncertain (?) before design and layout is explored.
5.3 Will it use previously developed land?	-	This strategic location is a previously undeveloped, greenfield location. Therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
5.4 Will it deliver or support allotments or community farms?	+?	This strategic location could be suitable for new allotments/community farms. The site promoter has not indicated if these facilities would be included as part of development at this strategic location. A minor positive (+) effect could occur, however this is currently uncertain (?) prior to further information.
6. Reduce air, soil, water, light and noise pollution		
6.1 Will the location be affected by significant noise generating uses or Air Quality Management Areas?	-?	The east of this strategic location is in close proximity to the railway line, which would have a potentially adverse noise impact upon new development at this location. The location is unlikely to be affected by or have an effect on an AQMA. Overall, a minor negative effect (-) is likely but is uncertain (?) prior to further information on design/layout.
6.2 Will development increase pollution?	--?	Given the scale of the strategic location there is likely to be a significant impact on traffic flows and volumes on nearby roads and potentially to Eastleigh town. Pollution from a significant increase in vehicles could impact local air quality generally and the nature conservation interests of the River Itchen SAC. A new road is proposed in combination with development at other nearby strategic locations. The effect of such a road scheme is currently uncertain. A significant negative (--) effect could occur, although is currently uncertain (?) prior to further transport assessment work and consideration of mitigation opportunities.

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
7. Plan for the anticipated levels of climate change		
7.1 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure?	+?	The strategic location is a greenfield site with some GI assets within or adjacent to the site (e.g. footpaths, woodland). Development at this strategic location could result in a loss of GI. However, the design of development including new open space and links to the wider GI network has potential for improvements to GI. A minor positive (+) effect could occur, however this is uncertain (?) at this stage prior to obtaining further information on design/layout and enhancement opportunities.
7.2 Is the location at risk from flooding, taking into account of the effects of climate change?	--?	Small areas identified at 'less' or 'intermediate' risk of surface water flooding are present at this strategic location. Therefore, a significant negative (--) effect is likely. However, the overall effect at this strategic location is uncertain (?) as the majority of the site is not within an area of flood risk and consideration of design and mitigation options is required.
7.3 Will the development be at risk from coastal change? If so, can the Shoreline Management Plan Objectives be supported?	0	Not located in an area of coastal change.
8. Minimise Eastleigh's contribution to climate change by reducing the borough's carbon footprint and minimising other greenhouse gas emissions.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
9. Reduce waste generation and disposal, encourage waste prevention and reuse and achieve the sustainable management of waste.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
10. Protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and geodiversity, improving its quality and range.		
10.1 Is the location within the HRA screening zone?	--?	Watercourses which are tributaries of the River Itchen bisect this location from north to south; therefore a significant negative effect (-) could occur, subject (?) to the outcome of HRA screening and consideration of mitigation.
10.2 Is the location within 200m of a SSSI?	0	This strategic location is not within 200m of a SSSI; therefore, a negligible (0) effect is likely.
10.3 Is the location within 200m of a Local Nature Reserve?	0	This strategic location is not within 200m of a Local Nature Reserve; therefore, a negligible (0) effect is likely.
10.4 Will the development adversely affect a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation? (N.B. No NNRs are present in the District)	0	Development at this strategic location is unlikely to have an adverse impact on a SINC.
10.5 Will the development adversely affect sites with local designation of nature conservation value (e.g. Biodiversity Opportunity Areas, Biodiversity Action Plan Priority Areas, and Priority Habitat etc.)?	-?	Small pockets of priority habitat are identified within this strategic location. A minor negative (-) effect could occur; however this is uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information on design/layout and consideration of mitigation and enhancement opportunities.

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
10.6 Will the development adversely affect protected species?	-?	Protected species are likely to be present at this strategic location. These include, but are not limited to: otter, water vole and great crested newts. A minor negative (-) effect is likely, but uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information on design/layout and consideration of mitigation and enhancement opportunities.
10.7 Will the development adversely impact the biodiversity network (e.g. Biodiversity Action Plan Priority Links)?	-?	The M27 Priority Biodiversity Link is incorporated into the south of the location. Dispersal routes should be kept open within development and habitats within corridors enhanced. A minor negative (-) effect could occur, but this is uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information
10.8 Will the development adversely affect ancient woodland?	0	Development at this strategic location is unlikely to have an adverse effect (0) on ancient woodland.
11. Enhance the Borough's multifunctional green infrastructure networks.		
11.1 Will the development affect TPO trees?	0	No TPO trees are present within or adjacent to this strategic location; therefore a negligible (0) effect is likely.
11.2 Can the location be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	+?	Two footpaths bisect the strategic location from north west to south east. The footpath further to the north east connects to a cycle route which is part of the Eastleigh Cycle Network. The potential to explore an upgrade to the existing footpath or providing a new connection to the nearby cycle route. Therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely, but is uncertain (?) subject to consideration of existing footpath upgrades.
11.3 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure? (same score as 7.1)	+?	The strategic location is a greenfield site with some GI assets within or adjacent to the site (e.g. footpaths, woodland). Development at this strategic location could result in a loss of GI. However, the design of development including new open space and links to the wider GI network has potential for improvements to GI. A minor positive (+) effect could occur, however this is uncertain (?) at this stage prior to obtaining further information on design/layout and enhancement opportunities.
12. Protect, enhance and manage the character and appearance of the landscape and townscape, maintaining and strengthening distinctiveness and its special qualities.		
12.1 Will development adversely affect the separation of neighbouring settlements?	-?	Development at this strategic location would reduce the gap and separation of Moorgreen and Hedge End. A minor negative (-) effect could occur; however this is uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information on design/layout.
12.2 Will it protect the setting of the South Downs National Park?	0	Development at this strategic location is unlikely to have an impact on the National Park.
12.3 Will it protect the character of the countryside, coast, towns and/or villages?	-?	Development in this strategic location is likely to have an effect on the open undeveloped character of predominantly open agricultural land close to Moorgreen Road, Bubb Lane and Burnetts Lane. A minor negative (-) effect could occur; however this is uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information on design/layout.

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
12.4 Will it have an impact on locally important views and settings?	-?	The effect of development at this strategic location is likely to be noticed from Moorgreen Road, Bubb Lane and Burnetts Lane. More direct effects are likely to be experienced from the footpath connections running through the site. A minor negative (-) effect could occur; however this is uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information on design/layout.
13. Protect and enhance and manage buildings, monuments, features, sites, places, areas and landscapes of archaeological, historical and cultural heritage importance.		
13.1 Will the development protect and enhance listed buildings and their settings, conservation areas, archaeological sites, historic landscapes and other sites of local importance for heritage?	0	Development at this strategic location is unlikely to have an impact on heritage assets (0).

West End 3 - North of West End

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
1. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified local needs, including affordability and special needs		
1.1 Will the development provide a significant contribution towards meeting identified affordable housing needs?	+	No issues have yet been raised that would suggest the typical proportion (35%) could not be achieved. Therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely. The proportion of affordable housing which could be delivered is currently uncertain (?) until further work is undertaken by the site promoter.
1.2 Will it provide other elements of identified housing need e.g. housing for older persons, self-build, support housing?	+	There is scope in this strategic location for provision of other elements of identified housing need. The site promoter has not proposed to meet other such elements of identified housing need. A minor positive (+) effect could occur but is uncertain (?) at this stage.
2. Safeguard and improve community health, safety and wellbeing		
2.1 Are community facilities (community hall or library) available locally?	0	The southern edge of this strategic location is just within 800m of West End Parish Centre and Moorgreen Youth Club; therefore a negligible (0) effect is likely. It is noted that the majority of the site is beyond 800m of community facilities.
2.2 Are health facilities available locally?	+	The south of this strategic location is within 1,000m of West End Surgery. Therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely. It is noted that the majority of the location is beyond 1,000m of health facilities.
2.3 What effect would the development have on local provision of sports pitches and facilities?	+	There is scope in this strategic location for provision of sports pitches and facilities therefore a positive effect (+) could occur. Site promoters have not indicated that sports pitches would be provided as part of development at this strategic location. Therefore, the effect is uncertain (?) at this stage.
2.4 Is public open space available locally?	++	The western area of this strategic location is within 300m of Itchen Valley Country Park, Barnsland Recreation Ground, open space at Barbe Baker Avenue and Megan Green. The majority of the rest of the site is within 800m of these open spaces. An area to the centre of the location, to the north east is beyond 800m of public open space. Site promoters have indicated that a significant area of new open space could come forward as part of development at this strategic location. Therefore, a significant positive (++) effect is likely.
2.5 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network?	0	There are three entry points via footpaths to this strategic location. There are no direct connections to cycle routes which form part of the Eastleigh Cycle Network. Two footpaths connect Burnetts Lane road, which is adjacent to the eastern edge of this strategic location, to a cycle route which is part of the Eastleigh Cycle Network. There is potential to explore an upgrade to the existing footpath or providing a new connection to the nearby cycle route. A negligible (0) effect is likely.
3. Develop a dynamic and diverse economy		
3.1(a) Is the location close to a major rail station?	-	This strategic location is more than 1,200m from the nearest major rail station. Therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
3.1 (b) Is the location close to a minor rail station?	-	This strategic location is more than 600m away from the nearest minor rail station; therefore, a

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
		minor negative (-) effect is likely.
3.1 (c) Is the location close to a frequent bus route?	-	The location is more than 600m to the nearest frequent bus route. Therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
3.1 (d) Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route?	-	The location is more than 300m from the nearest semi-frequent bus route; therefore a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
3.1 (e) Is the location close to a major employment centre?	--	The location is more than 1,000m from the nearest major employment centre; therefore a minor negative (-) negative effect is likely.
3.2 Will the proposed development contribute towards meeting the need for new industrial, office or warehousing floorspace?	+	This strategic location is suitable for employment land and approximately 10,000m ² is suggested for this strategic location. A minor positive (+) effect is likely.
3.3 Will the proposed development result in a net loss of existing employment land, or land which would be suitable for employment purposes?	0	No net loss of existing employment land would result in development of this strategic location; therefore, a negligible (0) effect is likely.
3.4 Will the proposed development increase the amount of commercial uses and other facilities in town, district or local centres?	0	There would be no change in the amount of commercial uses in town, district and local centres; therefore, a negligible (0) effect is likely.
4. Reduce road traffic and congestion through improved accessibility to services homes and jobs; reducing the need to travel by car/lorry and improving sustainable travel choice		
4.1 Is the location close to a major rail station? (same score as 3.1a)	-	This strategic location is more than 1,200m from the nearest major rail station. Therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
4.2 Is the location close to a minor rail station? (same score as 3.1b)	-	This strategic location is more than 600m away from the nearest minor rail station; therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
4.3 Is the location close to a frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1c)	-	The location is more than 600m to the nearest frequent bus route. Therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
4.4 Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1d)	-	The location is more than 300m from the nearest semi-frequent bus route; therefore a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
4.5(a) Will residential development at the location be close to a major employment centre? (same score as 3.1e)	-	The location is more than 1,000m from the nearest major employment centre; therefore a minor negative (-) negative effect is likely.
4.5(b) Will employment development at the location be close to a major population centre?	0	No significant employment use; therefore, a negligible (0) effect is likely.
4.6 Are health facilities available locally? (same score as 2.2)	+	The south of this strategic location is within 1,000m of West End Surgery. Therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely. It is noted that the majority of the location is beyond 1,000m of health facilities.
4.7 Are shopping and related services available locally?	0	A small area (approx. 5ha) of south west of this strategic location is within 800m of West End Village Centre. Therefore, a negligible (0) effect is likely. It is noted that the majority of the location is beyond 800m.
4.8 Is the location close to a Primary school?	++	A small area (approx. 3ha) of the southern part of this strategic location is within 400m of St James Church of England Primary School. Therefore, a significant positive (++) effect is likely. A small area at the east of this strategic location is within 800m

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
		of Wellstead Primary School. It is noted that the majority of the location is beyond 800m of a primary school.
4.9 Is the location close to a Secondary school?	-	This strategic location is more than 1,600m from the nearest secondary school; therefore a minor negative (-) effect is likely. It is noted that a new secondary school as part of development west of Horton Heath, immediately to the east of this strategic location, has a resolution to permit.
4.10 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	0	There are three entry points via footpaths to this strategic location. There are no direct connections to cycle routes which form part of the Eastleigh Cycle Network. Two footpaths connect Burnetts Lane road, which is adjacent to the eastern edge of this strategic location, to a cycle route which is part of the Eastleigh Cycle Network. There is potential to explore an upgrade to the existing footpath or providing a new connection to the nearby cycle route. A negligible (0) effect is likely.
4.11 Are there Geographical barriers between the location and key facilities/ destinations?	--	The M27 and railway line are somewhat of a barrier to facilities and services in West End and new facilities expected to come forward as part of development at Horton Heath. Main roads run broadly north east to south west and act as a barrier to direct east-west movement between this strategic location and the facilities and services of Hedge End. Footpaths connect through from this strategic location to Hedge End, but poor lighting and lack of natural surveillance limit these routes for regular day-to-day use. Therefore a significant negative (--) effect is likely.
5. Protect and conserve natural resources		
5.1 Will development avoid the sterilisation of mineral resources?	0	This strategic location is not an area safeguarded for minerals extraction or in a minerals and waste consultation area; therefore, a negligible (0) effect is likely.
5.2 Will it result in the loss of higher grade agricultural land?	--?	The majority of the location is grade 3 agricultural land; however there is an area of grade 2 land in the centre and in the southern part of the location. Therefore, there is potential for a significant negative (--) effect, however this is uncertain (?) before design and layout is explored.
5.3 Will it use previously developed land?	-	This strategic location is a previously undeveloped, greenfield location. Therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
5.4 Will it deliver or support allotments or community farms?	+?	This strategic location could be suitable for new allotments/community farms. The site promoter has not indicated if these facilities would be included as part of development at this strategic location. A minor positive (+) effect could occur, however this is currently uncertain (?) prior to further information.
6. Reduce air, soil, water, light and noise pollution		
6.1 Will the location be affected by significant noise generating uses or Air Quality Management Areas?	-?	There are no AQMAs which would be affected by or affect this strategic location. The railway line is adjacent to the north of this strategic location and the M27 adjacent to the south both of which could have potential adverse noise impacts upon new development at this location. A minor negative (-) effect is likely, but is uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information on design/layout and consideration of mitigation measures.

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
6.2 Will development increase pollution?	- -?	Given the scale of the strategic location there is likely to be a significant impact on traffic flows and volumes on nearby roads. Pollution from a significant increase in vehicles could impact local air quality generally and impact the nature conservation interests of the River Itchen SAC. A significant negative (- -) effect could occur, although is currently uncertain (?) prior to further transport assessment work and consideration of mitigation opportunities.
7. Plan for the anticipated levels of climate change		
7.1 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure?	+?	The strategic location is a greenfield site with some GI assets within or adjacent to the site (e.g. footpaths, woodland). Development at this strategic location could result in a loss of GI. However, the design of development including new open space and links to the wider GI network has potential for improvements to GI. A minor positive (+) effect could occur, however this is uncertain (?) at this stage prior to further information on design/layout and enhancement opportunities.
7.2 Is the location at risk from flooding, taking into account of the effects of climate change?	--?	There is a narrow linear area of land identified in Flood Zone 2 and 3 (three to the north only), which bisects the location from north east to south west. This area is also identified as at 'less' and 'intermediate' risk of surface water flooding. There are additional small areas at 'less' and 'intermediate' risk of surface water flooding in the south, and in the western areas of this strategic location. Therefore a significant negative (--?) effect is likely. However, the overall effect at this strategic location is uncertain (?) as the majority of the site is not within an area of flood risk and consideration of design and mitigation options is required.
7.3 Will the development be at risk from coastal change? If so, can the Shoreline Management Plan Objectives be supported?	0	Not located in an area of coastal change.
8. Minimise Eastleigh's contribution to climate change by reducing the borough's carbon footprint and minimising other greenhouse gas emissions.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
9. Reduce waste generation and disposal, encourage waste prevention and reuse and achieve the sustainable management of waste.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
10. Protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and geodiversity, improving its quality and range.		
10.1 Is the location within the HRA screening zone?	--?	Watercourses which are tributaries of the River Itchen bisect this location from north to south; therefore a significant negative effect (- -) could occur, subject (?) to the outcome of HRA screening and consideration of mitigation.
10.2 Is the location within 200m of a SSSI?	0	This strategic location is not within 200m of a SSSI; therefore, a negligible (0) effect is likely.
10.3 Is the location within 200m of a Local Nature Reserve?	0	This strategic location is not within 200m of a Local Nature Reserve; therefore, a negligible (0) effect is

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
		likely.
10.4 Will the development adversely affect a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation? (N.B. No NNRs are present in the District)	-?	SINCs are located within and adjacent to this strategic location. A minor negative (-) effect could occur, but this is unclear (?) prior to further information on design/layout and consideration of mitigation and enhancement opportunities.
10.5 Will the development adversely affect sites with local designation of nature conservation value (e.g. Biodiversity Opportunity Areas, Biodiversity Action Plan Priority Areas, and Priority Habitat etc.)?	-?	The Itchen Valley Biodiversity Opportunity Area is adjacent to the north west. There are pockets of priority habitat throughout this strategic location. Consideration should be given to maintain links between these priority habitats. A minor negative (-) effect could occur, but this is unclear (?) prior to further information on design/layout and consideration of mitigation and enhancement opportunities.
10.6 Will the development adversely affect protected species?	-?	Protected species are likely to be present at this strategic location. These include, but are not limited to: otter, water vole and great crested newts. A minor negative (-) effect is likely, but uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information on design/layout and consideration of mitigation and enhancement opportunities.
10.7 Will the development adversely impact the biodiversity network (e.g. Biodiversity Action Plan Priority Links)?	-?	The railway line and M27 Priority Biodiversity Links are adjacent to the north and south of this strategic location respectively. A minor negative (-) effect could occur, but this is unclear (?) prior to further information on design/layout and consideration of mitigation and enhancement opportunities.
10.8 Will the development adversely affect ancient woodland?	-?	Drummers Copse is designated as SINC for its ancient woodland and is located in the south west of this strategic location. A minor negative (-) effect could occur, but this is unclear (?) prior to further information on design/layout and consideration of mitigation and enhancement opportunities.
11. Enhance the Borough's multifunctional green infrastructure networks.		
11.1 Will the development affect TPO trees?	-?	Small pockets of TPO trees are located at the west and south west edge of this strategic location. A minor negative (-) effect could occur, but this is unclear (?) prior to further information on design/layout and consideration of mitigation and enhancement opportunities.
11.2 Can the location be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	+?	There are three entry points via footpaths to this strategic location. There are no direct connections to cycle routes which form part of the Eastleigh Cycle Network. Two footpaths connect Burnetts Lane road, which is adjacent to the eastern edge of this strategic location, to a cycle route which is part of the Eastleigh Cycle Network. There is potential to explore an upgrade to the existing footpath or providing a new connection to the nearby cycle route. Therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely, but is uncertain (?) subject to consideration of existing footpath upgrades.
11.3 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure? (same score as 7.1)	+?	The strategic location is a greenfield site with some GI assets within or adjacent to the site (e.g. footpaths, woodland). Development at this strategic location could result in a loss of GI. However, the design of development including new open space and links to the wider GI network has potential for improvements to GI. A minor positive (+) effect could occur, however this is uncertain (?) at this stage prior to further information on

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
		design/layout and enhancement opportunities.
12. Protect, enhance and manage the character and appearance of the landscape and townscape, maintaining and strengthening distinctiveness and its special qualities.		
12.1 Will development adversely affect the separation of neighbouring settlements?	-?	There may be erosion of or separation of the settlements of Hedge End and West End as perceived from Moorgreen Road, Burnetts Lane and Bubb Lane. A minor negative (-) effect could occur; however this is uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information on design/layout.
12.2 Will it protect the setting of the South Downs National Park?	0	Development at this strategic location is unlikely to have an impact on the National Park.
12.3 Will it protect the character of the countryside, coast, towns and/or villages?	-?	Development in this strategic location is likely to have an effect on the open undeveloped character of predominantly agricultural land adjoining the M27. The relatively remote, distinctive wooded high ground around Winslowe House is likely to be affected by development proposals. A minor negative (-) effect could occur; however this is uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information on design/layout.
12.4 Will it have an impact on locally important views and settings?	-?	The effect of development is likely to be noticed from the M27, Allington Lane, Quob Lane, Moorgreen Road and the railway corridor. More direct effects are likely to be experienced from the footpath connections running through the site. A minor negative (-) effect could occur; however this is uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information on design/layout.
13. Protect and enhance and manage buildings, monuments, features, sites, places, areas and landscapes of archaeological, historical and cultural heritage importance.		
13.1 Will the development protect and enhance listed buildings and their settings, conservation areas, archaeological sites, historic landscapes and other sites of local importance for heritage?	-?	This strategic location includes Winstowe House identified as a Historic Park and Garden and two buildings at Moorgreen Farm with Grade II listing. A minor negative (-) effect could occur, however this is uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information on design/layout and consideration of mitigation and enhancement opportunities

West End 4 – South of Cherry Drive, Horton Heath

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
1. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified local needs, including affordability and special needs		
1.1 Will the development provide a significant contribution towards meeting identified affordable housing needs?	+?	No issues have yet been raised that would suggest the typical proportion (35%) could not be achieved. Therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely. The proportion of affordable housing which could be delivered is currently uncertain (?) until further work is undertaken by the site promoter.
1.2 Will it provide other elements of identified housing need e.g. housing for older persons, self-build, support housing?	+?	There is scope in this strategic location for provision other elements of identified housing need. The site promoter has not proposed to meet other such elements of identified housing need. A minor positive (+) effect could occur but is uncertain (?) at this stage.
2. Safeguard and improve community health, safety and wellbeing		
2.1 Are community facilities (community hall or library) available locally?	+	The northern part of this strategic location is within 400m of Horton Heath Community Centre. The rest of this location is within 800m of this community facility. Therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely.
2.2 Are health facilities available locally?	--	This strategic location is more than 1.0 km from any healthcare facility; therefore a significant negative (--) effect is likely.
2.3 What effect would the development have on local provision of sports pitches and facilities?	+?	There is scope in this strategic location for provision of sports pitches and facilities therefore a minor positive effect (+) could occur. Site promoters have not indicated that sports pitches would be provided as part of development at this location. Therefore the effect is uncertain (?) at this stage.
2.4 Is public open space available locally?	+	The northern area of this strategic location is within 300m of two public open spaces at Valerian Close/Burnetts Lane and Horton Heath Community Centre to the north. The rest of this location is within 800m of these facilities and others including Cheltenham Gardens to the south and Fir Tree Lane to the north. Therefore, this location is assessed as having a minor positive effect (+).
2.5 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network?	0	There are three footpaths adjacent to the western and south eastern areas of this location. Therefore, a negligible (0) effect is likely.
3. Develop a dynamic and diverse economy		
3.1(a) Is the location close to a major rail station?	-	Hedge End railway station is just over 1.2km to the south east of this location. Therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
3.1 (b) Is the location close to a minor rail station?	-	This strategic location is over 600m from a minor railway station; therefore a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
3.1 (c) Is the location close to a frequent bus route?	-	This strategic location is over 600m from a frequent bus route. Therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
3.1 (d) Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route?	-	This strategic location is over 600m from a semi-frequent bus route. Therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
3.1 (e) Is the location close to a major employment	+	This strategic location is less than 1.0km to the east

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
centre?		of Chalcroft Business Centre. Therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely.
3.2 Will the proposed development contribute towards meeting the need for new industrial, office or warehousing floorspace?	-	This strategic location has not been considered for employment as part of the SLAA. The site promoter has not stated if employment would be part of development at this location. Therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
3.3 Will the proposed development result in a net loss of existing employment land, or land which would be suitable for employment purposes?	0	The development of this strategic location will not result in any loss of existing employment land therefore a negligible (0) effect is likely.
3.4 Will the proposed development increase the amount of commercial uses and other facilities in town, district or local centres?	0	This strategic location is identified for residential use only and is located outside district and local centres and will therefore not result in any loss of a primary shopping area. Therefore a negligible (0) effect is likely.
4. Reduce road traffic and congestion through improved accessibility to services homes and jobs; reducing the need to travel by car/lorry and improving sustainable travel choice		
4.1 Is the location close to a major rail station? (same score as 3.1a)	-	Hedge End railway station is just over 1.2km to the south east of this location. Therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
4.2 Is the location close to a minor rail station? (same score as 3.1b)	-	This strategic location is over 600m from a minor railway station; therefore a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
4.3 Is the location close to a frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1c)	-	This strategic location is over 600m from a frequent bus route. Therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
4.4 Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1d)	-	This strategic location is over 600m from a semi-frequent bus route. Therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
4.5(a) Will residential development at the location be close to a major employment centre? (same score as 3.1e)	+	This strategic location is between 400m-1.0km to the east of Chalcroft Business Centre. Therefore, a minor positive (+) effect is likely.
4.5(b) Will employment development at the location be close to a major population centre?	0	This strategic location is for residential development only; therefore a negligible (0) effect is likely.
4.6 Are health facilities available locally? (same score as 2.2)	--	This strategic location is more than 1.0 km from any healthcare facility; therefore a significant negative (--) effect is likely.
4.7 Are shopping and related services available locally?	-	This strategic location is over 800m to any shopping or related service area; therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
4.8 Is the location close to a Primary school?	-	This strategic location is over 800m from a primary school facility; therefore, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
4.9 Is the location close to a Secondary school?	-	The nearest education facility is Kings School Senior Secondary School, which is within 1.6km to the north, however this is a private education facility and therefore a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
4.10 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	0	There are three footpaths adjacent to the western and south eastern areas of this location. Therefore, a negligible (0) effect is likely.
4.11 Are there Geographical barriers between the location and key facilities/ destinations?	--	The strategic location immediately adjoins Horton Heath but there are few key facilities in this area. The Eastleigh-Fareham railway line is a significant geographical barrier for pedestrians separating this location from key facilities available in Hedge End. A significant negative (--) effect is likely.

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
5. Protect and conserve natural resources		
5.1 Will development avoid the sterilisation of mineral resources?	0	This strategic location is outside an area safeguarded for mineral extraction or where minerals extraction has already taken place. Therefore, a negligible effect (0) is likely in relation to this SA objective.
5.2 Will it result in the loss of higher grade agricultural land?	-	Half of this strategic location is on lower quality (Grade 4) agricultural land, while the other half is located on medium quality (Grade 3a or 3b) agricultural land. Overall, a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
5.3 Will it use previously developed land?	-	The strategic location is located on greenfield land; therefore a minor negative (-) effect is likely.
5.4 Will it deliver or support allotments or community farms?	+?	This strategic location could be suitable for new allotments/community farms. The site promoter has not indicated if these facilities would be included as part of development at this location. A minor positive (+) effect could occur, however this is currently uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information.
6. Reduce air, soil, water, light and noise pollution		
6.1 Will the location be affected by significant noise generating uses or Air Quality Management Areas?	0	Based on information currently available, there are no significant noise generating uses which would impact on development at this strategic location and there are no AQMAs in the vicinity; therefore a negligible (0) effect is likely.
6.2 Will development increase pollution?	0	The development does not raise concerns which cannot be addressed by mitigation; therefore a negligible (0) effect is likely.
7. Plan for the anticipated levels of climate change		
7.1 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure?	+?	The strategic location is a greenfield site with some GI assets within or adjacent to the site (e.g. footpaths, woodland). Development at this location could result in a loss of GI. However, the design of development including new open space and links to the wider GI network has potential for improvements to GI. A minor positive (+) effect could occur, however this is uncertain (?) at this stage prior to obtaining further information on design/layout and enhancement opportunities.
7.2 Is the location at risk from flooding, taking into account of the effects of climate change?	0	The strategic location is not in an area subject to surface water flooding or within a flood risk zone. Therefore, this location is assessed as having a negligible (0) effect on this objective.
7.3 Will the development be at risk from coastal change? If so, can the Shoreline Management Plan Objectives be supported?	0	Not located in an area of coastal change; therefore a negligible (0) change is likely.
8. Minimise Eastleigh's contribution to climate change by reducing the borough's carbon footprint and minimising other greenhouse gas emissions.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
9. Reduce waste generation and disposal, encourage waste prevention and reuse and achieve the sustainable management of waste.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		

SA objective/ criterion	Justification	
10. Protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and geodiversity, improving its quality and range.		
10.1 Is the location within the HRA screening zone?	0	This location is not within the HRA screening area; therefore a negligible (0) effect is likely.
10.2 Is the location within 200m of a SSSI?	0	This location is not within 200m of an SSSI designated site; therefore a negligible (0) effect is likely.
10.3 Is the location within 200m of a Local Nature Reserve?	0	There are no Local Nature Reserves within 200m of this strategic location; therefore a negligible (0) effect is likely in relation to this SA objective.
10.4 Will the development adversely affect a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation? (N.B. No NNRs are present in the District)	0	Unlikely to have an adverse impact on a SINC; therefore, a negligible (0) effect is likely.
10.5 Will the development adversely affect sites with local designation of nature conservation value (e.g. Biodiversity Opportunity Areas, Biodiversity Action Plan Priority Areas, and Priority Habitat etc.)?	-?	This strategic location lies entirely within the Chalcroft Priority Biodiversity Link with links to Scoreys Copse to the east. Development at this location would likely result in a minor negative (-) effect although this is uncertain (?) subject to obtaining further information on design/layout.
10.6 Will the development adversely affect protected species?	0	Due to the very short grassland and lack of vegetation this strategic location is unlikely to harbour protected species. A negligible (0) effect is likely.
10.7 Will the development adversely impact the biodiversity network (e.g. Biodiversity Action Plan Priority Links)?	-?	This strategic location is important as it sits at a juncture linking different parts of the Chalcroft Priority Biodiversity Link. Development at this location would likely result in a minor negative (-) effect although this is uncertain (?) subject to obtaining further information on design/layout.
10.8 Will the development adversely affect ancient woodland?	0	Unlikely to have an adverse impact on ancient woodland; therefore, a negligible (0) effect is likely.
11. Enhance the Borough's multifunctional green infrastructure networks.		
11.1 Will the development affect TPO trees?	0	No TPO trees are present within or adjacent to this strategic location; therefore a negligible (0) effect is likely.
11.2 Can the location be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	0	There are three footpaths adjacent to the western and south eastern areas of this location. Therefore, a negligible (0) effect is likely.
11.3 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure? (same score as 7.1)	+?	The strategic location is a greenfield site with some GI assets within or adjacent to the site (e.g. footpaths, woodland). Development at this location could result in a loss of GI. However, the design of development including new open space and links to the wider GI network has potential for improvements to GI. A minor positive (+) effect could occur, however this is uncertain (?) at this stage prior to obtaining further information on design/layout and enhancement opportunities.
12. Protect, enhance and manage the character and appearance of the landscape and townscape,		

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
maintaining and strengthening distinctiveness and its special qualities.		
12.1 Will development adversely affect the separation of neighbouring settlements?	-?	It is likely that the perceived separation between Horton Heath and Hedge End from the surrounding roads and footpaths would be impacted. A minor negative (-) effect is likely, although uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information on design/layout.
12.2 Will it protect the setting of the South Downs National Park?	0	Development at this strategic location is unlikely to have an impact on the National Park.
12.3 Will it protect the character of the countryside, coast, towns and/or villages?	-?	The predominately open character of this land fronted by scattered dwellings is likely to be significantly changed by development in this strategic location. A minor negative (-) effect is likely, although uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information on design/layout.
12.4 Will it have an impact on locally important views and settings?	-?	This strategic location is most visible from Burnetts Lane and Blind Lane on the open ground rising from the east. A minor negative (-) effect is likely, although uncertain (?) prior to obtaining further information on design/layout.
13. Protect and enhance and manage buildings, monuments, features, sites, places, areas and landscapes of archaeological, historical and cultural heritage importance.		
13.1 Will the development protect and enhance listed buildings and their settings, conservation areas, archaeological sites, historic landscapes and other sites of local importance for heritage?	0	Development at this strategic location is unlikely to have an impact on heritage assets (0).

Appendix 6

Detailed SA matrices for Strategic Growth Options and reasonable alternatives

Option B/C

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
1. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified local needs, including affordability and special needs		
1.1 Will the development provide a significant contribution towards meeting identified affordable housing needs?	++	This option would provide 5,200 new homes.
1.2 Will it provide other elements of identified housing need e.g. housing for older persons, self-build, support housing?	+?	At this stage, no barriers to the delivery of other specialist housing have been identified. The proportions of these housing types achievable will remain uncertain until further work is undertaken by site promoters.
2. Safeguard and improve community health, safety and wellbeing		
2.1 Are community facilities (community hall or library) available locally?	++	The Council has indicated that this option would include provision of a new community hall.
2.2 Are health facilities available locally?	++	The Council has indicated that all options will provide a new GP surgery.
2.3 What effect would the development have on local provision of sports pitches and facilities?	+?/--	<p>This SGO has potential to accommodate provision of sports pitches and sporting facilities, which could result in a minor positive effect. However, the site promoters of these locations have not indicated if such provision will be incorporated. Whilst failure to make new provision would only have a minor negative effect for individual locations, collectively this could result in a significant negative impact due to lack of provision in the area and place strain on existing sporting pitches and facilities.</p> <p>It is noted that development South of Mortimers Lane would result in the loss of East Horton Golf Course. Whilst not generally assessed as part of the Council's Open Space, Sport and Recreation study, it is recognised that golf courses are a sporting facility asset and significant negative effects could also occur through the loss of this facility. The full implications of this would need to be investigated further if this option were to be progressed.</p>
2.4 Is public open space available locally?	++	The Council has indicated that this option would provide 112 ha of publically accessible open space (40% total site area, and more beyond the site boundaries).
2.5 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network?	0	A number of footpaths and bridleways cross the site, but there are no cycleways either within or adjacent to the site.
3. Develop a dynamic and diverse economy		
3.1(a) Is the location close to a major rail station?	--	This option is further than 1400m from a major rail station and could not be directly served by rail services.
3.1 (b) Is the location close to a minor rail station?	--	This option is further than 1200m from a minor rail station and could not be directly served by rail services.
3.1 (c) Is the location close to a frequent bus	++	Part of the site lies within 400m of the Bluestar 2,

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
route?		frequent bus route. The Council has indicated that it may be possible for this service to be diverted or extended to serve more of the SGO, but this would need to be agreed with service operators.
3.1 (d) Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route?	--	The SGO is not within 800m of a semi-frequent bus route.
3.1 (e) Is the location close to a major employment centre?	++	The SGO would provide a new major employment centre.
3.2 Will the proposed development contribute towards meeting the need for new industrial, office or warehousing floorspace?	+	This option would deliver 30,000 sq. m. employment floorspace.
3.3 Will the proposed development result in a net loss of existing employment land, or land which would be suitable for employment purposes?	0	Development of this site would not result in loss of existing employment land.
3.4 Will the proposed development increase the amount of commercial uses and other facilities in town, district or local centres?	++?	The Council has indicated that this option will include a new district centre and two local centres.
4. Reduce road traffic and congestion through improved accessibility to services, homes and jobs; reducing the need to travel by car/lorry and improving sustainable travel choice		
4.1 Is the location close to a major rail station? (same score as 3.1a)	--	This option is further than 1400m from a major rail station and could not be directly served by rail services.
4.2 Is the location close to a minor rail station? (same score as 3.1b)	--	This option is further than 1200m from a minor rail station and could not be directly served by rail services.
4.3 Is the location close to a frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1c)	++	Part of the site lies within 400m of the Bluestar 2, frequent bus route. The Council has indicated that it may be possible for this service to be diverted or extended to serve more of the SGO, but this would need to be agreed with service operators.
4.4 Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1d)	--	The SGO is not within 800m of a semi-frequent bus route.
4.5(a) Will residential development at the location be close to a major employment centre? (same score as 3.1e)	++	The SGO would provide a new major employment centre.
4.5(b) Will employment development at the location be close to a major population centre?	-	The SGO is further than 1000 m from a major population centre.
4.6 Are health facilities available locally? (same score as 2.2)	++	The Council has indicated that all options will provide a new GP surgery.
4.7 Are shopping and related services available locally?	++	The Council has advised that this SGO would provide a new district centre, two new local centres, a new 2,300 sq m foodstore and other retail.
4.8 Is the location close to a Primary school?	++	The Council has advised that this option would provide three new primary schools.
4.9 Is the location close to a Secondary school?	++	The Council has advised that this option would provide a new secondary school.
4.10 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	0	A number of footpaths and bridleways cross the site, but there are no cycleways either within or adjacent to the site.
4.11 Are there Geographical barriers between the location and key facilities/ destinations?	+	There are no major geographical barriers on the most direct walking routes to the destinations above. In addition, due to the level of infrastructure expected to be delivered at this site, it is anticipated that residents will be able to meet most of their daily and weekly

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
		needs within the SGO.
5. Protect and conserve natural resources		
5.1 Will development avoid the sterilisation of mineral resources?	-?	Part of the site and link road route coincides with a Minerals Consultation Area and smaller parts of the site are within Minerals Safeguarding Areas.
5.2 Will it result in the loss of higher grade agricultural land?	-	This site is generally located on lower quality agricultural land. However, the link road route passes through areas of medium quality (Grade 3) agricultural land.
5.3 Will it use previously developed land?	-?	This SGO consists primarily of greenfield land. There are a few existing buildings in the main part of the site, but it is uncertain whether these will be retained.
5.4 Will it deliver or support allotments or community farms?	+?	The SGO has potential to provide allotments or possibly a community farm. Site promoters have not yet indicated if any provision of allotments or a community farm would form part of development at these locations.
6. Reduce air, soil, water, light and noise pollution		
6.1 Will the location be affected by significant noise generating uses or Air Quality Management Areas?	-?	The SGO is not within an AQMA or within 200m of a railway, A road or motorway. A new east-west road link is proposed as part of this SGO, which may reduce traffic and associated pollution along Bishopstoke Road, but may increase air pollution and noise in new areas. Further transport and air quality work is required to investigate this.
6.2 Will development increase pollution?	--?	<p>Due to the scale of development proposed for this Option, a significant negative effect is likely, particularly due to pollution from increased traffic arising from development, which could impact local air quality, the Eastleigh Air Quality Management Area and the nature conservation interest of the River Itchen Special Area of Conservation. A new east-west road link is proposed as part of this SGO, which may reduce traffic and associated pollution along Bishopstoke Road, but may increase air pollution in new areas. Further transport and air quality work is required to investigate this.</p> <p>The Draft Background Paper (2017) indicates that the new link road will avoid overall increases in congestion, although effects will vary locally.</p>
7. Plan for the anticipated levels of climate change		
7.1 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure?	+	The Council has advised that all options will provide new GI, and an area is earmarked for this within the northwest of this site (although additional GI will be provided throughout the site). The site also includes a number of small copses, including Hall Lands Copse, but the Council have stated that there will be no loss of existing woodland.
7.2 Is the location at risk from flooding, taking into account of the effects of climate change?	--?	There are small areas of the site located within Flood Zones 2 and 3. Most of this is within the area earmarked for provision of GI, but this also includes a small area in the south east of the site. The site also includes some areas of low and intermediate surface

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
		water flood risk. The link road route passes through an area within flood zone 3 and areas of surface water flood risk, particularly associated with the River Itchen.
7.3 Will the development be at risk from coastal change? If so, can the Shoreline Management Plan Objectives be supported?	0	The SGO is not located near the coast.
8. Minimise Eastleigh's contribution to climate change by reducing the borough's carbon footprint and minimising other greenhouse gas emissions.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
9. Reduce waste generation and disposal, encourage waste prevention and reuse and achieve the sustainable management of waste.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
10. Protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and geodiversity, improving its quality and range.		
10.1 Could development negatively impact or lead to loss of an internationally or nationally designated site (either alone or in combination)?	-	This option could have a range of impacts. This option includes a link road that would cross the River Itchen (designated as a SAC and SSSI). The SGO Draft Background Paper (2017) indicates that the link road and the extra traffic associated with development has potential to lead to negative effects on the River Itchen SAC. The paper also states that there are a number of headwaters on this site that flow into the River Itchen SAC and the Solent SPA/Ramsar/SAC. As part of the HRA process, the Council will consider ways to avoid or mitigate any likely significant effects from these and any other wider issues.
10.2 Could development negatively impact or lead to loss of a locally designated biodiversity site (either alone or in combination)?	-?	This option includes and is adjacent to a number of SINCS, consisting primarily of woodland. The SGO Draft Background Paper (2017) indicates that development can take place without loss of woodland, or any other effects on the habitat or species it supports.
10.3 Will the development adversely affect areas with other nature conservation value, as identified in Biodiversity Action Plans (BAPs)?	-?	A complete network of hedgerows is present, which provide excellent connectivity between the woodland blocks. Development at this location could isolate the small woodland block in the east from the wider woodland/hedgerow network. The strategic location is incorporated into the Stoke Park Priority Biodiversity Area. Land identified as part of the Itchen Valley Biodiversity Opportunity Area is present across the north of the location. Several different protected species could be present at or utilise this strategic location, including but not limited to: great crested newts, bats, otters. Due to the aquatic and hedgerow connections to the SAC, otter may use the sites. The site is also likely to include rough and semi-improved grassland. A minor negative effect is likely, although this is uncertain prior to further information about design/layout and potential mitigation and enhancement opportunities.
10.4 Will the development adversely impact the biodiversity network (e.g. Priority Biodiversity Links (PBLs), Priority Biodiversity Areas (PBAs), hedgerows and other corridors for species movement)?	-?	At present, the SINCS on the site are connected by a relatively complete hedgerow network and there is a danger that these woodland blocks could become isolated from the wider network. Connectivity between SINCS and movement corridors for protected

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
		<p>species are particularly important and there is risk that development of this Option could sever these.</p> <p>Undesignated habitats at these locations are also important to protect and link valuable habitats, safeguard natural hydrological processes, and provide broad dispersal corridors for protected species and connections between woodlands within this location and the wider biodiversity network. To minimise negative effects connections between woodlands and movement corridors for species should be retained and buffered.</p> <p>In addition, the Draft Background Paper (2017) indicates that development may have negative impacts on otters, which are likely to traverse the watercourses passing through this site.</p> <p>In addition, GIS data shows that the western part of the site contains PBLs and PBAs, including Stoke Park PBA and Bowlake PBL.</p> <p>A minor negative effect is likely, although this is uncertain prior to further information about design/layout and potential mitigation and enhancement opportunities coming forwards through the development management process.</p>
10.5 Will the development adversely affect ancient woodland?	-?	<p>The SGO Draft Background Paper (2017) states that this option is adjacent to five areas of ancient woodland. Natural England GIS data¹⁰⁹ suggests that there are three areas of ancient woodland within the SGO (two of which are part of the same site and within the area earmarked for GI) and three areas of ancient woodland adjacent to the site (two of these are part of the same site). The SGO Draft Background Paper (2017) indicates that development can take place without loss of woodland, or any other effects on the habitat or species it supports, hence the effect is assessed as minor on the assumption that protection of the ancient woodland would be secured through the allocation policy.</p>
11. Enhance the Borough's multifunctional green infrastructure networks.		
11.1 Will the development affect TPO trees?	-?	<p>A number of TPO trees are present north and east of Fair Oak. However, these occupy a small portion of these locations so it is likely that design and layout of development could accommodate them.</p>
11.2 Can the location be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	0	<p>A number of footpaths and bridleways cross the site, but there are no cycleways either within or adjacent to the site.</p>
11.3 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure? (same score as 7.1)	+	<p>The Council has advised that all options will provide new GI, and an area is earmarked for this within the northwest of this site (although additional GI will be provided throughout the site). The site also includes a number of small copses, including Hall Lands Copse, but the Council have stated that there will be no loss of existing woodland.</p>
12. Protect, enhance and manage the character and appearance of the landscape and townscape,		

¹⁰⁹ Magic map: <http://www.natureonthemap.naturalengland.org.uk/magicmap.aspx>, Accessed: 22/02/2018

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
maintaining and strengthening distinctiveness and its special qualities.		
12.1 Will development adversely affect the separation of neighbouring settlements?	-?	None of the options are within countryside gaps designated in the adopted Local Plan; however, all are of a scale that they could significantly alter the current pattern of town and countryside. The SGO Draft Background Paper (2017) states that this option will retain appropriate gaps with surrounding settlements, proportionate to the scale of these settlements.
12.2 Will it protect the character of the countryside, coast, towns and/or villages, including views and settings?	--?	<p>This SGO is likely to have significant negative effects, particularly arising from impacts on the character of the landscape in this area. This location has a strong rural character with generally a clear physical separation from nearby settlements. Development is likely to result in significant urbanisation.</p> <p>Development north and east of Fair Oak would represent a significant growth of Fair Oak, both in terms of land take and population size, which would significantly change the existing character of the village. However, the north/northeastern part of the site of would fill in a 'missing quadrant' of Fair Oak and include a new district centre, positioned to effectively serve existing as well as new development, therefore aiding integration. However, the western part of the site would extend beyond this, over to Crowdhill and Bishopstoke.</p> <p>The proposed east-west connecting road north of Bishopstoke and Fair Oak, which is part of this SGO, is likely to have a significant effect on the landscape and visual character of the area, enclosing wooded countryside on the northern side. There is likely to be significant negative effects with regard to locally important views.</p> <p>For north of Mortimers Lane this particularly relates to its historic rural character, and for south of Mortimers Lane, this particularly relates to the open character due to the golf courses. North of Mortimers Lane has a distinctive and historic field enclosure pattern and includes elevated land to the west, which is a key part of the character of this location.</p> <p>These effects are, however, uncertain because the site specific design and layout details would not be ascertained until decision-making stage. The SGO Draft Background Paper (2017) states that the effect of development on views from the South Downs National Park are expected to be negligible.</p>
13. Protect and enhance and manage buildings, monuments, features, sites, places, areas and landscapes of archaeological, historical and cultural heritage importance.		
13.1 Will the development protect and enhance listed buildings and their settings, conservation areas, archaeological sites, historic landscapes	-?	The SGO contains and is adjacent to Grade II listed buildings, locally listed buildings, and four archaeological locations. The link road route also

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
and other sites of local importance for heritage?		<p>passes some Grade II or II* listed buildings. Whilst these are already adjacent to a road, the presence of the link road may generate further traffic and therefore affect the settings of these assets.</p> <p>Retaining the setting of listed buildings such as the buildings of Crowdhill Farmhouse and the wooded setting of Lincolns Farmhouse would minimise negative effects. Part of the north of Stoke Park Woods Strategic Location is within the Stoke Woods Deer Park Historic Park and Garden. Further information would be required with regard to the sensitivity of design and landscaping.</p>

Option C

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
1. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified local needs, including affordability and special needs		
1.1 Will the development provide a significant contribution towards meeting identified affordable housing needs?	++	This option would provide 4,204 new homes.
1.2 Will it provide other elements of identified housing need e.g. housing for older persons, self-build, support housing?	+?	At this stage, no barriers to the delivery for specialist housing have been identified. The proportions of these housing types achievable will remain uncertain until further work is undertaken by site promoters.
2. Safeguard and improve community health, safety and wellbeing		
2.1 Are community facilities (community hall or library) available locally?	++	The Council has indicated that this option would include provision of a new community hall.
2.2 Are health facilities available locally?	++	The Council has indicated that all options will provide a new GP surgery.
2.3 What effect would the development have on local provision of sports pitches and facilities?	+?/--	<p>This SGO has potential to accommodate provision of sports pitches and sporting facilities, which could result in a minor positive effect. However, the site promoters of these locations have not indicated if such provision will be incorporated. Whilst failure to make new provision would only have a minor negative effect for individual locations, collectively this could result in a significant negative impact due to lack of provision in the area and place strain on existing sporting pitches and facilities.</p> <p>It is noted that development South of Mortimers Lane would result in the loss of East Horton Golf Course. Whilst not generally assessed as part of the Council's Open Space, Sport and Recreation study, it is recognised that golf courses are a sporting facility asset and significant negative effects could also occur through the loss of this facility. The full implications of this would need to be investigated further if this option were to be progressed.</p>
2.4 Is public open space available locally?	++	The Council has indicated that around 40% of the land in this option would be publically accessible open space.
2.5 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network?	0	A number of footpaths and a bridleway cross the site, but there are no cycleways either within or adjacent to the site.
3. Develop a dynamic and diverse economy		
3.1(a) Is the location close to a major rail station?	--	This option is further than 1400m from a major rail station and could not be directly served by rail services.
3.1 (b) Is the location close to a minor rail station?	--	This option is further than 1200m from a minor rail station and could not be directly served by rail services.
3.1 (c) Is the location close to a frequent bus route?	++	Part of the site lies within 400m of the Bluestar 2, frequent bus route. The Council has indicated that it may be possible for this service to be diverted or extended to serve more of the SGO, but this would need to be agreed with service operators.
3.1 (d) Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route?	--	The SGO is not within 800m of a semi-frequent bus route.
3.1 (e) Is the location close to a major	++	The SGO would provide a new major employment centre.

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
employment centre?		
3.2 Will the proposed development contribute towards meeting the need for new industrial, office or warehousing floorspace?	+	This option would deliver 25,417 sq. m. employment floorspace.
3.3 Will the proposed development result in a net loss of existing employment land, or land, which would be suitable for employment purposes?	0	Development of this site would not result in loss of existing employment land.
3.4 Will the proposed development increase the amount of commercial uses and other facilities in town, district or local centres?	+++	The Council has indicated that this option will include a new district centre and a new local centre.
4. Reduce road traffic and congestion through improved accessibility to services, homes and jobs; reducing the need to travel by car/lorry and improving sustainable travel choice		
4.1 Is the location close to a major rail station? (same score as 3.1a)	--	This option is further than 1400m from a major rail station and could not be directly served by rail services.
4.2 Is the location close to a minor rail station? (same score as 3.1b)	--	This option is further than 1200m from a minor rail station and could not be directly served by rail services.
4.3 Is the location close to a frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1c)	++	Part of the site lies within 400m of the Bluestar 2, frequent bus route. The Council has indicated that it may be possible for this service to be diverted or extended to serve more of the SGO, but this would need to be agreed with service operators.
4.4 Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1d)	--	The SGO is not within 800m of a semi-frequent bus route.
4.5(a) Will residential development at the location be close to a major employment centre? (same score as 3.1e)	++	The SGO would provide a new major employment centre.
4.5(b) Will employment development at the location be close to a major population centre?	-	The SGO is further than 1000 m from a major population centre.
4.6 Are health facilities available locally? (same score as 2.2)	++	The Council has indicated that all options will provide a new GP surgery.
4.7 Are shopping and related services available locally?	++	The Council has advised that this SGO would include a new District Centre and local centre, as well as a 2,300 sq m (gross) foodstore and other retail.
4.8 Is the location close to a Primary school?	++	The Council has advised that this option would deliver two new primary schools.
4.9 Is the location close to a Secondary school?	++	The Council has advised that this option would deliver a new secondary school.
4.10 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	0	A number of footpaths and a bridleway cross the site, but there are no cycleways either within or adjacent to the site.
4.11 Are there Geographical barriers between the location and key facilities/ destinations?	+	There are no major geographical barriers on the most direct walking routes to the destinations above. In addition, due to the level of infrastructure expected to be delivered at this site, it is anticipated that residents will be able to meet most of their daily and weekly needs within the SGO.
5. Protect and conserve natural resources		
5.1 Will development avoid the sterilisation of mineral resources?	-?	A large part of the site is located in a Mineral Consultation Area and there are smaller areas of the site within a Minerals Safeguarding Area.
5.2 Will it result in the loss of higher grade agricultural land?	0	This site consists of lower quality agricultural land (Grades 4 or 5).

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
5.3 Will it use previously developed land?	-?	This SGO consists primarily of greenfield land. There are a few existing buildings in the main part of the site, but it is uncertain whether these will be retained.
5.4 Will it deliver or support allotments or community farms?	+?	The SGO has potential to provide allotments or possibly a community farm. Site promoters have not yet indicated if any provision of allotments or a community farm would form part of development at these locations.
6. Reduce air, soil, water, light and noise pollution		
6.1 Will the location be affected by significant noise generating uses or Air Quality Management Areas?	0	The SGO is not located within an AQMA or within 200m of a railway, A-road or motorway.
6.2 Will development increase pollution?	--?	There could also be potential impacts arising from pollution from increased traffic generated by development at these locations, which could adversely affect local air quality, the Eastleigh Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) and the nature conservation interest of the River Itchen SAC. Further work would be required about the transport and associated air quality impacts arising from development at these locations. The Draft Background Paper (2017) recognises that, due to the scale of development, all SGOs are likely to increase traffic congestion somewhere in the Borough and surrounding areas. It is suggested that this may be largely for SGOs other than B/C, as B/C will also provide a new link road.
7. Plan for the anticipated levels of climate change		
7.1 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure?	+	The Council has advised that all options will provide new GI. The site also includes a number of small copses, including Hall Lands Copse, but the Council has stated that there will be no loss of existing woodland.
7.2 Is the location at risk from flooding, taking into account of the effects of climate change?	--?	There is a small area of Flood Zones 3 in the south east of the site. The site also includes some areas of less and intermediate surface water flood risk.
7.3 Will the development be at risk from coastal change? If so, can the Shoreline Management Plan Objectives be supported?	0	The SGO is not located near the coast.
8. Minimise Eastleigh's contribution to climate change by reducing the borough's carbon footprint and minimising other greenhouse gas emissions.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
9. Reduce waste generation and disposal, encourage waste prevention and reuse and achieve the sustainable management of waste.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
10. Protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and geodiversity, improving its quality and range.		
10.1 Could development negatively impact or lead to loss of an internationally or nationally designated site (either alone or in combination)?	-	This option could have a range of impacts. The SGO is around 2.5km from the River Itchen SAC and SSSI. The SGO Draft Background Paper (2017) indicates that the site includes headwaters that flow into the River Itchen SAC and the Solent SPA/Ramsar/SAC via the Hamble. Traffic from the development would cross the Itchen SAC on existing roads. As part of the HRA process, the Council will consider ways to avoid or mitigate any likely

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
		significant effects from these and any other, wider issues.
10.2 Could development negatively impact or lead to loss of a locally designated biodiversity site (either alone or in combination)?	-?	This option includes three SINCs and is adjacent four more, consisting primarily of woodland. The SGO Draft Background Paper (2017) indicates that development can take place without loss of woodland, or any other effects on the habitat or species it supports.
10.3 Will the development adversely affect areas with other nature conservation value, as identified in Biodiversity Action Plans (BAPs)?	-?	A complete network of hedgerows is present, which provide excellent connectivity between the woodland blocks. Development at this strategic location could isolate the small woodland block from the wider woodland/hedgerow network. Several different protected species could be present at or utilise this strategic location, including but not limited to: great crested newts, bats, otters. Due to the aquatic and hedgerow connections to the SAC, otter may use the sites. The site is also likely to include rough and semi-improved grassland. A minor negative effect is likely, although this is uncertain prior to further information about design/layout and potential mitigation and enhancement opportunities.
10.4 Will the development adversely impact the biodiversity network (e.g. Priority Biodiversity Links (PBLs), Priority Biodiversity Areas (PBAs), hedgerows and other corridors for species movement)?	-?	At present, the SINCs on the site are connected by a relatively complete hedgerow network and there is a danger that these woodland blocks could become isolated from the wider network. Connectivity between SINCs and movement corridors for protected species are particularly important and there is risk that development of this Option could sever these. Undesignated habitats at these locations are also important to protect and link valuable habitats, safeguard natural hydrological processes, and provide broad dispersal corridors for protected species and connections between woodlands within this location and the wider biodiversity network. To minimise negative effects connections between woodlands and movement corridors for species should be retained and buffered. Further information would be required about design and layout of potential development at these locations. In addition, the Draft Background Paper (2017) indicates that development may have negative impacts on otters, which are likely to traverse the watercourses passing through this site.
10.5 Will the development adversely affect ancient woodland?	-?	There is an area of ancient woodland within the SGO and another adjacent to the northern part of the site. The SGO Draft Background Paper (2017) indicates that development can take place without loss of woodland, or any other effects on the habitat or species it supports, hence the effect is assessed as minor on the assumption that protection of the ancient woodland would be secured through the allocation policy.
11. Enhance the Borough's multifunctional green infrastructure networks.		
11.1 Will the development affect TPO trees?	-?	A number of TPO trees are present within the SGO, however these occupy a small portion of the location and it is likely that design and layout of development could accommodate them.
11.2 Can the location be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	0	A number of footpaths and a bridleway cross the site, but there are no cycleways either within or adjacent to the site.
11.3 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure? (same score as 7.1)	+	The Council has advised that all options will provide new GI. The site also includes a number of small copses, including Hall Lands Copse, but the Council has stated that there will be no loss of existing woodland.
12. Protect, enhance and manage the character and		

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
appearance of the landscape and townscape, maintaining and strengthening distinctiveness and its special qualities.		
12.1 Will development adversely affect the separation of neighbouring settlements?	-?	<p>None of the options are within countryside gaps designated in the adopted Local Plan, however all are of a scale that they could significantly alter the current pattern of town and countryside.</p> <p>The SGO Draft Background Paper (2017) states that this option will retain appropriate gaps with surrounding settlements, proportionate to the scale of these settlements.</p>
12.2 Will it protect the character of the countryside, coast, towns and/or villages, including views and settings?	--?	<p>This SGO is likely to have significant negative effects, particularly arising from impacts on the character of the landscape in this area. For north of Mortimers Lane this particularly relates to its historic rural character, and for south of Mortimers Lane, this particularly relates to the open character due to the golf courses. North of Mortimers Lane has a distinctive and historic field enclosure pattern and includes elevated land to the west, which is a key part of the character of this location. However, development would fill in a 'missing quadrant' of Fair Oak and include a new district centre, positioned to effectively serve existing as well as new development, therefore aiding integration.</p> <p>Development at this location could result in significant negative effects to the character of this historic and rural landscape.</p> <p>These effects are, however, uncertain because the site specific design and layout details would not be ascertained until decision-making stage. The SGO Draft Background Paper (2017) states that the effect of development on views from the South Downs National Park are expected to be negligible.</p>
13. Protect and enhance and manage buildings, monuments, features, sites, places, areas and landscapes of archaeological, historical and cultural heritage importance.		
13.1 Will the development protect and enhance listed buildings and their settings, conservation areas, archaeological sites, historic landscapes and other sites of local importance for heritage?	-?	<p>North of Mortimers Lane includes Little Dower House, a locally listed building, as is Stroudwood Farmhouse and Mortimer's Farm (including house, barn and granary). It is also noted that the SGO includes land that is within the Fair Oak Historic Park and Garden. Further information would be required with regard to the sensitivity of design and landscaping.</p>

Option D plus greenfield land immediately to the north east of Fair Oak (a)

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
1. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified local needs, including affordability and special needs		
1.1 Will the development provide a significant contribution towards meeting identified affordable housing needs?	++	This option would provide 3,350 new homes.
1.2 Will it provide other elements of identified housing need e.g. housing for older persons, self-build, support housing?	+?	At this stage, no barriers to the delivery of specialist housing have been identified. The proportions of these housing types achievable will remain uncertain until further work is undertaken by site promoters.
2. Safeguard and improve community health, safety and wellbeing		
2.1 Are community facilities (community hall or library) available locally?	++/+	The Council has indicated that this option would include provision of a new community hall. However, this will only be delivered in the main part of the site, although land immediately to the north east of Fair Oak (a) is within 400m of Fair Oak Library and Acorn Social Club. Therefore, mixed significant positive and minor positive effects have been recorded.
2.2 Are health facilities available locally?	++/0	The Council has indicated that all options will provide a new GP surgery. Whilst this will only be delivered in the main part of the site (Option E), land immediately to the north east of Fair Oak (a) is within 1200m of Stokewood Surgery. Therefore, mixed significant positive and negligible effects have been recorded.
2.3 What effect would the development have on local provision of sports pitches and facilities?	+?	The SGO could be suitable for provision of sports pitches and facilities, however, the site promoters of these locations have not indicated if such provision will be incorporated.
2.4 Is public open space available locally?	++	The Council has indicated that this option would include nearly 63 ha new publically accessible open space, including provision of open space in both parts of the SGO.
2.5 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network?	+/0	A number of footpaths cross and are adjacent to the site and a cycleway is also adjacent to, and crosses, the main site. There is a footpath located to the land immediately to the north east of Fair Oak (a), but there are no cycleways within or adjacent to this part of the SGO. Therefore, mixed minor positive and negligible effects have been recorded.
3. Develop a dynamic and diverse economy		
3.1(a) Is the location close to a major rail station?	--?	Both parts of the SGO are further than 1400m from a major rail station. However, the southern limit of the main site is adjacent to the Eastleigh-Fareham railway line, which creates the potential for the SGO to be served by rail. This is uncertain, as provision of a new rail station would require approval and agreements from a number of parties, including network rail, and a source of funding. It is considered unlikely that an additional station would be opened within the plan period.
3.1 (b) Is the location close to a minor rail station?	--	Both parts of the SGO are further than 1200m from a minor rail station.
3.1 (c) Is the location close to a frequent bus route?	++	Parts of both the main site and land immediately north east of Fair Oak (a) are within 400m of the frequent Blue star 2 bus route.
3.1 (d) Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route?	--	The SGO is not within 800m of a semi-frequent bus route.

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
3.1 (e) Is the location close to a major employment centre?	++	The SGO would provide a new major employment centre.
3.2 Will the proposed development contribute towards meeting the need for new industrial, office or warehousing floorspace?	+	This option would deliver 30,000 sq. m. employment floorspace.
3.3 Will the proposed development result in a net loss of existing employment land, or land which would be suitable for employment purposes?	0	The SGO includes existing small-scale businesses, primarily along Allington Lane, however EBC has indicated that the site would deliver 30,000 sq. m. employment floorspace so it is assumed there will be no net loss of employment space overall.
3.4 Will the proposed development increase the amount of commercial uses and other facilities in town, district or local centres?	++?/+?	The Council has indicated that the main site will include a new district centre. A new local centre will be provided at land immediately north east of Fair Oak (a), but it is uncertain what effect this will have on existing facilities.
4. Reduce road traffic and congestion through improved accessibility to services, homes and jobs; reducing the need to travel by car/lorry and improving sustainable travel choice		
4.1 Is the location close to a major rail station? (same score as 3.1a)	--?	Both parts of the SGO are further than 1400m from a major rail station. However, the southern limit of the main site is adjacent to the Eastleigh-Fareham railway line, which creates the potential for the SGO to be served by rail. This is uncertain, as provision of a new rail station would require approval and agreements from a number of parties, including network rail, and a source of funding. It is considered unlikely that an additional station would be opened within the plan period.
4.2 Is the location close to a minor rail station? (same score as 3.1b)	--	Both parts of the SGO are further than 1200m from a minor rail station.
4.3 Is the location close to a frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1c)	++	Parts of both the main site and land immediately north east of Fair Oak (a) are within 400m of the frequent Blue star 2 bus route.
4.4 Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1d)	--	The SGO is not within 800m of a semi-frequent bus route.
4.5(a) Will residential development at the location be close to a major employment centre? (same score as 3.1e)	++	The SGO would provide a new major employment centre.
4.5(b) Will employment development at the location be close to a major population centre?	+/-	Small parts of the main site are within 1000m of a major population centre, Eastleigh. Land immediately north east of Fair Oak (a) is further than 1000m from a major population centre.
4.6 Are health facilities available locally? (same score as 2.2)	++/0	The Council has indicated that all options will provide a new GP surgery. Whilst this will only be delivered in the main part of the site (Option E), land immediately to the north east of Fair Oak (a) is within 1200m of Stokewood Surgery. Therefore, mixed significant positive and negligible effects have been recorded.
4.7 Are shopping and related services available locally?	++	The Council has advised that this SGO would provide a new district centre, as well as a new 2,300 sq m foodstore and other retail at the main site, and a local centre at land immediately north east of fair oak (a).
4.8 Is the location close to a Primary school?	++/0	The Council has advised that this option would deliver two new primary schools within the main site. Land immediately north east of Fair Oak (a) is approximately 650m from Fair Oak Infant and Junior Schools, leading to mixed significant positive uncertain and negligible scores on this objective.
4.9 Is the location close to a Secondary	++	A small section of the main site and approximately half

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
school?		of the supplementary site is located within 800m of Wyvern College..
4.10 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	+/0	A number of footpaths cross and are adjacent to the site and a cycleway is also adjacent to, and crosses, the main site. There is a footpath located to the land immediately to the north east of Fair Oak (a), but there are no cycleways within or adjacent to this part of the SGO. Therefore, mixed minor positive and negligible effects have been recorded.
4.11 Are there Geographical barriers between the location and key facilities/ destinations?	+	There are no major geographical barriers on the most direct walking routes to the destinations above in the main part of the site. Due to the level of infrastructure expected to be delivered at this site, it is anticipated that residents, at least within the main part of the site, will be able to meet most of their daily and weekly needs within the SGO.
5. Protect and conserve natural resources		
5.1 Will development avoid the sterilisation of mineral resources?	-?	The site lies partly within multiple Mineral Consultation Areas and Mineral Safeguarding Areas.
5.2 Will it result in the loss of higher grade agricultural land?	-	The site consists primarily of low quality agricultural land (Grades 4 and/or 5) but also includes an area of medium quality (Grade 3) agricultural land in the southeastern part of the site.
5.3 Will it use previously developed land?	-?	This SGO consists primarily of greenfield land. There are a few existing buildings in the main part of the site, but it is uncertain whether these will be retained.
5.4 Will it deliver or support allotments or community farms?	+?	The SGO has potential to provide allotments or possibly a community farm. Site promoters have not yet indicated if any provision of allotments or a community farm would form part of development at these locations.
6. Reduce air, soil, water, light and noise pollution		
6.1 Will the location be affected by significant noise generating uses or Air Quality Management Areas?	-?/0	The southern part of the main site is adjacent to a railway line. However, land immediately north east of Fair Oak (a) is not within 200m of an AQMA, motorway, A road or railway line.
6.2 Will development increase pollution?	--?	Development at this SGO may increase air pollution, however the detail of these potential effects are currently uncertain and further information is required. Negative effects are due to impacts arising from increased traffic generated by development at these locations, which could adversely affect local air quality, the Eastleigh Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) and the nature conservation interest of the River Itchen SAC. Further work would be required about the transport and associated air quality impacts arising from development at these locations. The Draft Background Paper (2017) recognises that, due to the scale of development, all SGOs are likely to increase traffic congestion somewhere in the Borough and surrounding areas. It is suggested that this may be largely for SGOs other than B/C, as B/C will also provide a new link road.
7. Plan for the anticipated levels of climate change		
7.1 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure?	+	The Council has advised that all options will provide new GI. The northern part of the main site includes existing amenity space. There is also a corridor of trees along

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
		the stream running east-west through the site that. The Council has stated that both this amenity space and corridor of trees would be retained.
7.2 Is the location at risk from flooding, taking into account of the effects of climate change?	--?	The site includes areas of Flood Zones 2 and 3, associated with the stream through the site and the River Itchen. There are also areas at 'less' and 'intermediate' risk of surface water flooding present in both parts of the SGO.
7.3 Will the development be at risk from coastal change? If so, can the Shoreline Management Plan Objectives be supported?	0	The SGO is not located near the coast.
8. Minimise Eastleigh's contribution to climate change by reducing the borough's carbon footprint and minimising other greenhouse gas emissions.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
9. Reduce waste generation and disposal, encourage waste prevention and reuse and achieve the sustainable management of waste.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
10. Protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and geodiversity, improving its quality and range.		
10.1 Could development negatively impact or lead to loss of an internationally or nationally designated site (either alone or in combination)?	-	This option could have a range of impacts. The south western part of the main site is adjacent to the River Itchen SAC and SSSI. The site also includes a smaller watercourse, which feeds into the River Itchen and therefore, for example, may carry pollutants or silt etc. from the development site into the River Itchen SAC, and could also have negative effects with regards to light spill. Development at the SGO may also increase recreational pressure on the River Itchen. The Draft Background Paper (2017) notes that this SGO is within the 5.6 km buffer of the Solent SPA / Ramsar / SAC, which a draft mitigation strategy considers to be the area within which there is the potential for adverse effects. Extra traffic arising from development would cross the River Itchen SAC on existing roads. As part of the HRA process, the Council will consider ways to avoid or mitigate any likely significant effects from these and any other, wider issues.
10.2 Could development negatively impact or lead to loss of a locally designated biodiversity site (either alone or in combination)?	-?	The main site contains the Allington Lane Pond SINC and is adjacent to both the Hearts Copse SINC and the West Horton Farm Woods SINC. The SGO Draft Background Paper (2017) indicates that development can take place without loss of woodland, or any other effects on the habitat or species it supports.
10.3 Will the development adversely affect areas with other nature conservation value, as identified in Biodiversity Action Plans (BAPs)?	-?	A number of protected species have been recorded or are anticipated to be present at the SINCs within and near to the site. For example, the Council is undertaking a strategic survey of great crested newts as this SGO is close to significant GCN habitat/population. Bechstein's bats have been recorded in Stoke Park Woods and these locations could require survey.
10.4 Will the development adversely impact the biodiversity network (e.g. Priority Biodiversity Links (PBLs), Priority Biodiversity Areas (PBAs), hedgerows and other corridors for species movement)?	-?	The Draft Background Paper (2017) indicates that development may have negative impacts on otters, which are likely to traverse the watercourses passing through this site. However, the Paper also suggests that field enlargements that have already occurred at the site have somewhat reduced habitat connectivity in this SGO.

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
		In addition, GIS data shows that the main site contains PBLs and PBAs.
10.5 Will the development adversely affect ancient woodland?	-?	Hearts Copse, adjacent to the southwest of the main site, consists of ancient woodland. However, the SGO Draft Background Paper (2017) indicates that development can take place without loss of woodland, or any other effects on the habitat or species it supports, hence the effect is assessed as minor on the assumption that protection of the ancient woodland would be secured through the allocation policy.
11. Enhance the Borough's multifunctional green infrastructure networks.		
11.1 Will the development affect TPO trees?	-?	There are a small number of TPO trees south of Bishopstoke, which could be lost as a result of development at this SGO.
11.2 Can the location be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	+ / 0	A number of footpaths cross and are adjacent to the site and a cycleway is also adjacent to, and crosses, the main site. There is a footpath located to the land immediately to the north east of Fair Oak (a), but there are no cycleways within or adjacent to this part of the SGO. Therefore, mixed minor positive and negligible effects have been recorded.
11.3 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure? (same score as 7.1)	+	The Council has advised that all options will provide new GI. The northern part of the main site includes existing amenity space. There is also a corridor of trees along the stream running east-west through the site. The Council has stated that both this amenity space and corridor of trees would be retained.
12. Protect, enhance and manage the character and appearance of the landscape and townscape, maintaining and strengthening distinctiveness and its special qualities.		
12.1 Will development adversely affect the separation of neighbouring settlements?	-?	None of the options are within countryside gaps designated in the adopted Local Plan; however, all are of a scale that they could significantly alter the current pattern of town and countryside. The Draft Background Paper (2017) states that the distance between existing urban areas is generally around 2 to 3 km. Development at this SGO would narrow this, but this area is already compromised by the proposed development west of Horton Heath and Chalcroft Distribution Park. The railway line and motorway create boundaries to maintain a strong gap with Southampton.
12.2 Will it protect the character of the countryside, coast, towns and/or villages, including views and settings?	--?	Development at the SGO has potential to negatively affect landscape and townscape, including the setting of the wooded Quobleigh Pond and the open character of the recreational land south of Bishopstoke. There would be significant erosion of the remaining gap between Bishopstoke and Fair Oak and between Bishopstoke, Fair Oak and Horton Heath, particularly in combination with development proposed west of Horton Heath, which currently has resolution to permit. Development may also have impacts on the more prominent ridges of the landscape and on the lower more open landscape in the Itchen Valley in particular. In addition, wooded horizons are important in views across the landscape and could be compromised by new development. These effects are, however, uncertain because the site

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
		specific design and layout details would not be ascertained until decision-making stage.
13. Protect and enhance and manage buildings, monuments, features, sites, places, areas and landscapes of archaeological, historical and cultural heritage importance.		
13.1 Will the development protect and enhance listed buildings and their settings, conservation areas, archaeological sites, historic landscapes and other sites of local importance for heritage?	-?	The SGO includes Grade II listed buildings at West Horton Lane, and Fair Oak Lodge, a locally listed building, is located close to this Strategic Location on the other side of Allington Lane. A possible prehistoric enclosure lies within land immediately north east of Fair Oak (a). Further information would be required with regard to the sensitivity of design and landscaping.

Option D plus land immediately south of Option D and the railway line

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
1. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified local needs, including affordability and special needs		
1.1 Will the development provide a significant contribution towards meeting identified affordable housing needs?	++	This option would provide 3,350 new homes.
1.2 Will it provide other elements of identified housing need e.g. housing for older persons, self-build, support housing?	++?	At this stage, no barriers to the delivery of specialist housing have been identified. The proportions of these housing types achievable will remain uncertain until further work is undertaken by site promoters.
2. Safeguard and improve community health, safety and wellbeing		
2.1 Are community facilities (community hall or library) available locally?	++?	The Council has indicated that this option would include provision of a new community hall. However, this will only be provided in the main area of the site, north of the railway line. There are no community facilities within 800m of land to the south of Option D. However, it is reasonable to assume that any new facilities provided in the main part of the site would be accessible for residents at land to the south of Option D. The barrier posed by the railway line has resulted in some uncertainty with regards to this assessment.
2.2 Are health facilities available locally?	++?	The Council has indicated that all options will provide a new GP surgery. However, this will only be provided in the main area of the site, north of the railway line. There are no health facilities within 1600m of land to the south of Option D. However, it is reasonable to assume that any new facilities provided in the main part of the site would be accessible for residents at land to the south of Option D. The barrier posed by the railway line has resulted in some uncertainty with regards to this assessment.
2.3 What effect would the development have on local provision of sports pitches and facilities?	++?	The SGO could be suitable for provision of sports pitches and facilities, however, the site promoters of these locations have not indicated if such provision will be incorporated.
2.4 Is public open space available locally?	++	The Council has indicated that this option would include nearly 63 ha new publically accessible open space, including provision both north and south of the railway line.
2.5 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network?	++/0	A number of footpaths cross and are adjacent to the site and a cycleway is also adjacent to, and crosses, the main site. A footpath crosses the land immediately south of Option D, but there are no cycleways within or adjacent to this part of the SGO, therefore there is some uncertainty relating to the positive effect identified.
3. Develop a dynamic and diverse economy		
3.1(a) Is the location close to a major rail station?	--?	Both parts of the SGO are further than 1400m from a major rail station. However, the railway between the two parts of the site is the Eastleigh-Fareham railway line, which creates the potential for the SGO to be served by rail. This is uncertain, as provision of a new rail station would require approval and agreements from a number of parties, including network rail, and a source of funding. It is considered unlikely that an additional station would be opened within the plan period.
3.1 (b) Is the location close to a minor rail station?	--	Both parts of the SGO are further than 1200m from a minor rail station.

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
3.1 (c) Is the location close to a frequent bus route?	++/--	Parts of the main site are within 400m of the frequent Blue star 2 bus route. However, the land south of the railway line is further than 800m from a bus route, leading to mixed significant positive and significant negative effects.
3.1 (d) Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route?	--	The SGO is not within 800m of a semi-frequent bus route.
3.1 (e) Is the location close to a major employment centre?	++	The SGO would provide a new major employment centre.
3.2 Will the proposed development contribute towards meeting the need for new industrial, office or warehousing floorspace?	+	This option would deliver 30,000 sq. m. employment floorspace.
3.3 Will the proposed development result in a net loss of existing employment land, or land which would be suitable for employment purposes?	0	The SGO includes existing small-scale businesses, primarily along Allington Lane. However EBC has indicated that the site would deliver 30,000 sq. m. employment floorspace so it is assumed there will be no net loss of employment space overall.
3.4 Will the proposed development increase the amount of commercial uses and other facilities in town, district or local centres?	+++?/+	The Council has indicated that the main site will include a new district centre. A new local centre will also be provided south of the railway line. This is not expected to affect existing facilities, as there are no local or district centres within 800m of the site.
4. Reduce road traffic and congestion through improved accessibility to services, homes and jobs; reducing the need to travel by car/lorry and improving sustainable travel choice		
4.1 Is the location close to a major rail station? (same score as 3.1a)	--?	Both parts of the SGO are further than 1400m from a major rail station. However, the railway between the two parts of the site is the Eastleigh-Fareham railway line, which creates the potential for the SGO to be served by rail. This is uncertain, as provision of a new rail station would require approval and agreements from a number of parties, including network rail, and a source of funding. It is considered unlikely that an additional station would be opened within the plan period.
4.2 Is the location close to a minor rail station? (same score as 3.1b)	--	Both parts of the SGO are further than 1200m from a minor rail station.
4.3 Is the location close to a frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1c)	++/--	Parts of the main site are within 400m of the frequent Blue star 2 bus route. However, the land south of the railway line is further than 800m from a bus route, leading to mixed significant positive and significant negative effects.
4.4 Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1d)	--	The SGO is not within 800m of a semi-frequent bus route.
4.5(a) Will residential development at the location be close to a major employment centre? (same score as 3.1e)	++	The SGO would provide a new major employment centre.
4.5(b) Will employment development at the location be close to a major population centre?	+	Parts of the main site are within 1000m of a major population centre, Eastleigh. Parts of the site south of the railway line are within 1000m of the major population centre of Southampton.
4.6 Are health facilities available locally? (same score as 2.2)	++?	The Council has indicated that all options will provide a new GP surgery. However, this will only be provided in the main area of the site, north of the railway line. There are no health facilities within 1600m of land to the south of Option D. However, it is reasonable to assume that any new facilities provided in the main part of the site would be accessible for residents at land to the south of Option D. The barrier posed by the railway line

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
		has resulted in some uncertainty with regards to this assessment.
4.7 Are shopping and related services available locally?	++	The Council has advised that this SGO would provide a new district centre, as well as a new 2,300 sq m foodstore and other retail at the main site, and a local centre at land south of the railway line.
4.8 Is the location close to a Primary school?	++?	The Council has advised that this option will provide two primary schools in the main part of the site. There are no primary schools within 1000m of land south of the railway line. However, it is reasonable to assume that any new facilities provided in the main part of the site would be accessible for residents at land to the south of Option D. The barrier posed by the railway line has resulted in some uncertainty with regards to this assessment.
4.9 Is the location close to a Secondary school?	++/--	A small section of the main site is located within 800m of Wyvern College however, the supplementary site is further than 2000m from a secondary school and no new provision has been indicated by EBC.
4.10 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	+?/0	A number of footpaths cross and are adjacent to the site and a cycleway is also adjacent to, and crosses, the main site. A footpath crosses the land immediately south of Option D, but there are no cycleways within or adjacent to this part of the SGO, therefore there is some uncertainty relating to the positive effect identified.
4.11 Are there Geographical barriers between the location and key facilities/ destinations?	+/--	There are no major geographical barriers on the most direct walking routes to the destinations above in the main part of the site. Due to the level of infrastructure expected to be delivered, it is anticipated that residents, within the main part of the site, will be able to meet most of their daily and weekly needs within the SGO. However, for land immediately south of Option D and the railway line, the railway could present a major barrier to ease of access to services and facilities in the main part of the site. Whilst there is a road crossing the railway, this does not currently have a pavement and is the only crossing point within or adjacent to the site.
5. Protect and conserve natural resources		
5.1 Will development avoid the sterilisation of mineral resources?	-?/0	The main site lies partly within multiple Mineral Consultation Areas and Mineral Safeguarding Areas. The part of the site immediately south of the railway line does not coincide with an MSA or MCA.
5.2 Will it result in the loss of higher grade agricultural land?	-	The site consists primarily of low quality agricultural land (Grades 4 and/or 5) but also includes an area of medium quality (Grade 3) agricultural land in the southeastern part of the site and land immediately south of the railway line.
5.3 Will it use previously developed land?	-?	This SGO consists primarily of greenfield land. There are a few existing buildings in the main part of the site, but it is uncertain whether these will be retained.
5.4 Will it deliver or support allotments or community farms?	+?	The SGO has potential to provide allotments or possibly a community farm. Site promoters have not yet indicated if any provision of allotments or a community farm would form part of development at these locations.
6. Reduce air, soil, water, light and noise pollution		
6.1 Will the location be affected by significant noise generating uses or Air Quality Management Areas?	-?	The site is adjacent to a railway line. However, the site is not within 200m of an AQMA, motorway or A road.
6.2 Will development increase pollution?	--?	Development at this SGO may increase air pollution,

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
		however the detail of these potential effects are currently uncertain and further information is required. Negative effects are due to impacts arising from increased traffic generated by development at these locations, which could adversely affect local air quality, the Eastleigh Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) and the nature conservation interest of the River Itchen SAC. Further work would be required about the transport and associated air quality impacts arising from development at these locations. The Draft Background Paper (2017) recognises that, due to the scale of development, all SGOs are likely to increase traffic congestion somewhere in the Borough and surrounding areas. It is suggested that this may be largely for SGOs other than B/C, as B/C will also provide a new link road.
7. Plan for the anticipated levels of climate change		
7.1 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure?	+	The Council has advised that all options will provide new GI. The northern part of the main site includes existing amenity space. There is also a corridor of trees along the stream running east-west through the site. The Council has stated that both this amenity space and corridor of trees would be retained.
7.2 Is the location at risk from flooding, taking into account of the effects of climate change?	--?/0	The main site includes areas of Flood Zones 2 and 3, associated with the stream through the site and the River Itchen. There are also areas at 'less' and 'intermediate' risk of surface water flooding present in the main site. The site immediately south of Option D is not within an area at risk of surface water flooding and only a negligible part of the site lies within Flood Zone 3.
7.3 Will the development be at risk from coastal change? If so, can the Shoreline Management Plan Objectives be supported?	0	The SGO is not located near the coast.
8. Minimise Eastleigh's contribution to climate change by reducing the borough's carbon footprint and minimising other greenhouse gas emissions.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
9. Reduce waste generation and disposal, encourage waste prevention and reuse and achieve the sustainable management of waste.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
10. Protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and geodiversity, improving its quality and range.		
10.1 Could development negatively impact or lead to loss of an internationally or nationally designated site (either alone or in combination)?	-	This option could have a range of impacts. The south western part of the main site is adjacent to the River Itchen SAC and SSSI. The site also includes a smaller watercourse, which feeds into the River Itchen and therefore, for example, may carry pollutants or silt etc. from the development site into the River Itchen SAC, and could also have negative effects with regards to light spill. Development at the SGO may also increase recreational pressure on the River Itchen. The Draft Background Paper (2017) notes that this SGO is within the 5.6 km buffer of the Solent SPA / Ramsar / SAC, which a draft mitigation strategy considers to be the

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
		area within which there is the potential for adverse effects. Extra traffic arising from development would cross the River Itchen SAC on existing roads. As part of the HRA process, the Council will consider ways to avoid or mitigate any likely significant effects from these and any other, wider issues.
10.2 Could development negatively impact or lead to loss of a locally designated biodiversity site (either alone or in combination)?	-?	The main site contains the Allington Lane Pond SINC and is adjacent to both the Hearts Copse SINC and the West Horton Farm Woods SINC. The SGO Draft Background Paper (2017) indicates that development can take place without loss of woodland, or any other effects on the habitat or species it supports.
10.3 Will the development adversely affect areas with other nature conservation value, as identified in Biodiversity Action Plans (BAPs)?	-?	A number of protected species have been recorded or are anticipated to be present at the SINC within and near to the site. For example, the Council is undertaking a strategic survey of great crested newts as this SGO is close to significant GCN habitat/population. Bechstein's bats have been recorded in Stoke Park Woods and these locations could require survey.
10.4 Will the development adversely impact the biodiversity network (e.g. Priority Biodiversity Links (PBLs), Priority Biodiversity Areas (PBAs), hedgerows and other corridors for species movement)?	-?	The Draft Background Paper (2017) indicates that development may have negative impacts on otters, which are likely to traverse the watercourses passing through this site. However, the Paper also suggests that field enlargements that have already occurred at the site have somewhat reduced habitat connectivity in this SGO. In addition, GIS data shows that the main site contains PBLs and PBAs.
10.5 Will the development adversely affect ancient woodland?	-?	Hearts Copse, adjacent to the southwest of the main site, consists of ancient woodland. However, the SGO Draft Background Paper (2017) indicates that development can take place without loss of woodland, or any other effects on the habitat or species it supports, hence the effect is assessed as minor on the assumption that protection of the ancient woodland would be secured through the allocation policy.
11. Enhance the Borough's multifunctional green infrastructure networks.		
11.1 Will the development affect TPO trees?	-?	There are a small number of TPO trees south of Bishopstoke, which could be lost as a result of development at this SGO.
11.2 Can the location be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	+?/0	A number of footpaths cross and are adjacent to the site and a cycleway is also adjacent to, and crosses, the main site. A footpath crosses the land immediately south of Option D, but there are no cycleways within or adjacent to this part of the SGO, therefore there is some uncertainty relating to the positive effect identified.
11.3 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure? (same score as 7.1)	+	The Council has advised that all options will provide new GI. The northern part of the main site includes existing amenity space. There is also a corridor of trees along the stream running east-west through the main site. The Council has stated that both this amenity space and corridor of trees would be retained.
12. Protect, enhance and manage the character and appearance of the landscape and townscape, maintaining and strengthening distinctiveness and its special qualities.		
12.1 Will development adversely affect the separation of neighbouring settlements?	-?	None of the options are within countryside gaps designated in the adopted Local Plan; however, all are of a scale that they could significantly alter the current pattern of town and countryside. The Draft Background Paper (2017) states that the

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
		distance between existing urban areas is generally around 2 to 3 km. This area is compromised by the proposed development west of Horton Heath and Chalcroft Distribution Park. A gap would be retained with Southampton, although the railway line boundary would be breached
12.2 Will it protect the character of the countryside, coast, towns and/or villages, including views and settings?	--?	<p>Development at the SGO has potential to negatively affect landscape and townscape, including the setting of the wooded Quobleigh Pond and the open character of the recreational land south of Bishopstoke. There would be significant erosion of the remaining gap between Bishopstoke and Fair Oak and between Bishopstoke, Fair Oak and Horton Heath, particularly in combination with development proposed west of Horton Heath, which currently has resolution to permit. Development may also have impacts on the more prominent ridges of the landscape and on the lower more open landscape in the Itchen Valley in particular. In addition, wooded horizons are important in views across the landscape and could be compromised by new development.</p> <p>These effects are, however, uncertain because the site specific design and layout details would not be ascertained until decision-making stage.</p>
13. Protect and enhance and manage buildings, monuments, features, sites, places, areas and landscapes of archaeological, historical and cultural heritage importance.		
13.1 Will the development protect and enhance listed buildings and their settings, conservation areas, archaeological sites, historic landscapes and other sites of local importance for heritage?	-?	The SGO includes Grade II listed buildings at West Horton Lane, and Fair Oak Lodge, a locally listed building, is located close to this Strategic Location on the other side of Allington Lane. Further information would be required with regard to the sensitivity of design and landscaping.

Option E plus greenfield land immediately to the north east of Fair Oak (b)

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
1. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified local needs, including affordability and special needs		
1.1 Will the development provide a significant contribution towards meeting identified affordable housing needs?	++	This option would provide 3,350 new homes.
1.2 Will it provide other elements of identified housing need e.g. housing for older persons, self-build, support housing?	+?	At this stage, no barriers to the delivery of specialist housing have been identified. The proportions of these housing types achievable will remain uncertain until further work is undertaken by site promoters.
2. Safeguard and improve community health, safety and wellbeing		
2.1 Are community facilities (community hall or library) available locally?	++/+	The Council has indicated that this option would include provision of a new community hall. However, this will only be delivered in the main part of the site, although land immediately to the north east of Fair Oak (b) is within 400m of Fair Oak Library and Acorn Social Club. Therefore, mixed significant positive and minor positive effects have been recorded.
2.2 Are health facilities available locally?	++/0	The Council has indicated that all options will provide a new GP surgery. Whilst this will only be delivered in the main part of the site (Option E), land immediately to the north east of Fair Oak (b) is within 1200m of Stokewood Surgery. Therefore, mixed significant positive and negligible effects have been recorded.
2.3 What effect would the development have on local provision of sports pitches and facilities?	+?	The SGO could be suitable for provision of sports pitches and facilities, which could result in a minor positive effect. However, the site promoters of these locations have not indicated if such provision will be incorporated.
2.4 Is public open space available locally?	++	The Council has indicated that this option would include 75.1 ha publically accessible open space, including provision of open space in both parts of the SGO.
2.5 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network?	0	Footpaths cross the main part of the site and there is a footpath adjacent to land immediately to the north east of Fair Oak (b), but there are no cycleways within or adjacent to any part of the SGO.
3. Develop a dynamic and diverse economy		
3.1(a) Is the location close to a major rail station?	--?	A very small part of the main site is within 1400m of Hedge End rail station and land immediately northeast of Fair Oak (b) is further than 1400m from a rail station, resulting in a significant negative assessment result. However, the northern limit of the main site is adjacent to the Eastleigh-Fareham railway line, which creates the potential for the SGO to be served by rail. This is uncertain, as provision of a new rail station would require approval and agreements from a number of parties, including network rail, and a source of funding. It is considered unlikely that an additional station would be opened within the plan period.
3.1 (b) Is the location close to a minor rail station?	--	Both parts of the SGO are further than 1200m from a minor rail station.
3.1 (c) Is the location close to a frequent bus route?	--/++	The main part of the site is further than 800m from a frequent bus route, leading to mixed significant positive and significant negative effects. The Draft Background Paper (2017) suggests that incorporating a commercially viable bus route into this option is less viable. Part of land immediately northeast of Fair Oak (b) is within 400m of the frequent Blue star 2 bus route.

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
3.1 (d) Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route?	-/--	The main part of the site is within 800m of the semi-frequent First 8 bus route. However, land immediately northeast of Fair Oak (b) is further than 800m from any semi-frequent bus route, resulting in a mixed minor negative and significant negative effect. The Draft Background Paper (2017) suggests that incorporating a commercially viable bus route into this option is less viable.
3.1 (e) Is the location close to a major employment centre?	++	The SGO would provide a new major employment centre.
3.2 Will the proposed development contribute towards meeting the need for new industrial, office or warehousing floorspace?	+	This option would deliver 30,000 sq. m. employment floorspace.
3.3 Will the proposed development result in a net loss of existing employment land, or land which would be suitable for employment purposes?	0	Development of this site would not result in loss of existing employment land.
3.4 Will the proposed development increase the amount of commercial uses and other facilities in town, district or local centres?	+?	The Council has indicated that the main site will include a new local centre. A new local centre will also be provided at land immediately north east of Fair Oak (b), but it is uncertain what effect this will have on existing facilities.
4. Reduce road traffic and congestion through improved accessibility to services, homes and jobs; reducing the need to travel by car/lorry and improving sustainable travel choice		
4.1 Is the location close to a major rail station? (same score as 3.1a)	--?	A very small part of the main site is within 1400m of Hedge End rail station and land immediately northeast of Fair Oak (b) is further than 1400m from a rail station, resulting in a significant negative assessment result. However, the northern limit of the main site is adjacent to the Eastleigh-Fareham railway line, which creates the potential for the SGO to be served by rail. This is uncertain, as provision of a new rail station would require approval and agreements from a number of parties, including network rail, and a source of funding. It is considered unlikely that an additional station would be opened within the plan period.
4.2 Is the location close to a minor rail station? (same score as 3.1b)	--	Both parts of the SGO are further than 1200m from a minor rail station.
4.3 Is the location close to a frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1c)	--/++	The main part of the site is further than 800m from a frequent bus route, leading to mixed significant positive and significant negative effects. The Draft Background Paper (2017) suggests that incorporating a commercially viable bus route into this option is less viable. Part of land immediately northeast of Fair Oak (b) is within 400m of the frequent Blue star 2 bus route.
4.4 Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1d)	-/--	The main part of the site is within 800m of the semi-frequent First 8 bus route. However, land immediately northeast of Fair Oak (b) is further than 800m from any semi-frequent bus route, resulting in a mixed minor negative and significant negative effect. The Draft Background Paper (2017) suggests that incorporating a commercially viable bus route into this option is less viable.
4.5(a) Will residential development at the location be close to a major employment centre? (same score as 3.1e)	++	The SGO would provide a new major employment centre.
4.5(b) Will employment development at the location be close to a major population centre?	++/-	The main part of the site is adjacent to the major population centres of Southampton and just over 400m from the major population centre of Hedge End. However, land immediately northeast of Fair Oak (b) is

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
		not within 1000 m of a major population centre.
4.6 Are health facilities available locally? (same score as 2.2)	++/0	The Council has indicated that all options will provide a new GP surgery. Whilst this will only be delivered in the main part of the site (Option E), land immediately to the north east of Fair Oak (b) is within 1200m of Stokewood Surgery. Therefore, mixed significant positive and negligible effects have been recorded.
4.7 Are shopping and related services available locally?	++	The Council has advised that this SGO will provide a new local centre at the main site, including 2,000 sq m gross retail, and a new local centre at land immediately north east of Fair Oak (b).
4.8 Is the location close to a Primary school?	++/0	The Council has advised that two primary schools are to be provided in the main part of this site. Land immediately northeast of Fair Oak (b) is approximately 650m from Fair Oak Infant and Junior Schools, leading to mixed significant positive uncertain and negligible scores on this objective.
4.9 Is the location close to a Secondary school?	-/+	A small part of the main site is within 2000m of Wildern School. The majority of the supplementary site is located within 800m of Wyvern College.
4.10 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	+/0	A number of footpaths cross and are adjacent to the site and a cycleway is also adjacent to, and crosses, the main site. There is a footpath located to the land immediately to the north east of Fair Oak (b), but there are no cycleways within or adjacent to this part of the SGO. Therefore, mixed minor positive and negligible effects have been recorded.
4.11 Are there Geographical barriers between the location and key facilities/ destinations?	-?	The main site is bounded to the north by a railway line and to the south by the M27 motorway. Due to the level of infrastructure expected to be delivered at this site, it is anticipated that residents, at least within the main part of the site, will be able to meet most of their daily and weekly needs within the SGO. Other services and facilities are available at Hedge End, which can be accessed without crossing any major geographical barriers. However, the most direct walking route to Hedge End from some parts of the site, particularly in the west, would involve crossing the motorway.
5. Protect and conserve natural resources		
5.1 Will development avoid the sterilisation of mineral resources?	-?	Small parts of the main site are within Minerals Consultation Areas. Land immediately northeast of Fair Oak (b) is also within a Mineral Consultation Area.
5.2 Will it result in the loss of higher grade agricultural land?	--/0	The main site includes a large area of high quality (grades 1 and 2) agricultural land, as well as some medium and low quality land. Land immediately north east of Fair Oak (b) consists entirely of low quality (grade 4 and/or 5) agricultural land.
5.3 Will it use previously developed land?	-?	The SGO consists primarily of agricultural land. There are a few existing buildings in the main part of the site, but it is uncertain whether these will be retained.
5.4 Will it deliver or support allotments or community farms?	+?	There is scope for the provision of allotments/community farm as part of the development. Site promoters have not yet indicated if any provision of allotments or a community farm would form part of development, therefore this remains uncertain.
6. Reduce air, soil, water, light and noise pollution		
6.1 Will the location be affected by significant noise generating uses or Air Quality Management Areas?	-?	The main site is bordered by a railway line to the north and the M27 to the south.

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
6.2 Will development increase pollution?	--?	<p>Given the scale of the Strategic Locations combined, there is likely to be a significant increase in traffic flows and volumes on the local road network, including Eastleigh Town. Air pollution from a significant increase in vehicles could impact local air quality generally and also have a potential knock on effect on nature conservation interest such as the River Itchen SAC.</p> <p>The Draft Background Paper (2017) recognises that, due to the scale of development, all SGOs are likely to increase traffic congestion somewhere in the Borough and surrounding areas. It is suggested that this may be largely for SGOs other than B/C, as B/C will also provide a new link road.</p>
7. Plan for the anticipated levels of climate change		
7.1 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure?	+	The Council has advised that all SGOs would provide new green infrastructure. The site includes Dummer's Copse and a limited number of other GIs features, but the Council has stated that these will not be lost to development.
7.2 Is the location at risk from flooding, taking into account of the effects of climate change?	--?	Small parts of the main site are within Flood Zones 2 and 3. Parts of both the main site and land immediately north east of Fair Oak (b) include areas at 'less' and 'intermediate' risk of surface water flooding.
7.3 Will the development be at risk from coastal change? If so, can the Shoreline Management Plan Objectives be supported?	0	The SGO is not located near the coast.
8. Minimise Eastleigh's contribution to climate change by reducing the borough's carbon footprint and minimising other greenhouse gas emissions.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
9. Reduce waste generation and disposal, encourage waste prevention and reuse and achieve the sustainable management of waste.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
10. Protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and geodiversity, improving its quality and range.		
10.1 Could development negatively impact or lead to loss of an internationally or nationally designated site (either alone or in combination)?	-	This option could have a range of impacts. The main site is within 500m of the River Itchen SAC and SSSI. The site contains one small headwater that flows into the river; therefore, this could be a pathway for effects from development. Development at this SGO may also encourage more visits to the River Itchen SAC and SSSI, as homes will be located near this feature. The Draft Background Paper (2017) also suggests that development may cause disturbance to the River Itchen due to light spill. The Draft Background Paper (2017) notes that this SGO is within the 5.6km buffer where the emerging Solent mitigation strategy judges there is potential for adverse effects in terms of increased recreational pressure. Extra traffic arising from development would use existing roads across the Itchen SAC. As part of the HRA process, the Council will consider ways to avoid or mitigate any likely significant effects from these and any other, wider issues.
10.2 Could development negatively impact or lead to loss of a locally designated biodiversity site (either alone or in combination)?	--?	The main site contains four SINCs: Dummer's Copse North, Winslowe House Meadow, Home Covert, West End and Meadow adjacent to Home Covert. There are

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
		also a number of designations adjacent to the site, including the large Itchen Valley Country Park and associated SINCs. Additional SINCs are present on the northern side of the railway and the southern side of the M27. The Draft Background Paper (2017) highlights that some of these are wet woodlands, which are rare, as they require supporting wet conditions. The SGO Draft Background Paper (2017) indicates that development can take place without loss of woodland, or any other effects on the habitat or species it supports, hence the effect is assessed as minor on the assumption that protection of the SINCs would be secured through the allocation policy.
10.3 Will the development adversely affect areas with other nature conservation value, as identified in Biodiversity Action Plans (BAPs)?	-?	Land in this Option contains hedgerows with woodland belts and copses. Protected species are likely to be present, for example, Otter, which are likely to utilise watercourse and hedgerows as routes of travel. The Draft Background Paper (2017) notes that a part of the main site is within 500m of a great crested newt habitat/population. The site is also adjacent to Itchen Valley Priority Biodiversity Area and Biodiversity Opportunity Area.
10.4 Will the development adversely impact the biodiversity network (e.g. Priority Biodiversity Links (PBLs), Priority Biodiversity Areas (PBAs), hedgerows and other corridors for species movement)?	-?	The Draft Background Paper (2017) indicates that development may have negative impacts on otters, which are likely to traverse the watercourses passing through this site. In addition, protected species such as otter are likely to use the hedgerow and watercourse links to travel through this site. Retention of dispersal routes such as the hedgerow and woodland habitat remaining, plus recreating the ancient hedgerow and woodland network and to connect the SINCs could minimise potential negative effects. The site is also adjacent to Itchen Valley Priority Biodiversity Area, as well as Moorgreen Priority Biodiversity Area. The northern and southernmost parts of the site include Priority Biodiversity Links, which could be affected by development.
10.5 Will the development adversely affect ancient woodland?	-?	The site includes Dummer's Copse, which is ancient woodland. However, the SGO Draft Background Paper (2017) indicates that development can take place without loss of woodland, or any other effects on the habitat or species it supports, hence the effect is assessed as minor on the assumption that protection of the ancient woodland would be secured through the allocation policy.
11. Enhance the Borough's multifunctional green infrastructure networks.		
11.1 Will the development affect TPO trees?	-?	Several trees that are the subject of Tree Preservation Orders are located at the west and south of the site, although it is possible that design and layout of development could accommodate them.
11.2 Can the location be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	0	Footpaths cross the main part of the site and there is a footpath adjacent to land immediately to the north east of Fair Oak (b), but there are no cycleways within or adjacent to any part of the SGO.
11.3 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure? (same score as 7.1)	+	The Council has advised that all SGOs would provide new green infrastructure. The site includes Dummer's Copse and a limited number of other GI features, but the Council has stated that these will not be lost to development.

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
12. Protect, enhance and manage the character and appearance of the landscape and townscape, maintaining and strengthening distinctiveness and its special qualities.		
12.1 Will development adversely affect the separation of neighbouring settlements?	--?	None of the options are within countryside gaps designated in the adopted Local Plan; however, all are of a scale that they could significantly alter the current pattern of town and countryside. In places, development of this Option could leave little or no gap with Horton Heath, due to already permitted extensions to Horton Heath, and the remaining area to the north of the railway line is already compromised by permitted development.
12.2 Will it protect the character of the countryside, coast, towns and/or villages, including views and settings?	--?	Transient views of development at this Option are likely to be seen from the local road network, the railway and the local public rights of way network. The public rights of way network is likely to receive more direct effects, particularly where it runs through the SGO. Development at this site would also have an impact upon the openness of the landscape character. The M27 motorway creates a physical barrier between this SGO and Southampton, therefore limiting integration with the existing urban area. Development on this site may also adversely affect the historic landscapes associated with Allington Manor and Winslowe House. These effects are, however, uncertain because the site specific design and layout details would not be ascertained until decision-making stage.
13. Protect and enhance and manage buildings, monuments, features, sites, places, areas and landscapes of archaeological, historical and cultural heritage importance.		
13.1 Will the development protect and enhance listed buildings and their settings, conservation areas, archaeological sites, historic landscapes and other sites of local importance for heritage?	-?	Winstowe House, a historic park and garden, and two Grade II listed buildings (a farmhouse and granary) at Moorgreen Farm are located at this Option; therefore, a minor negative effect would be likely. Further information would be required with regard to the sensitivity of design and landscaping. A possible prehistoric enclosure lies within land immediately north east of Fair Oak (b). Further information would be required with regard to the sensitivity of design and landscaping. EBC officers have also identified potential adverse effects on the historic landscape associated with Allington Manor.

Appendix 7

Comparative summary of SA findings for Strategic Growth Options

Introduction

The purpose of this appendix is to provide a summary of how the reasonable alternatives perform in sustainability terms in comparison to the selected option, SGO B/C. The reasonable alternatives comprise: SGO C; SGO D plus land immediately to the northeast of Fair Oak (a); SGO D plus land immediately south of Option D and the railway line; and SGO E. The sustainability performance of each option in relation to the SA objectives is set out in **Appendix 6**.

Methodology

This document does not present a change to any of the previous SA results for the SGOs, it simply compares the results of the alternatives against the selected SGO included in the Local Plan.

The assessment methodology is presented in the main SA Report. The SA framework and questions have been also been included in **Appendix 4**.

The comparisons consider how the options scored against each of the questions in the SA framework. For each SA question, there is an overall conclusion on whether SGO B/C scored better or worse than the other options. The scoring scheme used to rate the performance of SGO B/C relative to the other SGOs is shown in **Table A7.1**. This exercise has not sought to capture the extent of difference between options, but to highlight the key differences in SA scoring.

Table A7.1: Scoring scheme for performance of SGO B/C relative to other SGOs

Rating	
Better	SGO B/C performs better than all other options, or scores better than the main site of at least one other option.
Slightly better	SGO B/C performs better than at least one supplementary site, although main sites score the same.
Equal	All options score the same. Some of the scores may have uncertainty associated with them.
Slightly worse	SGO B/C performs worse than at least one supplementary site, although main sites score the same.
Worse	SGO B/C performs worse than all other options, or scores worse than the main site of at least one other option.

The assessments presented in **Appendix 6** and summaries in Chapter 5 of the main SA Report have been used for this comparison. While Strategic Policy S5 of the local plan allocates development at SGO B/C, the assessment of Strategic Policy S5 takes into account policy requirements, which are not available for the other SGOs. The SA results for Strategic Policy S5 have therefore not been taken into account in this comparison to avoid inconsistency.

Comparison of SA findings

Table A7.2 considers how the SA findings for SGO B/C compare to those of SGO D plus land immediately to the northeast of Fair Oak (a), SGO D plus land immediately south of Option D and the railway line, and SGO E.

Table A7.3 compares the SA findings for SGO B/C with those of Option C. The comparison with SGO C has been presented separately to the other reasonable alternatives because it includes part of SGO B/C (i.e. SGO C lies entirely within the boundary of SGO B/C) - and as there is a large amount of geographical overlap between the two sites, they are expected to have very similar implications for sustainability. SA scores for SGO B/C and SGO C only differ for two SA questions. SGO B/C scores worse against question 5.2, as its larger size means it includes some Grade 3 agricultural land, and question 6.1, as the associated link road may increase local pollution, although it may bring benefits, such as minimising congestion elsewhere in the borough. Therefore, only those SA objectives where the SA scores differ between SGO B/C and SGO C have been included in **Table A7.3**.

Table A7.2: Comparison between SA findings for SGO B/C, SGO D or SGO E

SA objective and question	SGO B/C score	SGO D plus land immediately to the northeast of Fair Oak (a) score	SGO D plus land immediately south of Option D and the railway line score	SGO E score	Does SGO B/C score better or worse than SGO D and E?	Reasons for difference
SA objective 1: Provide sufficient housing to meet identified local needs, including affordability and special needs						
1.1 Affordable housing	Significant positive	Significant positive	Significant positive	Significant positive	Equal	N/A
1.2 Other specialist housing	Minor positive uncertain	Minor positive uncertain	Minor positive uncertain	Minor positive uncertain	Equal	N/A
SA objective 2: Safeguard and improve community health, safety and wellbeing						
2.1 Community facilities	Significant positive	Significant positive for main site, with minor positive for Land north east of Fair Oak (a)	Significant positive with uncertainty	Significant positive with minor positive for land immediately north east of Fair Oak (b)	Slightly better	Access to community facilities may be more limited from SGO D/E supplementary sites
2.2 Health facilities	Significant positive	Significant positive for main site, with negligible for land immediately northeast of Fair Oak (a)	Significant positive with uncertainty	Significant positive with negligible for land immediately north east of Fair Oak (b)	Slightly better	Access to community facilities may be more limited from SGO D/E supplementary sites
2.3 Sports facilities	Minor positive uncertain/ Significant negative	Minor positive uncertain	Minor positive uncertain	Minor positive uncertain	Worse	Loss of East Horton Golf Course
2.4 Public open space	Significant positive	Significant positive	Significant positive	Significant positive	Equal	N/A
2.5 Cycle and	Negligible	Minor positive for main site,	Minor positive with negligible	Negligible	Worse	Fewer links to the existing

SA objective and question	SGO B/C score	SGO D plus land immediately to the northeast of Fair Oak (a) score	SGO D plus land immediately south of Option D and the railway line score	SGO E score	Does SGO B/C score better or worse than SGO D and E?	Reasons for difference
footpaths		with negligible for land north east of Fair Oak (a)	for land immediately south of Option D			footpath and cycle network (than SGO D)
SA objective 3: Develop a dynamic and diverse economy						
3.1(a) Major rail station	Significant negative	Significant negative uncertain	Significant negative uncertain	Significant negative uncertain	Equal	N/A
3.1(b) Minor rail station	Significant negative	Significant negative	Significant negative	Significant negative	Equal	N/A
3.1(c) Frequent bus route	Significant positive	Significant positive	Significant positive for main site, with significant negative for land immediately south of Option D	Significant negative with significant positive for land immediately north east of Fair Oak (b)	Better	SGO B/C scores better than SGO E and SGO D plus land immediately south of Option D. SGO B/C scores the same as SGO D plus land immediately north of Fair Oak (a), as both are closer to a frequent bus service than other options
3.1(d) Semi-frequent bus route	Significant negative	Significant negative	Significant negative	Minor negative with significant negative for land immediately north east of Fair Oak (b)	Worse	Further to a semi-frequent bus route than the main site for SGO E
3.1(e) Major employment centre	Significant positive	Significant positive	Significant positive	Significant positive	Equal	N/A
3.2 Employment land provision	Minor positive	Minor positive	Minor positive	Minor positive	Equal	N/A
3.3 Loss of employment land	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Equal	N/A
3.4 Commercial uses in centres	Significant positive uncertain	Significant positive uncertain with minor positive uncertain for land immediately northeast of	Significant positive uncertain for main site, with minor positive for land immediately south of	Minor positive uncertain	Better	Provision of new district and two local centres, accessible within one main site (i.e. no supplementary sites, which may

SA objective and question	SGO B/C score	SGO D plus land immediately to the northeast of Fair Oak (a) score	SGO D plus land immediately south of Option D and the railway line score	SGO E score	Does SGO B/C score better or worse than SGO D and E?	Reasons for difference
		Fair Oak (a)	Option D			have more limited access)
SA objective 4: Reduce road traffic and congestion through improved accessibility to services, homes and jobs; reducing the need to travel by car/lorry and improving sustainable travel choice						
4.1 Major rail station	Significant negative	Significant negative uncertain	Significant negative uncertain	Significant negative uncertain	Equal	N/A
4.2 Minor rail station	Significant negative	Significant negative	Significant negative	Significant negative	Equal	N/A
4.3 Frequent bus route	Significant positive	Significant positive	Significant positive for main site, with significant negative for land immediately south of Option D	Significant negative with significant positive for land immediately north east of Fair Oak (b)	Better	SGO B/C scores better than SGO E and SGO D plus land immediately south of Option D. SGO B/C scores the same as SGO D plus land immediately north of Fair Oak (a), as both are closer to a frequent bus service than other options
4.4 Semi-frequent bus route	Significant negative	Significant negative	Significant negative	Minor negative with significant negative for land immediately north east of Fair Oak (b)	Worse	Further to a semi-frequent bus route than the main site for SGO E
4.5(a) Major employment centre	Significant positive	Significant positive	Significant positive	Significant positive	Equal	N/A
4.5(b) Major population centre	Minor negative	Minor positive for main site, with minor negative for land immediately northeast of Fair Oak (a)	Minor positive	Significant positive with minor negative for land immediately north east of Fair Oak (b)	Worse	Further from a major population centre than the main site of all other SGOs
4.6 Health facilities	Significant positive	Significant positive for main site, with negligible for land immediately northeast of	Significant positive uncertain	Significant positive with negligible for land immediately north east of Fair Oak	Slightly better	Access to community facilities may be more limited from SGO D/E supplementary

SA objective and question	SGO B/C score	SGO D plus land immediately to the northeast of Fair Oak (a) score	SGO D plus land immediately south of Option D and the railway line score	SGO E score	Does SGO B/C score better or worse than SGO D and E?	Reasons for difference
		Fair Oak (a)		(b)		sites
4.7 Shopping facilities	Significant positive	Significant positive	Significant positive	Significant positive	Equal	N/A
4.8 Primary school	Significant positive	Significant positive with negligible for Land north east of Fair Oak (a)	Significant positive uncertain	Significant positive with negligible for land immediately north east of Fair Oak (b)	Slightly better	Access to primary schools may be more limited from SGO D/E supplementary sites
4.9 Secondary school	Significant positive	Significant positive	Significant positive for main site with significant negative for land immediately south of Option D	Minor negative with significant positive for land immediately north east of Fair Oak (b)	Better	Access to secondary schools more limited from land immediately south of Option D and from the main site for SGO E
4.10 Cycle and footpaths	negligible	Minor positive for main site, with negligible for land north east of Fair Oak (a)	Minor positive with negligible for land immediately south of Option D	Minor positive with negligible for land immediately north east of Fair Oak (b)	Worse	Fewer links to the existing footpath and cycle network (than SGO D)
4.11 Geographical barriers	Minor positive	Minor positive	Minor positive for main site, with significant negative for land immediately south of Option D	Minor negative uncertain	Better	SGO B/C scores the same as SGO D plus land immediately north east of Fair Oak (a), but other options are separated from nearby services and facilities by railways and/or major roads
SA objective 5: Protect and conserve natural resources						
5.1 Mineral resources	Minor negative uncertain	Minor negative uncertain	Minor negative uncertain for main site, with negligible for land immediately south of Option D	Minor negative uncertain	Slightly worse	All options score the same, with the exception of land immediately south of Option D, which does not coincide with an MSA or MCA
5.2 Agricultural	Minor negative	Minor negative	Minor negative	Significant negative	Better	SGO B/C scores the same as

SA objective and question	SGO B/C score	SGO D plus land immediately to the northeast of Fair Oak (a) score	SGO D plus land immediately south of Option D and the railway line score	SGO E score	Does SGO B/C score better or worse than SGO D and E?	Reasons for difference
land				with negligible for land immediately north east of Fair Oak (b)		SGO D, as these consist of lower quality agricultural land. Whilst land immediately north east of Fair Oak (b) does not include any best and most versatile agricultural land, this is a small area compared to the main site of SGO E
5.3 Previously developed land	Minor negative uncertain	Minor negative uncertain	Minor negative uncertain	Minor negative uncertain	Equal	N/A
5.4 Allotments/ community farms	Minor positive uncertain	Minor positive uncertain	Minor positive uncertain	Minor positive uncertain	Equal	N/A
SA objective 6: Reduce air, soil, water, light and noise pollution						
6.1 Noise and AQMAs	Minor negative uncertain	Minor negative uncertain for main site, with negligible for land immediately north east of Fair Oak (a)	Minor negative uncertain	Minor negative uncertain	Slightly worse	All options score the same with the exception of land immediately north east of Fair Oak (a), which is not within 200m of an AQMA, motorway, A road or railway line. SGO B/C is also further than 200m from an AQMA, A road or railway line but the new link road associated with SGO B/C may worsen noise and traffic locally.
6.2 Pollution	Significant negative uncertain	Significant negative uncertain	Significant negative uncertain	Significant negative uncertain	Equal	N/A
SA objective 7: Plan for the anticipated levels of climate change						
7.1 Green Infrastructure	Minor positive	Minor positive	Minor positive	Minor positive	Equal	N/A

SA objective and question	SGO B/C score	SGO D plus land immediately to the northeast of Fair Oak (a) score	SGO D plus land immediately south of Option D and the railway line score	SGO E score	Does SGO B/C score better or worse than SGO D and E?	Reasons for difference
7.2 Flooding	Significant negative uncertain	Significant negative uncertain	Significant negative uncertain for main site with negligible for land immediately south of Option D	Significant negative uncertain	Slightly worse	All options score the same with the exception of land immediately south of Option D, which is at low risk of flooding
7.3 Coastal change	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Negligible	Equal	N/A
SA objective 8. Minimise Eastleigh's contribution to climate change by reducing the borough's carbon footprint and minimising other greenhouse gas emissions.						
This objective was only used in the appraisal of development management policies.						
SA objective 9. Reduce waste generation and disposal, encourage waste prevention and reuse and achieve the sustainable management of waste.						
This objective was only used in the appraisal of development management policies.						
SA objective 10: Protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and geodiversity, improving its quality and range.						
10.1 Internationally/nationally designated site	Minor negative	Minor negative	Minor negative	Minor negative	Equal	N/A
10.2 Locally designated site	Minor negative uncertain	Minor negative uncertain	Minor negative uncertain	Minor negative uncertain	Equal	N/A
10.3 Areas of nature conservation value	Minor negative uncertain	Minor negative uncertain	Minor negative uncertain	Minor negative uncertain	Equal	N/A
10.4 Biodiversity network	Minor negative uncertain	Minor negative uncertain	Minor negative uncertain	Minor negative uncertain	Equal	N/A
10.5 Ancient woodland	Minor negative uncertain	Minor negative uncertain	Minor negative uncertain	Minor negative uncertain	Equal	N/A
SA objective 11: Enhance the Borough's multifunctional green infrastructure networks.						
11.1 TPO trees	Minor negative uncertain	Minor negative uncertain	Minor negative uncertain	Minor negative uncertain	Equal	N/A
11.2 Cycle and footpaths	negligible	Minor positive for main site, with negligible for land north east of Fair	Minor positive with negligible for land immediately south of	Negligible	Worse	Fewer links to the existing footpath and cycle network

SA objective and question	SGO B/C score	SGO D plus land immediately to the northeast of Fair Oak (a) score	SGO D plus land immediately south of Option D and the railway line score	SGO E score	Does SGO B/C score better or worse than SGO D and E?	Reasons for difference
		Oak (a)	Option D			(than SGO D)
11.3 Green infrastructure	Minor positive	Minor positive	Minor positive	Minor positive	Equal	N/A
SA objective 12: Protect, enhance and manage the character and appearance of the landscape and townscape, maintaining and strengthening distinctiveness and its special qualities.						
12.1 Separation of settlements	Minor negative uncertain	Minor negative uncertain	Minor negative uncertain	Significant negative uncertain	Better	SGO B/C scores the same as SGO D but better than SGO E, as SGO B/C will leave at least some gap with neighbouring settlements
12.2 Character, views and settings	Significant negative uncertain	Significant negative uncertain	Significant negative uncertain	Significant negative uncertain	Equal	N/A
SA objective 13: Protect and enhance and manage buildings, monuments, features, sites, places, areas and landscapes of archaeological, historical and cultural heritage importance.						
13.1 historic environment	Minor negative uncertain	Minor negative uncertain	Minor negative uncertain	Minor negative uncertain	Equal	N/A

Table A7.3: Comparison between SA findings for SGO B/C and SGO C

SA objective and question	SGO B/C Score	SGO C Score	Does SGO B/C score better or worse than SGO C?	Reasons for difference
5.2 Agricultural land	Minor negative	Negligible	Worse	SGO B/C includes areas of higher quality agricultural land (Grade 3)
6.1 Noise and AQMAs	Minor negative uncertain	Negligible	Worse	New link road (part of SGO B/C) could increase air pollution and noise in some areas

Appendix 8

Detailed SA matrices for greenfield site allocations and reasonable alternatives

Site 1: Allbrook Way

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
1. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified local needs, including affordability and special needs		
1.1 Will the development provide a significant contribution towards meeting identified affordable housing needs?	++	Site has capacity for 176 dwellings.
1.2 Will it provide other elements of identified housing need e.g. housing for older persons, self-build, support housing?	?	Uncertainty is recorded against all residential site options as information on provision of other elements of housing need is not available on a consistent basis.
2. Safeguard and improve community health, safety and wellbeing		
2.1 Are community facilities (community hall or library) available locally?	+	There are two parish halls within 400m of the site, one to the south and one to the northeast.
2.2 Are health facilities available locally?	0	The site is between 801 and 1200m of The Fryern Surgery.
2.3 What effect would the development have on local provision of sports pitches and facilities?	0	Development would not lead to loss of sports or recreation facilities.
2.4 Is public open space available locally?	+	Development would be within 300m of existing open space at Allbrook Knoll, Allbrook Hill Recreation, Kanes Hill Allotments, Boyatt Wood and Lewes Close Open Space.
2.5 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network?	+	A public footpath crosses this site and there is a bridleway and cycleway along Boyatt Lane, which passes through the site.
3. Develop a dynamic and diverse economy		
3.1(a) Is the location close to a major rail station?	--	The site is over 1400m from a major railway station.
3.1 (b) Is the location close to a minor rail station?	--	The site is over 1200m from a minor railway station.
3.1 (c) Is the location close to a frequent bus route?	++	The northern corner of the site is located within 400m of the frequent Bluestar 1 service.
3.1 (d) Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route?	-	The majority of the site is located 401 to 800m from the semi-frequent Bluestar 5 service.
3.1 (e) Is the location close to a major employment centre?	-	The site is located further than 1000m from a major employment centre.
3.2 Will the proposed development contribute towards meeting the need for new industrial, office or warehousing floorspace?	-	This site would be developed for residential use, therefore additional employment floorspace would not be provided.
3.3 Will the proposed development result in a net loss of existing employment land, or land which would be suitable for employment purposes?	0	SLAA assessments do not identify this site as being suitable for employment uses.
3.4 Will the proposed development increase the amount of commercial uses and other facilities in town, district or local centres?	0	No loss of commercial facilities or other facilities in town, district or local centres.
4. Reduce road traffic and congestion through improved accessibility to services homes and jobs; reducing the need to travel by car/lorry and improving sustainable travel choice		
4.1 Is the location close to a major rail station? (same score as 3.1a)	--	The site is over 1400m from a major railway station.
4.2 Is the location close to a minor rail station?	--	The site is over 1200m from a minor railway station.

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
(same score as 3.1b)		
4.3 Is the location close to a frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1c)	++	The northern corner of the site is located within 400m of the frequent Bluestar 1 service.
4.4 Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1d)	-	The majority of the site is located 401 to 800m from the semi-frequent Bluestar 5 service.
4.5(a) Will residential development at the location be close to a major employment centre? (same score as 3.1e)	-	The site is further than 1000m from a major employment centre.
4.5(b) Will employment development at the location be close to a major population centre?	0	This site would not include employment use.
4.6 Are health facilities available locally? (same score as 2.2)	0	The site is between 801 and 1200m of The Fryern Surgery.
4.7 Are shopping and related services available locally?	-	The northern part of the site lies within 800m of a local centre at Hiltingbury Road.
4.8 Is the location close to a Primary school?	++	The site is within 400m of Scantabout Primary School.
4.9 Is the location close to a Secondary school?	++	The site is within 800m of Thornden School and Lakeside School.
4.10 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	+	A public footpath crosses this site and there is a bridleway and cycleway along Boyatt Lane, which passes through the site.
4.11 Are there Geographical barriers between the location and key facilities/ destinations?	-	The north western side of the site is adjacent to the M3, which presents a barrier to accessing The Fryern Surgery, Scantabout Primary School, Thirnden School and Lakeside School.
5. Protect and conserve natural resources		
5.1 Will development avoid the sterilisation of mineral resources?	-?	Most of this site overlays Mineral Consultation Areas for soft sand, therefore development may sterilise mineral resources.
5.2 Will it result in the loss of higher grade agricultural land?	-	The southern part of the site consists of Grade 3, medium quality agricultural land, which would be lost to development. The northern part consists of low quality agricultural land.
5.3 Will it use previously developed land?	-	This site consists of greenfield land.
5.4 Will it deliver or support allotments or community farms?	++	There would be no loss of allotments or community farms. The location could be suitable for these but this is unknown.
6. Reduce air, soil, water, light and noise pollution		
6.1 Will the location be affected by significant noise generating uses or Air Quality Management Areas?	--?	The site is within 200m of both the M3 and the A335. The part of the M3 corridor overlapping the western edge of the site is designated as an AQMA.
6.2 Will development increase pollution?	-?	Adversely impacted by traffic noise and as site is narrow reduced options to mitigate noise impact. Potential impact from adjacent landfill.
7. Plan for the anticipated levels of climate change		
7.1 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure?	0	No loss of existing green infrastructure.
7.2 Is the location at risk from flooding, taking into account of the effects of climate change?	--?	There are two small areas at risk of 'intermediate' surface water flooding within the site and an area of 'less' surface water flood risk.

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
7.3 Will the development be at risk from coastal change? If so, can the Shoreline Management Plan Objectives be supported?	0	This site is not near the coast.
8. Minimise Eastleigh's contribution to climate change by reducing the borough's carbon footprint and minimising other greenhouse gas emissions.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
9. Reduce waste generation and disposal, encourage waste prevention and reuse and achieve the sustainable management of waste.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
10. Protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and geodiversity, improving its quality and range.		
10.1 Could development negatively impact or lead to loss of an internationally or nationally designated site (either alone or in combination)?	-	The site could drain towards Pitmore Gully which flows into the River Itchen SAC. If this is the case, mitigation has been suggested by EBC in the form of SuDS with three naturalised forms of filtration to preserve water quality.
10.2 Could development negatively impact or lead or loss of a locally designated biodiversity site (either alone or in combination)?	--	The site contains Allbrook Clay Pits SINC which would be lost to development in the absence of specific policy protection in the Plan. If direct habitat loss was avoided, recreational pressure and urbanisation could have adverse effects on the SINC. The site could drain into Pitmore Gully and pollute the watercourse.
10.3 Will the development adversely affect areas with other nature conservation value, as identified in Biodiversity Action Plans (BAPs)?	--	Significant areas of woodland are present within both the designated sites and wider development site. Barbastelle bats are likely to be present within Lincolns Copse, which could be disturbed by noise and light pollution resulting from development at this site. Potential mitigation has been identified in the form of establishing a 50m dark corridor between development and the copse. Otters may be using the clay pits to forage and therefore development could disturb foraging otters.
10.4 Will the development adversely impact the biodiversity network (e.g. Priority Biodiversity Links (PBLs), Priority Biodiversity Areas (PBAs), hedgerows and other corridors for species movement)?	--	The M3 PBL runs along the north and west of the site and could be lost to development.
10.5 Will the development adversely affect ancient woodland?	0	Development will not have an adverse effect on ancient woodland.
11. Enhance the Borough's multifunctional green infrastructure networks.		
11.1 Will the development affect TPO trees?	-?	Yes- TPO 314-E covering all tree species. 312-E covering 8 Birch and 2 Elm. 313-E covering 3 Oak.
11.2 Can the location be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	+	A public footpath crosses this site and there is a bridleway and cycleway along Boyatt Lane, which passes through the site.
11.3 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure? (same score as 7.1)	0	No loss of existing green infrastructure.
12. Protect, enhance and manage the character and appearance of the landscape and townscape, maintaining and strengthening distinctiveness and its special qualities.		
12.1 Will development adversely affect the separation of neighbouring settlements?	--	This site was assessed as having poor / average potential for development in relation to avoiding

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
		settlement coalescence.
12.2 Will it protect the character of the countryside, coast, towns and/or villages, including views and settings?	--	The landscape within this site has high/medium sensitivity to development.
13. Protect and enhance and manage buildings, monuments, features, sites, places, areas and landscapes of archaeological, historical and cultural heritage importance.		
13.1 Will the development protect and enhance listed buildings and their settings, conservation areas, archaeological sites, historic landscapes and other sites of local importance for heritage?	-?	Lincoln Farm House, a locally listed building is just outside the proposed boundary and currently has a backdrop of mature trees as seen from Boyatt Lane. This is an important element of the setting of this asset and should be retained. Of the Lincoln Farm buildings only two cottages are excluded from the development site. This whole group are currently in the process of local listing as an original set of farm buildings which have not been altered together with the pair of cottages, one would have been for a carter and the other for a stockman, farming at that time being reliant on the animals producing muck in the farmyard for the carter to transport and spread on the fields, all by horses, for enrichment before fertilizer was invented. Most unusual to find an unadulterated complete set like this. This group is an important asset from rural history that should be retained and left in a little space.

Sites 1a and 1b: West of Allbrook Way / north of Knowle Hill, Allbrook

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
1. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified local needs, including affordability and special needs		
1.1 Will the development provide a significant contribution towards meeting identified affordable housing needs?	++	This site is capable of accommodating 45 dwellings.
1.2 Will it provide other elements of identified housing need e.g. housing for older persons, self-build, support housing?	?	Uncertainty is recorded against all residential site options as information on provision of other elements of housing need is not available on a consistent basis.
2. Safeguard and improve community health, safety and wellbeing		
2.1 Are community facilities (community hall or library) available locally?	+	The site is located within 400m of a Scout hut on Allbrook Hill and within 800m of another on Boyatt Lane.
2.2 Are health facilities available locally?	-	This site is between 1201m and 1600m of The Brownhill Surgery, The Fryern Surgery and Dr Cyril Stephen GP practices.
2.3 What effect would the development have on local provision of sports pitches and facilities?	0	Development would not lead to loss of existing sports facilities.
2.4 Is public open space available locally?	+	This site is within 300m of Allbrook Knoll amenity space and Allbrook Hill children's play area.
2.5 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network?	0	A public footpath runs through the western part of the site, but there are no cycle paths within or adjacent to the site.
3. Develop a dynamic and diverse economy		
3.1(a) Is the location close to a major rail station?	--	The site is further than 1400m from a major railway station.
3.1 (b) Is the location close to a minor rail station?	--	The site is further than 1200m from a minor railway station.
3.1 (c) Is the location close to a frequent bus route?	-	The northern part of the site is between 601 and 800m of the Bluestar 1 frequent bus route.
3.1 (d) Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route?	-	The site is within 800m of the semi-frequent Bluestar 5 bus route.
3.1 (e) Is the location close to a major employment centre?	-	This site is over 1000m from a major employment centre.
3.2 Will the proposed development contribute towards meeting the need for new industrial, office or warehousing floorspace?	-	This site would be developed for residential use, therefore additional employment floorspace would not be provided.
3.3 Will the proposed development result in a net loss of existing employment land, or land which would be suitable for employment purposes?	0	The SLAA does not recognise this site as being suitable for employment land.
3.4 Will the proposed development increase the amount of commercial uses and other facilities in town, district or local centres?	0	Development would not lead to loss of commercial uses or other facilities in town, district or local centres.
4. Reduce road traffic and congestion through improved accessibility to services homes and jobs; reducing the need to travel by car/lorry and improving sustainable travel choice		
4.1 Is the location close to a major rail station? (same score as 3.1a)	--	The site is further than 1400m from a major railway station.
4.2 Is the location close to a minor rail station?	--	The site is further than 1200m from a minor railway

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
(same score as 3.1b)		station.
4.3 Is the location close to a frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1c)	-	The northern part of the site is between 601 and 800m of the Bluestar 1 frequent bus route.
4.4 Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1d)	-	The site is within 800m of the semi-frequent Bluestar 5 bus route.
4.5(a) Will residential development at the location be close to a major employment centre? (same score as 3.1e)	-	This site is over 1000m from a major employment centre.
4.5(b) Will employment development at the location be close to a major population centre?	0	Development would be residential only.
4.6 Are health facilities available locally? (same score as 2.2)	-	This site is between 1201m and 1600m of The Brownhill Surgery, The Fryern Surgery and Dr Cyril Stephen GP practices.
4.7 Are shopping and related services available locally?	--	This site is further than 800m from a town, district or local centre.
4.8 Is the location close to a Primary school?	0	This site lies partly between 601 to 800m from Scantabout Primary School. A small part of the site is also within 1000m from Shakespeare Junior School.
4.9 Is the location close to a Secondary school?	++	The site is within 800m of Thornden School.
4.10 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	0	A public footpath runs through the western part of the site, but there are no cycle paths within or adjacent to the site.
4.11 Are there Geographical barriers between the location and key facilities/ destinations?	-	There is an A road, Allbrook Way, between the site and the nearby Scout huts. The site is also separated from Thornden School by the M3 motorway.
5. Protect and conserve natural resources		
5.1 Will development avoid the sterilisation of mineral resources?	-?	The site is located within a Mineral Consultation Area.
5.2 Will it result in the loss of higher grade agricultural land?	-	The site is located on medium quality agricultural land (Grade 3).
5.3 Will it use previously developed land?	-	The site consists of greenfield land.
5.4 Will it deliver or support allotments or community farms?	+?	There would be no loss of allotments or community farms. The location could be suitable for these but this is unknown.
6. Reduce air, soil, water, light and noise pollution		
6.1 Will the location be affected by significant noise generating uses or Air Quality Management Areas?	-?	Site is within 200m of an A-road (Allbrook Way). Site is expected to be adversely impacted by traffic noise from A335 and M3, and as site is narrow there are reduced opportunities to mitigate noise impacts.
6.2 Will development increase pollution?	--?	This site could increase traffic on the M3, therefore exacerbating air quality issues in the AQMA. In addition, it has been identified as having potential to increase water pollution in the Pitmore Gully, which flows into the River Itchen SAC.
7. Plan for the anticipated levels of climate change		
7.1 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure?	0	Development of this site will not lead to loss of GI.
7.2 Is the location at risk from flooding, taking into account of the effects of climate change?	0	This site is not in an areas of surface water flood risk and is not within Flood Zones 2 or 3.

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
7.3 Will the development be at risk from coastal change? If so, can the Shoreline Management Plan Objectives be supported?	0	This is not a coastal site.
8. Minimise Eastleigh's contribution to climate change by reducing the borough's carbon footprint and minimising other greenhouse gas emissions.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
9. Reduce waste generation and disposal, encourage waste prevention and reuse and achieve the sustainable management of waste.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
10. Protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and geodiversity, improving its quality and range.		
10.1 Could development negatively impact or lead to loss of an internationally or nationally designated site (either alone or in combination)?	-?	The site could drain towards Pitmore Gully which flows into the River Itchen SAC. If this is the case, mitigation has been suggested by EBC in the form of SuDS with three naturalised forms of filtration to preserve water quality.
10.2 Could development negatively impact or lead or loss of a locally designated biodiversity site (either alone or in combination)?	-?	The site is adjacent to Allbrook Clay Pits SINC, which could be negatively affected by recreational pressure and urbanisation. The site could drain into Pitmore Gully and pollute the watercourse.
10.3 Will the development adversely affect areas with other nature conservation value, as identified in Biodiversity Action Plans (BAPs)?	-	The site contains small areas of woodland and there are larger areas of woodland present within the adjacent Allbrook Clay Pits SINC. EBC has stated that woodland will not be lost to development, although it could still be indirectly impacted by development. Otters may be using the clay pits to forage and therefore development could disturb foraging otters.
10.4 Will the development adversely impact the biodiversity network (e.g. Priority Biodiversity Links (PBLs), Priority Biodiversity Areas (PBAs), hedgerows and other corridors for species movement)?	0	Development is not expected to have an adverse effect on biodiversity network links.
10.5 Will the development adversely affect ancient woodland?	0	Development will not have an adverse effect on ancient woodland.
11. Enhance the Borough's multifunctional green infrastructure networks.		
11.1 Will the development affect TPO trees?	-?	There are three TPOs areas within the site - TPO numbers 312 G2, 312 G3 and 312 G4 and woodland to the west of the site (314 W1). EBC has stated that woodland will not be lost to development, although it could still be indirectly impacted by development.
11.2 Can the location be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	0	A public footpath runs through the western part of the site, but there are no cycle paths within or adjacent to the site.
11.3 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure? (same score as 7.1)	0	Development of this site will not lead to loss of GI.
12. Protect, enhance and manage the character and appearance of the landscape and townscape, maintaining and strengthening distinctiveness and its special qualities.		
12.1 Will development adversely affect the separation of neighbouring settlements?	-	This site was assessed as having average potential for development in relation to avoiding settlement

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
		coalescence.
12.2 Will it protect the character of the countryside, coast, towns and/or villages, including views and settings?	--?	The landscape within the northern part of this site has moderate-high sensitivity to development, whereas the landscape within the southern part of the site has low sensitivity to development. In line with the precautionary approach this site is assessed as having significant negative effects on landscape, with some uncertainty, as this depends on the area(s) of the site in which development is concentrated.
13. Protect and enhance and manage buildings, monuments, features, sites, places, areas and landscapes of archaeological, historical and cultural heritage importance.		
13.1 Will the development protect and enhance listed buildings and their settings, conservation areas, archaeological sites, historic landscapes and other sites of local importance for heritage?	0	Development of this site will not affect heritage assets.

Site 2: Land east of Allbrook Way

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
1. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified local needs, including affordability and special needs		
1.1 Will the development provide a significant contribution towards meeting identified affordable housing needs?	++	This site is capable of providing 95 dwellings.
1.2 Will it provide other elements of identified housing need e.g. housing for older persons, self-build, support housing?	?	Uncertainty is recorded against all residential site options as information on provision of other elements of housing need is not available on a consistent basis.
2. Safeguard and improve community health, safety and wellbeing		
2.1 Are community facilities (community hall or library) available locally?	+	The site is located within 400m of a parish hall to the south.
2.2 Are health facilities available locally?	-	The site is between 1201 and 1600m from the Boyatt Wood Centre (GP surgery).
2.3 What effect would the development have on local provision of sports pitches and facilities?	0	Development would not lead to loss of sports pitches and facilities.
2.4 Is public open space available locally?	+	The site is within 300m of Allbrook Hill OAP and Allbrook Hill recreation.
2.5 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network?	-	No footpath or cycle path crosses this location or is adjacent to its boundary.
3. Develop a dynamic and diverse economy		
3.1(a) Is the location close to a major rail station?	--	The site is further than 1400m from a major rail station.
3.1 (b) Is the location close to a minor rail station?	--	The site is further than 1200m from a minor rail station.
3.1 (c) Is the location close to a frequent bus route?	-	The northern edge of the site is located within 601 to 800m of the Bluestar 1 frequent bus route.
3.1 (d) Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route?	-	The site is located within 401 to 800m of the semi-frequent Bluestar 5 bus service.
3.1 (e) Is the location close to a major employment centre?	-	The site is located further than 1000m from a major employment centre.
3.2 Will the proposed development contribute towards meeting the need for new industrial, office or warehousing floorspace?	-	This site would be developed for residential use, therefore additional employment floorspace would not be provided.
3.3 Will the proposed development result in a net loss of existing employment land, or land which would be suitable for employment purposes?	0	The SLAA does not recognise this site as being suitable for employment land.
3.4 Will the proposed development increase the amount of commercial uses and other facilities in town, district or local centres?	0	Development would not lead to loss of commercial uses or other facilities in town, district or local centres.
4. Reduce road traffic and congestion through improved accessibility to services homes and jobs; reducing the need to travel by car/lorry and improving sustainable travel choice		
4.1 Is the location close to a major rail station? (same score as 3.1a)	--	The site is further than 1400m from a major rail station.
4.2 Is the location close to a minor rail station? (same score as 3.1b)	--	The site is further than 1200m from a minor rail station.
4.3 Is the location close to a frequent bus route?	-	The northern edge of the site is located within 601 to

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
(same score as 3.1c)		800m of the Bluestar 1 frequent bus route.
4.4 Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1d)	-	The site is located within 401 to 800m of the semi-frequent Bluestar 5 bus service.
4.5(a) Will residential development at the location be close to a major employment centre? (same score as 3.1e)	-	The site is further than 1000m from a major employment centre.
4.5(b) Will employment development at the location be close to a major population centre?	0	Development would be residential only.
4.6 Are health facilities available locally? (same score as 2.2)	-	The site is between 1201 and 1600m from the Boyatt Wood Centre (GP surgery).
4.7 Are shopping and related services available locally?	--	The site is further than 800m from a town, district or local centre.
4.8 Is the location close to a Primary school?	-	The site is between 801 and 1000m of Shakespeare Infant and Junior Schools and Scantabout Primary School.
4.9 Is the location close to a Secondary school?	++	The site is within 800m of Thornden School and Lakeside School.
4.10 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	-	No footpath or cycle path crosses this location or is adjacent to its boundary.
4.11 Are there Geographical barriers between the location and key facilities/ destinations?	-	The A335 and M3 are barriers between the site and Thornden School and Lakeside School. The A335 is also a barrier in accessing the Boyatt Wood Centre from the site.
5. Protect and conserve natural resources		
5.1 Will development avoid the sterilisation of mineral resources?	-?	A large proportion of this site is coincident with a Minerals Consultation Area, therefore development could lead to sterilisation of mineral resources.
5.2 Will it result in the loss of higher grade agricultural land?	-	The site consists entirely of Grade 3, medium quality agricultural land.
5.3 Will it use previously developed land?	-	This site consists of greenfield land.
5.4 Will it deliver or support allotments or community farms?	+	There will be no loss of allotments or community farms. The location could be suitable for these but this is unknown.
6. Reduce air, soil, water, light and noise pollution		
6.1 Will the location be affected by significant noise generating uses or Air Quality Management Areas?	-?	This site is within 200m of the A335 and a railway line.
6.2 Will development increase pollution?	-?	Adversely impacted by traffic noise and as site is narrow reduced options to mitigate noise impact. Potential impact from adjacent brickworks/ limited opportunity to remediate .
7. Plan for the anticipated levels of climate change		
7.1 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure?	0	No loss of existing green infrastructure.
7.2 Is the location at risk from flooding, taking into account of the effects of climate change?	-?	This site contains a small area of 'less' surface water flood risk on the eastern edge of the site.
7.3 Will the development be at risk from coastal change? If so, can the Shoreline Management Plan Objectives be supported?	0	Site is not located near the coast.

SA objective/ criterion	Justification	
8. Minimise Eastleigh's contribution to climate change by reducing the borough's carbon footprint and minimising other greenhouse gas emissions.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
9. Reduce waste generation and disposal, encourage waste prevention and reuse and achieve the sustainable management of waste.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
10. Protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and geodiversity, improving its quality and range.		
10.1 Could development negatively impact or lead to loss of an internationally or nationally designated site (either alone or in combination)?	-	The Lower Itchen flows along the eastern edge of the site and into the River Itchen SAC. The site is approximately 200m from the border of the SAC at its closest point, but existing development is present in closer proximity to the SAC. A 20m development buffer around the Lower Itchen and three forms of naturalised filtration are suggested as mitigation measures to preserve water quality.
10.2 Could development negatively impact or lead or loss of a locally designated biodiversity site (either alone or in combination)?	-	The site is adjacent to Lincolns Copse SINC designated for its ancient woodland. Potential for recreation and urbanisation effects, including in-combination with any other sites allocated nearby. The Lower Itchen feeds downstream SINC's including Allbrook Hill Copse and Ham Farm Meadow which, among other downstream SINC's could be affected by impacts on the Itchen.
10.3 Will the development adversely affect areas with other nature conservation value, as identified in Biodiversity Action Plans (BAPs)?	--	A significant woodland belt could be lost to development, which may provide a foraging route for Barbastelle bats. Development is likely to impact on a rare Barbastelle maternity roost. Otters may use the connecting habitats.
10.4 Will the development adversely impact the biodiversity network (e.g. Priority Biodiversity Links (PBLs), Priority Biodiversity Areas (PBAs), hedgerows and other corridors for species movement)?	--	The site contains a broad woodland belt which connects directly into Lincolns Copse SINC.
10.5 Will the development adversely affect ancient woodland?	-	The site is adjacent to Lincolns Copse SINC, which is designated for its ancient woodland.
11. Enhance the Borough's multifunctional green infrastructure networks.		
11.1 Will the development affect TPO trees?	-?	Yes - TPO 421-E covering all tree species, TPO 3389-E covering 6 oaks and 3 Ash, TPO 338-E covering individual Oak, Ash and Alder, TPO 578-E covering two Lime.
11.2 Can the location be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	-	No footpath or cycle path crosses this location or is adjacent to its boundary.
11.3 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure? (same score as 7.1)	0	No loss of existing green infrastructure.
12. Protect, enhance and manage the character and appearance of the landscape and townscape, maintaining and strengthening distinctiveness and its special qualities.		
12.1 Will development adversely affect the separation of neighbouring settlements?	-	This site was assessed as having average potential for development in relation to avoiding settlement coalescence.
12.2 Will it protect the character of the countryside,	-	The landscape within this site was assessed as having

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
coast, towns and/or villages, including views and settings?		low/moderate sensitivity to development.
13. Protect and enhance and manage buildings, monuments, features, sites, places, areas and landscapes of archaeological, historical and cultural heritage importance.		
13.1 Will the development protect and enhance listed buildings and their settings, conservation areas, archaeological sites, historic landscapes and other sites of local importance for heritage?	-?	109 Allbrook Hill is an old cottage from the 1700's which is in the process of being locally listed and is situated in the south east corner of this site adjacent to what appears to be a possible entrance to the site. Being of this age the foundations will be very shallow and the structure therefore very susceptible to vibration from road construction and large lorry movements.

Site 3: Between 77 Church Road and Recreation Ground

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
1. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified local needs, including affordability and special needs		
1.1 Will the development provide a significant contribution towards meeting identified affordable housing needs?	++	The site has capacity to provide 30 dwellings.
1.2 Will it provide other elements of identified housing need e.g. housing for older persons, self-build, support housing?	?	Uncertainty is recorded against all residential site options as information on provision of other elements of housing need is not available on a consistent basis.
2. Safeguard and improve community health, safety and wellbeing		
2.1 Are community facilities (community hall or library) available locally?	0	The site is between 400 and 800m of three community halls, all of which lie south of the site.
2.2 Are health facilities available locally?	0	The site is between 801 and 1200m from the Old Anchor surgery.
2.3 What effect would the development have on local provision of sports pitches and facilities?	0	Development would not lead to loss of sports pitches and facilities.
2.4 Is public open space available locally?	+	The site is adjacent to Stoke Common and within 300m of Saville Close amenity space, Kanes Hill allotments and Glebe Meadow.
2.5 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network?	0	An existing public footpath crosses this site north to south.
3. Develop a dynamic and diverse economy		
3.1(a) Is the location close to a major rail station?	--	The site is further than 1400m from a major rail station.
3.1 (b) Is the location close to a minor rail station?	--	The site is further than 1200m from a minor rail station.
3.1 (c) Is the location close to a frequent bus route?	+	The southern corner of the site is located within 401 to 600m from the frequent Bluestar 2 bus service.
3.1 (d) Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route?	--	The site is located further than 800m from a semi-frequent bus service.
3.1 (e) Is the location close to a major employment centre?	-	The site is located further than 1000m from a major employment centre.
3.2 Will the proposed development contribute towards meeting the need for new industrial, office or warehousing floorspace?	-	This site would be developed for residential use therefore, additional employment floorspace would not be provided.
3.3 Will the proposed development result in a net loss of existing employment land, or land which would be suitable for employment purposes?	0	The SLAA does not recognise this site as being suitable for employment land.
3.4 Will the proposed development increase the amount of commercial uses and other facilities in town, district or local centres?	0	Development would not lead to loss of commercial uses or other facilities in town, district or local centres.
4. Reduce road traffic and congestion through improved accessibility to services homes and jobs; reducing the need to travel by car/lorry and improving sustainable travel choice		
4.1 Is the location close to a major rail station? (same score as 3.1a)	--	The site is further than 1400m from a major rail station.
4.2 Is the location close to a minor rail station? (same score as 3.1b)	--	The site is further than 1200m from a minor rail station.

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
4.3 Is the location close to a frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1c)	+	The southern corner of the site is located within 401 to 600m from the frequent Bluestar 2 bus service.
4.4 Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1d)	--	The site is located further than 800m from a semi-frequent bus service.
4.5(a) Will residential development at the location be close to a major employment centre? (same score as 3.1e)	-	The site is further than 1000m from a major employment centre.
4.5(b) Will employment development at the location be close to a major population centre?	0	Development would be residential only.
4.6 Are health facilities available locally? (same score as 2.2)	0	The site is between 801 and 1200m from the Old Anchor surgery.
4.7 Are shopping and related services available locally?	--	The site is further than 800m from a town, local or district centre.
4.8 Is the location close to a Primary school?	--	The site is further than 1000m from a primary school.
4.9 Is the location close to a Secondary school?	-	The site is between 1601m and 2000m from Crestwood College for Business and Enterprise.
4.10 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	0	An existing public footpath crosses this site north to south.
4.11 Are there Geographical barriers between the location and key facilities/ destinations?	0	The railway line forms a barrier between the site and Crestwood College, but there are no major geographical barriers identified to accessing other services and facilities.
5. Protect and conserve natural resources		
5.1 Will development avoid the sterilisation of mineral resources?	-?	A small area in the northeast corner of this site lies within a Mineral Consultation Area.
5.2 Will it result in the loss of higher grade agricultural land?	0	The site consists entirely of lower quality (Grade 4 and/or 5) agricultural land.
5.3 Will it use previously developed land?	-	This site consists of greenfield land.
5.4 Will it deliver or support allotments or community farms?	+?	There would be no loss of allotments or community farms. The location could be suitable for provision of these but this is unknown.
6. Reduce air, soil, water, light and noise pollution		
6.1 Will the location be affected by significant noise generating uses or Air Quality Management Areas?	0	This site is not within 200m of an AQMA, motorway or A-road, therefore air and noise pollution are not expected to be an issue at this site.
6.2 Will development increase pollution?	-?	Site is adjacent to former landfill and disused quarry.
7. Plan for the anticipated levels of climate change		
7.1 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure?	0	No loss of existing green infrastructure.
7.2 Is the location at risk from flooding, taking into account of the effects of climate change?	0	This site is not located within an area of surface water flood risk and its outside of Flood Zones 2 and 3.
7.3 Will the development be at risk from coastal change? If so, can the Shoreline Management Plan Objectives be supported?	0	This site is not located near the coast.
8. Minimise Eastleigh's contribution to climate change by reducing the borough's carbon footprint and minimising other greenhouse gas emissions.		

SA objective/ criterion	Justification	
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
9. Reduce waste generation and disposal, encourage waste prevention and reuse and achieve the sustainable management of waste.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
10. Protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and geodiversity, improving its quality and range.		
10.1 Could development negatively impact or lead to loss of an internationally or nationally designated site (either alone or in combination)?	-	The site is immediately adjacent to Breach Sling Copse, which borders the River Itchen SAC. Impacts on the Copse, which is a SINCD designated for ancient woodland and partially within the River Itchen SAC and SSSI. The EBC ecological appraisal suggested that a 20m buffer would need to be provided, but this would leave little room on the site for development. Due to the proximity of the River Itchen, the EBC ecological appraisal also recommends that naturalised SuDS with three forms of filtration should be required.
10.2 Could development negatively impact or lead or loss of a locally designated biodiversity site (either alone or in combination)?	--	The site is immediately adjacent to Breach Sling Copse and Stoke Common Copse SINCD. Provision of a 20m buffer has been suggested as mitigation by the EBC ecological appraisal.
10.3 Will the development adversely affect areas with other nature conservation value, as identified in Biodiversity Action Plans (BAPs)?	-	Hedgerow habitat could be lost to development. Otter may use the hedgerow network.
10.4 Will the development adversely impact the biodiversity network (e.g. Priority Biodiversity Links (PBLs), Priority Biodiversity Areas (PBAs), hedgerows and other corridors for species movement)?	-	Hedgerows connect into the woodland to the north which connects directly into the SAC.
10.5 Will the development adversely affect ancient woodland?	--	The site is immediately adjacent to Breach Sling Copse ancient woodland, which could be adversely affected by urban edge effects. Provision of a 20m buffer has been suggested as mitigation by the EBC ecological appraisal.
11. Enhance the Borough's multifunctional green infrastructure networks.		
11.1 Will the development affect TPO trees?	0	Development of the site will not affect TPO trees.
11.2 Can the location be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	0	An existing public footpath crosses this site north to south.
11.3 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure? (same score as 7.1)		No loss of existing green infrastructure.
12. Protect, enhance and manage the character and appearance of the landscape and townscape, maintaining and strengthening distinctiveness and its special qualities.		
12.1 Will development adversely affect the separation of neighbouring settlements?	0	This site was assessed as having 'good/very good' potential for development in relation to avoiding settlement coalescence.
12.2 Will it protect the character of the countryside, coast, towns and/or villages, including views and settings?	0	The landscape within this site was assessed as having low sensitivity to development.
13. Protect and enhance and manage buildings,		

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
monuments, features, sites, places, areas and landscapes of archaeological, historical and cultural heritage importance.		
13.1 Will the development protect and enhance listed buildings and their settings, conservation areas, archaeological sites, historic landscapes and other sites of local importance for heritage?	-?	Stoke Lodge & 148 Church Road (Weymouth House) are both statutorily listed buildings Grade II with all three plots adjoining Stoke Lodge but the first two separated from it by a footpath and a belt of trees along its eastern boundary. The north end of the Lodge plot is against the woods so again the setting should be protected by the retention of at least a tree belt. Weymouth House is on the opposite side of Church Road and set reasonably well back.

Site 4: East of Knowle Lane

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
1. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified local needs, including affordability and special needs		
1.1 Will the development provide a significant contribution towards meeting identified affordable housing needs?	++	This site has capacity to provide 34 dwellings.
1.2 Will it provide other elements of identified housing need e.g. housing for older persons, self-build, support housing?	?	Uncertainty is recorded against all residential site options as information on provision of other elements of housing need is not available on a consistent basis.
2. Safeguard and improve community health, safety and wellbeing		
2.1 Are community facilities (community hall or library) available locally?	0	The northern corner of the site is between 400m and 800m of a community hall, which lies to the northwest of the site.
2.2 Are health facilities available locally?	--	There are no hospitals or GP surgeries within 1600m of this site.
2.3 What effect would the development have on local provision of sports pitches and facilities?	0	Development would not result in the loss of sports pitches or facilities.
2.4 Is public open space available locally?	+	The site is adjacent public open space, specifically Knowle Hill Park.
2.5 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network?	-	No footpaths or cycleways cross the site or are adjacent to the site.
3. Develop a dynamic and diverse economy		
3.1(a) Is the location close to a major rail station?	--	The site is further than 1400m from a major rail station.
3.1 (b) Is the location close to a minor rail station?	--	The site is further than 1200m from a minor rail station.
3.1 (c) Is the location close to a frequent bus route?	--	The site is located further than 800m from a frequent bus route.
3.1 (d) Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route?	--	The site is located further than 800m from a semi-frequent bus route.
3.1 (e) Is the location close to a major employment centre?	-	The site is located further than 1000m from a major employment centre.
3.2 Will the proposed development contribute towards meeting the need for new industrial, office or warehousing floorspace?	-	This site would be developed for residential use, therefore additional employment floorspace would not be provided.
3.3 Will the proposed development result in a net loss of existing employment land, or land which would be suitable for employment purposes?	0	EBC has confirmed that this site is not suitable for employment land.
3.4 Will the proposed development increase the amount of commercial uses and other facilities in town, district or local centres?	0	Development would not lead to loss of commercial uses or other facilities in town, district or local centres.
4. Reduce road traffic and congestion through improved accessibility to services homes and jobs; reducing the need to travel by car/lorry and improving sustainable travel choice		
4.1 Is the location close to a major rail station? (same score as 3.1a)	--	The site is further than 1400m from a major rail station.
4.2 Is the location close to a minor rail station? (same score as 3.1b)	--	The site is further than 1200m from a minor rail station.

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
4.3 Is the location close to a frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1c)	--	The site is located further than 800m from a frequent bus route.
4.4 Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1d)	--	The site is located further than 800m from a semi-frequent bus route.
4.5(a) Will residential development at the location be close to a major employment centre? (same score as 3.1e)	-	The site is further than 1000m from a major employment centre.
4.5(b) Will employment development at the location be close to a major population centre?	0	Development would be residential only.
4.6 Are health facilities available locally? (same score as 2.2)	--	There are no hospitals or GP surgeries within 1600m of this site.
4.7 Are shopping and related services available locally?	--	The site is further than 800m from a town, district or local centre.
4.8 Is the location close to a Primary school?	-	The western corner of the site is between 801m and 1000m from Fair Oak Infant School.
4.9 Is the location close to a Secondary school?	+	The site is located 800 to 1200m from Wyvern College.
4.10 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	-	No footpaths or cycleways cross the site or are adjacent to the site.
4.11 Are there Geographical barriers between the location and key facilities/ destinations?	+	No geographical barriers have been identified on walking routes to the destinations considered above.
5. Protect and conserve natural resources		
5.1 Will development avoid the sterilisation of mineral resources?	0	The site is not located within a Minerals Safeguarding Area or a Minerals Consultation Area.
5.2 Will it result in the loss of higher grade agricultural land?	0	The site consists entirely of lower quality agricultural land.
5.3 Will it use previously developed land?	-	This site consists of greenfield land.
5.4 Will it deliver or support allotments or community farms?	+?	There will be no loss of allotments or community farms. The location could be suitable for these but this is unknown.
6. Reduce air, soil, water, light and noise pollution		
6.1 Will the location be affected by significant noise generating uses or Air Quality Management Areas?	0	This site is not within proximity of an AQMA, motorway or A-road.
6.2 Will development increase pollution?	--?	Road Traffic noise impact from Knowle Lane. Commercial noise impact from BskyB and other commercial uses in vicinity. Significant risk as adjacent to former landfills which are producing landfill bulk and trace gases, option to remediate existing infill on site.
7. Plan for the anticipated levels of climate change		
7.1 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure?	0	No loss of existing green infrastructure.
7.2 Is the location at risk from flooding, taking into account of the effects of climate change?	-?	The eastern part of the site is covered by areas subject to 'less' surface water flood risk.
7.3 Will the development be at risk from coastal change? If so, can the Shoreline Management Plan Objectives be supported?	0	The site is not located near the coast.

SA objective/ criterion	Justification	
8. Minimise Eastleigh's contribution to climate change by reducing the borough's carbon footprint and minimising other greenhouse gas emissions.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
9. Reduce waste generation and disposal, encourage waste prevention and reuse and achieve the sustainable management of waste.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
10. Protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and geodiversity, improving its quality and range.		
10.1 Could development negatively impact or lead to loss of an internationally or nationally designated site (either alone or in combination)?	-	A tributary of the Hamble runs from the southernmost corner of the site into the Hamble which in turns flows into the Solent and Southampton Water SAC, SPA and Ramsar site. Potential for in combination effects on water quality.
10.2 Could development negatively impact or lead or loss of a locally designated biodiversity site (either alone or in combination)?	--	The site incorporates Land at Knowle Lane SINC which would be lost to development in the absence of specific policy protection in the Plan. The site is adjacent to Knowle Lane Open Space SINC and so this may be subject to increased recreational pressure and urban edge effects.
10.3 Will the development adversely affect areas with other nature conservation value, as identified in Biodiversity Action Plans (BAPs)?	0	Development of this site will not adversely affect areas with other nature conservation value.
10.4 Will the development adversely impact the biodiversity network (e.g. Priority Biodiversity Links (PBLs), Priority Biodiversity Areas (PBAs), hedgerows and other corridors for species movement)?	0	Development of this site will not adversely affect the biodiversity network.
10.5 Will the development adversely affect ancient woodland?	0	Development of this site will not adversely affect ancient woodland.
11. Enhance the Borough's multifunctional green infrastructure networks.		
11.1 Will the development affect TPO trees?	0	Development of the site will not affect TPO trees.
11.2 Can the location be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	-	No footpaths or cycleways cross the site or are adjacent to the site.
11.3 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure? (same score as 7.1)		No loss of existing green infrastructure.
12. Protect, enhance and manage the character and appearance of the landscape and townscape, maintaining and strengthening distinctiveness and its special qualities.		
12.1 Will development adversely affect the separation of neighbouring settlements?	?	Currently uncertain. Awaiting updated Gap Appraisal
12.2 Will it protect the character of the countryside, coast, towns and/or villages, including views and settings?	?	Currently uncertain. Awaiting updated Landscape Appraisal.
13. Protect and enhance and manage buildings, monuments, features, sites, places, areas and landscapes of archaeological, historical and cultural heritage importance.		
13.1 Will the development protect and enhance listed buildings and their settings, conservation areas, archaeological sites, historic landscapes and other	0	Development of the site is not expected to affect heritage assets.

SA objective/ criterion	Justification
sites of local importance for heritage?	

Site 5: Land South of Yewtree Cottage, Knowle Land and Land east of Botley Rd and north of Knowle Lane

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
1. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified local needs, including affordability and special needs		
1.1 Will the development provide a significant contribution towards meeting identified affordable housing needs?	++	This site has capacity to provide 100 dwellings.
1.2 Will it provide other elements of identified housing need e.g. housing for older persons, self-build, support housing?	?	Uncertainty is recorded against all residential site options as information on provision of other elements of housing need is not available on a consistent basis.
2. Safeguard and improve community health, safety and wellbeing		
2.1 Are community facilities (community hall or library) available locally?	0	The western part of this site is within 800m of a community hall.
2.2 Are health facilities available locally?	-	The Stokewood Surgery is within 1600m of this site.
2.3 What effect would the development have on local provision of sports pitches and facilities?	0	Development would not lead to loss of existing sports pitches and facilities.
2.4 Is public open space available locally?	+	The site is adjacent to Whitetree Farm amenity space and within 300m of Lapstone Farm (green route and outdoor sports facility), Ascot Road green route and Fontwell Gardens green route, as well as additional amenity spaces.
2.5 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network?	0	A footpath crosses the north eastern part of this site, but there are no nearby cycle routes.
3. Develop a dynamic and diverse economy		
3.1(a) Is the location close to a major rail station?	--	This site is further than 1400m from a major rail station.
3.1 (b) Is the location close to a minor rail station?	--	This site is further than 1200m from a minor rail station.
3.1 (c) Is the location close to a frequent bus route?	--	While a very small section on the northern corner of the site is located within 800m of a frequent bus route, a significant negative score has been given as almost all of the site is more than 800m from a frequent bus route.
3.1 (d) Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route?	--	The site is located further than 1000m from a semi-frequent bus route.
3.1 (e) Is the location close to a major employment centre?	-	This site is further than 1000m from a major employment centre.
3.2 Will the proposed development contribute towards meeting the need for new industrial, office or warehousing floorspace?	-	This site would be developed for residential use, therefore additional employment floorspace would not be provided.
3.3 Will the proposed development result in a net loss of existing employment land, or land which would be suitable for employment purposes?	-	The southwestern part of this site currently includes a public house and farm shop, which may be lost to development.
3.4 Will the proposed development increase the amount of commercial uses and other facilities in town, district or local centres?	0	The site is not located within a town, district or local centre.
4. Reduce road traffic and congestion through improved accessibility to services homes and jobs; reducing the need to travel by car/lorry and improving sustainable travel choice		

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
4.1 Is the location close to a major rail station? (same score as 3.1a)	--	This site is further than 1400m from a major rail station.
4.2 Is the location close to a minor rail station? (same score as 3.1b)	--	This site is further than 1200m from a minor rail station.
4.3 Is the location close to a frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1c)	--	A very small section on the northern corner of the site is located within 800m of a frequent bus route however, the score a significant negative score has been given as the area of the site within 800m of the bus stop is a very small proportion of the site as a whole.
4.4 Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1d)	--	The site is located further than 1000m from a semi-frequent bus route.
4.5(a) Will residential development at the location be close to a major employment centre? (same score as 3.1e)	-	This site is further than 1000m from a major employment centre.
4.5(b) Will employment development at the location be close to a major population centre?	0	Development would be residential only.
4.6 Are health facilities available locally? (same score as 2.2)	-	The Stokewood Surgery is within 1600m of this site.
4.7 Are shopping and related services available locally?	--	The site is further than 800m from a town, district or local centre.
4.8 Is the location close to a Primary school?	++	The northern part of the site is within 400m of Fair Oak Infant and Junior Schools.
4.9 Is the location close to a Secondary school?	++	The site is located within 800m of Wyvern College.
4.10 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	0	A footpath crosses the north eastern part of this site, but there are no nearby cycle routes.
4.11 Are there Geographical barriers between the location and key facilities/ destinations?	+	No geographical barriers exist on the most direct walking routes to the destinations above.
5. Protect and conserve natural resources		
5.1 Will development avoid the sterilisation of mineral resources?	0	This site does not lie within a Mineral Safeguarding Area or a Mineral Consultation Area.
5.2 Will it result in the loss of higher grade agricultural land?	0	The site consists entirely of lower quality agricultural land.
5.3 Will it use previously developed land?	-	This site consists primarily of greenfield land, although there are a few buildings in the western part of the site.
5.4 Will it deliver or support allotments or community farms?	++?	There will be no loss of allotments or community farms. The location could be suitable for these but this is unknown.
6. Reduce air, soil, water, light and noise pollution		
6.1 Will the location be affected by significant noise generating uses or Air Quality Management Areas?	0	The site is not within 200m of an A-road, motorway or AQMA.
6.2 Will development increase pollution?	-?	Site is adjacent to a former scrapyards, Potential to be partially remediated by redevelopment.
7. Plan for the anticipated levels of climate change		
7.1 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure?	0	No loss of existing green infrastructure.
7.2 Is the location at risk from flooding, taking into account of the effects of climate change?	-	The northern edge of this site follows a small waterbody/ditch, the land around which is at 'less' risk of surface water flooding.

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
7.3 Will the development be at risk from coastal change? If so, can the Shoreline Management Plan Objectives be supported?	0	This site is not near the coast.
8. Minimise Eastleigh's contribution to climate change by reducing the borough's carbon footprint and minimising other greenhouse gas emissions.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
9. Reduce waste generation and disposal, encourage waste prevention and reuse and achieve the sustainable management of waste.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
10. Protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and geodiversity, improving its quality and range.		
10.1 Could development negatively impact or lead to loss of an internationally or nationally designated site (either alone or in combination)?	-	Allington Lane Stream, which flows into the River Itchen SAC, runs along the north western boundary of the site. Changes in hydrology could cause adverse effects to the SAC. Mitigation consisting of 20m buffers are recommended and the EBC ecological appraisal states that if surface water drains into the stream three forms of naturalised flirtation would be essential mitigation.
10.2 Could development negatively impact or lead or loss of a locally designated biodiversity site (either alone or in combination)?	-	The site is boarded by a stream that flows through Quobleigh Woods SINC. Interruption of hydrological processes could cause impacts on the wet woodland within Quobleigh Woods.
10.3 Will the development adversely affect areas with other nature conservation value, as identified in Biodiversity Action Plans (BAPs)?	--	There appear to be trees, scrub and rough grassland within the north of the site that could be lost to development. Otter use the Lower Itchen Headwater Streams and therefore may use Allington Lane Stream. Great Crested Newts rely on the Lower Itchen for water supply to their terrestrial habitats and breeding ponds and terrestrial habitat of Great Crested Newts is likely to be lost to development.
10.4 Will the development adversely impact the biodiversity network (e.g. Priority Biodiversity Links (PBLs), Priority Biodiversity Areas (PBAs), hedgerows and other corridors for species movement)?	--	The Knowle Park PBL covers the majority of the site and could be lost to development. Suggested mitigation relates to provision of biodiversity corridors.
10.5 Will the development adversely affect ancient woodland?	0	Development of the site will not adversely affect ancient woodland.
11. Enhance the Borough's multifunctional green infrastructure networks.		
11.1 Will the development affect TPO trees?	-?	Yes- TPO645-E. Individual Yew.
11.2 Can the location be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	0	A footpath crosses the north eastern part of this site, but there are no nearby cycle routes.
11.3 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure? (same score as 7.1)	0	No loss of existing green infrastructure.
12. Protect, enhance and manage the character and appearance of the landscape and townscape, maintaining and strengthening distinctiveness and its special qualities.		
12.1 Will development adversely affect the separation of neighbouring settlements?	--	The site as assessed as having very poor/poor potential for development in relation to avoiding settlement coalescence.
12.2 Will it protect the character of the countryside,	0	The landscape within this site was assessed as having

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
coast, towns and/or villages, including views and settings?		low sensitivity to development.
13. Protect and enhance and manage buildings, monuments, features, sites, places, areas and landscapes of archaeological, historical and cultural heritage importance.		
13.1 Will the development protect and enhance listed buildings and their settings, conservation areas, archaeological sites, historic landscapes and other sites of local importance for heritage?	0	Development of the site is not expected to affect heritage assets.

Site 6: Cockpit Farm, Durley Road

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
1. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified local needs, including affordability and special needs		
1.1 Will the development provide a significant contribution towards meeting identified affordable housing needs?	++	This site has capacity to provide 124 dwellings.
1.2 Will it provide other elements of identified housing need e.g. housing for older persons, self-build, support housing?	?	Uncertainty is recorded against all residential site options as information on provision of other elements of housing need is not available on a consistent basis.
2. Safeguard and improve community health, safety and wellbeing		
2.1 Are community facilities (community hall or library) available locally?	0	The site is within 401 to 800m of a community hall, which lies to the southwest of the site.
2.2 Are health facilities available locally?	--	There are no GP surgeries or hospitals within 1600m of the site.
2.3 What effect would the development have on local provision of sports pitches and facilities?	0	Development would not lead to loss of sports pitches or facilities.
2.4 Is public open space available locally?	+	The site is within 300m of Whitetree Farm amenity space, Lapstone Farm (green route and outdoor sports facility), Ascot Road green route and Fontwell Gardens green route, as well as additional amenity spaces.
2.5 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network?	0	There is a footpath to Dumpers Drove that starts at Durley Road, opposite the southwest corner of the site.
3. Develop a dynamic and diverse economy		
3.1(a) Is the location close to a major rail station?	--	This site is not within 1400m of a major rail station.
3.1 (b) Is the location close to a minor rail station?	--	This site is not within 1200m of a minor rail station.
3.1 (c) Is the location close to a frequent bus route?	--	The site is located further than 800m from a frequent bus route.
3.1 (d) Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route?	--	The site is located more than 800m from a semi-frequent bus route.
3.1 (e) Is the location close to a major employment centre?	-	The site is further than 1000m from a major employment centre.
3.2 Will the proposed development contribute towards meeting the need for new industrial, office or warehousing floorspace?	-	This site would be developed for residential use, therefore additional employment floorspace would not be provided.
3.3 Will the proposed development result in a net loss of existing employment land, or land which would be suitable for employment purposes?	0	The SLAA does not identify this site as being suitable for employment land and no employment land would be lost to residential development.
3.4 Will the proposed development increase the amount of commercial uses and other facilities in town, district or local centres?	0	The site is not located within a town, district or local centre.
4. Reduce road traffic and congestion through improved accessibility to services homes and jobs; reducing the need to travel by car/lorry and improving sustainable travel choice		
4.1 Is the location close to a major rail station? (same score as 3.1a)	--	This site is not within 1400m of a major rail station.
4.2 Is the location close to a minor rail station? (same score as 3.1b)	--	This site is not within 1200m of a minor rail station.

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
4.3 Is the location close to a frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1c)	--	The site is located further than 800m from a frequent bus route.
4.4 Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1d)	--	The site is located more than 800m from a semi-frequent bus route.
4.5(a) Will residential development at the location be close to a major employment centre? (same score as 3.1e)	-	The site is further than 1000m from a major employment centre.
4.5(b) Will employment development at the location be close to a major population centre?	0	Development would be residential only.
4.6 Are health facilities available locally? (same score as 2.2)	--	There are no GP surgeries or hospitals within 1600m of the site.
4.7 Are shopping and related services available locally?	--	The site is further than 800m from a town, district or local centre.
4.8 Is the location close to a Primary school?	+	Part of the site is between 401 and 600m of Fair Oak Infant and Junior Schools.
4.9 Is the location close to a Secondary school?	++	The northern third of the site is located within 800m of Wyvern College.
4.10 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	0	There is a footpath to Dumpers Drove that starts at Durley Road, opposite the southwest corner of the site.
4.11 Are there Geographical barriers between the location and key facilities/ destinations?	+	There are no geographical barriers that may hinder residents for accessing the destinations discussed above.
5. Protect and conserve natural resources		
5.1 Will development avoid the sterilisation of mineral resources?	0	The site does not lie within a Mineral Safeguarding Area or a Mineral Consultation Area.
5.2 Will it result in the loss of higher grade agricultural land?	0	The site lies entirely on lower quality agricultural land.
5.3 Will it use previously developed land?	-	This site consists of greenfield land.
5.4 Will it deliver or support allotments or community farms?	++?	There will be no loss of allotments or community farms. The location could be suitable for these but this is unknown.
6. Reduce air, soil, water, light and noise pollution		
6.1 Will the location be affected by significant noise generating uses or Air Quality Management Areas?	0	The site is not located within 200m of an A-road, motorway, railway or AQMA.
6.2 Will development increase pollution?	-?	Road Traffic noise impact from Knowle Lane. Opportunity to remediate former poultry houses / brownfield.
7. Plan for the anticipated levels of climate change		
7.1 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure?	0	No loss of existing green infrastructure.
7.2 Is the location at risk from flooding, taking into account of the effects of climate change?	--?	The south eastern part of this site lies within Flood Zones 2 and 3 and has areas of 'intermediate' surface water flood risk along the tributary to Ford Lake.
7.3 Will the development be at risk from coastal change? If so, can the Shoreline Management Plan Objectives be supported?	0	This site is not near the coast.
8. Minimise Eastleigh's contribution to climate change by reducing the borough's carbon footprint and minimising other greenhouse gas emissions.		

SA objective/ criterion	Justification	
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
9. Reduce waste generation and disposal, encourage waste prevention and reuse and achieve the sustainable management of waste.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
10. Protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and geodiversity, improving its quality and range.		
10.1 Could development negatively impact or lead to loss of an internationally or nationally designated site (either alone or in combination)?	-	Ford Lake runs along the eastern boundary of the site. This stream is a tributary of the Hamble and flows into the Solent and Southampton Water SPA, SAC and Ramsar site. The EBC ecological appraisal has suggested that a 20m buffer would be required and naturalised SuDS with three forms of filtration to preserve water quality.
10.2 Could development negatively impact or lead or loss of a locally designated biodiversity site (either alone or in combination)?	0	Development of this site will not negatively impact or lead to loss of a locally designated biodiversity site.
10.3 Will the development adversely affect areas with other nature conservation value, as identified in Biodiversity Action Plans (BAPs)?	--	An area of this site known as the Mazels contains a natural meadow through most of the site and there appears to be significant belts of trees dissecting Cockpit Farm which could be lost to development.
10.4 Will the development adversely impact the biodiversity network (e.g. Priority Biodiversity Links (PBLs), Priority Biodiversity Areas (PBAs), hedgerows and other corridors for species movement)?	--	The Chalcroft PBL is present to the north and east of the site and could be adversely affected by development. The EBC ecological appraisal recommend that this corridor should remain connected for biodiversity.
10.5 Will the development adversely affect ancient woodland?	0	Development of this site would not adversely affect ancient woodland.
11. Enhance the Borough's multifunctional green infrastructure networks.		
11.1 Will the development affect TPO trees?	-?	Yes- TPO405-E Weeping Beech
11.2 Can the location be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	0	There is a footpath to Dumpers Drove that starts at Durley Road, opposite the southwest corner of the site.
11.3 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure? (same score as 7.1)	0	No loss of existing green infrastructure.
12. Protect, enhance and manage the character and appearance of the landscape and townscape, maintaining and strengthening distinctiveness and its special qualities.		
12.1 Will development adversely affect the separation of neighbouring settlements?	--	This site was assessed as having very poor/poor/average potential for development in relation to avoiding settlement coalescence.
12.2 Will it protect the character of the countryside, coast, towns and/or villages, including views and settings?	-	The landscape within this site was assessed as having moderate sensitivity to development.
13. Protect and enhance and manage buildings, monuments, features, sites, places, areas and landscapes of archaeological, historical and cultural heritage importance.		
13.1 Will the development protect and enhance listed buildings and their settings, conservation areas, archaeological sites, historic landscapes and other	-?	The Cockpit is a statutorily Grade II listed building. It is located on the south west boundary toward the

SA objective/ criterion	Justification
sites of local importance for heritage?	northern end.

Site 7: West of Durley Road

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
1. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified local needs, including affordability and special needs		
1.1 Will the development provide a significant contribution towards meeting identified affordable housing needs?	++	This site has capacity to provide 73 dwellings.
1.2 Will it provide other elements of identified housing need e.g. housing for older persons, self-build, support housing?	?	Uncertainty is recorded against all residential site options as information on provision of other elements of housing need is not available on a consistent basis.
2. Safeguard and improve community health, safety and wellbeing		
2.1 Are community facilities (community hall or library) available locally?	0	The site is within 400 to 800m of a community hall, which lies to the southwest of the site.
2.2 Are health facilities available locally?	--	There are no GP surgeries or hospitals within 1600m of the site.
2.3 What effect would the development have on local provision of sports pitches and facilities?	0	Development would not lead to loss of sports facilities.
2.4 Is public open space available locally?	+	The site is adjacent to Fontwell Gardens green route and within 300m of Whitetree Farm amenity space, Lapstone Farm (green route and outdoor sports facility), Ascot Road green route and, as well as additional amenity spaces.
2.5 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network?	-	No footpath or cycleway crosses or is adjacent to this site.
3. Develop a dynamic and diverse economy		
3.1(a) Is the location close to a major rail station?	--	This site is not within 1400m of a major rail station.
3.1 (b) Is the location close to a minor rail station?	--	This site is not within 1200m of a minor rail station.
3.1 (c) Is the location close to a frequent bus route?	--	The site is located further than 800m from a frequent bus route.
3.1 (d) Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route?	--	The site is located further than 800m from a semi-frequent bus route.
3.1 (e) Is the location close to a major employment centre?	-	The site is further than 1000m from a major employment centre.
3.2 Will the proposed development contribute towards meeting the need for new industrial, office or warehousing floorspace?	-	This site would be developed for residential use, therefore additional employment floorspace would not be provided.
3.3 Will the proposed development result in a net loss of existing employment land, or land which would be suitable for employment purposes?	0	The SLAA does not identify this site as being suitable for employment land and no employment land would be lost to residential development.
3.4 Will the proposed development increase the amount of commercial uses and other facilities in town, district or local centres?	0	The site is not located within a town, district or local centre.
4. Reduce road traffic and congestion through improved accessibility to services homes and jobs; reducing the need to travel by car/lorry and improving sustainable travel choice		
4.1 Is the location close to a major rail station? (same score as 3.1a)	--	This site is not within 1400m of a major rail station.
4.2 Is the location close to a minor rail station? (same score as 3.1b)	--	This site is not within 1200m of a minor rail station.

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
4.3 Is the location close to a frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1c)	--	The site is located further than 800m from a frequent bus route.
4.4 Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1d)	--	The site is located further than 800m from a semi-frequent bus route.
4.5(a) Will residential development at the location be close to a major employment centre? (same score as 3.1e)	-	The site is further than 1000m from a major employment centre.
4.5(b) Will employment development at the location be close to a major population centre?	0	Development would be residential only.
4.6 Are health facilities available locally? (same score as 2.2)	--	There are no GP surgeries or hospitals within 1600m of the site.
4.7 Are shopping and related services available locally?	--	The site is further than 800m from a town, district or local centre.
4.8 Is the location close to a Primary school?	+	The northern part of the site is between 401 and 600m of Fair Oak Infant and Junior Schools.
4.9 Is the location close to a Secondary school?	++	The northern most tip of the site is located within 800m of Wyvern College.
4.10 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	-	No footpath or cycleway crosses or is adjacent to this site.
4.11 Are there Geographical barriers between the location and key facilities/ destinations?	+	There are no geographical barriers that may hinder residents for accessing the destinations discussed above.
5. Protect and conserve natural resources		
5.1 Will development avoid the sterilisation of mineral resources?	0	The site does not lie within a Mineral Safeguarding Area or a Mineral Consultation Area.
5.2 Will it result in the loss of higher grade agricultural land?	0	The site lies entirely on lower quality agricultural land.
5.3 Will it use previously developed land?	-	This site consists of greenfield land.
5.4 Will it deliver or support allotments or community farms?	+?	There would be no loss of allotments or community farms. The location could be suitable for these but this is unknown.
6. Reduce air, soil, water, light and noise pollution		
6.1 Will the location be affected by significant noise generating uses or Air Quality Management Areas?	0	The site is not located within 200m of an A-road, motorway, railway or AQMA.
6.2 Will development increase pollution?	-?	Road Traffic noise impact from Knowle Lane. Commercial noise impact from adjacent farms.
7. Plan for the anticipated levels of climate change		
7.1 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure?	0	No loss of existing green infrastructure.
7.2 Is the location at risk from flooding, taking into account of the effects of climate change?	0	This site is not located in an area of surface water flood risk and is located outside of Flood Zones 2 and 3.
7.3 Will the development be at risk from coastal change? If so, can the Shoreline Management Plan Objectives be supported?	0	This site is not near the coast.
8. Minimise Eastleigh's contribution to climate change by reducing the borough's carbon footprint and minimising other greenhouse gas emissions.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		

SA objective/ criterion	Justification	
9. Reduce waste generation and disposal, encourage waste prevention and reuse and achieve the sustainable management of waste.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
10. Protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and geodiversity, improving its quality and range.		
10.1 Could development negatively impact or lead to loss of an internationally or nationally designated site (either alone or in combination)?	-	The site is 34m from Ford Lake, which flows into the Hamble and the Solent and Southampton Water SPA, SAC and Ramsar site. If the site drains into this tributary it could have an in-combination impact on water quality with other development draining into this tributary. To preserve water quality and flows, naturalised SuDS with three forms of filtration are recommended as mitigation measures.
10.2 Could development negatively impact or lead or loss of a locally designated biodiversity site (either alone or in combination)?	0	Development of this site will not negatively impact or lead to loss of a locally designated biodiversity site.
10.3 Will the development adversely affect areas with other nature conservation value, as identified in Biodiversity Action Plans (BAPs)?	0	Development of this site will not adversely affect areas with other nature conservation value. EBC's ecological appraisal identifies hedgerows on site but considers that they are not likely to be of high biodiversity value as they appear 'gappy'.
10.4 Will the development adversely impact the biodiversity network (e.g. Priority Biodiversity Links (PBLs), Priority Biodiversity Areas (PBAs), hedgerows and other corridors for species movement)?	--	The Chalcroft PBL is present on the south east edge of the site and could be adversely affected by development. The EBC ecological appraisal suggests that the corridor should remain connected for biodiversity.
10.5 Will the development adversely affect ancient woodland?	0	Development of this site will not adversely affect ancient woodland.
11. Enhance the Borough's multifunctional green infrastructure networks.		
11.1 Will the development affect TPO trees?	-?	Yes - TPO 139-E covering all tree species
11.2 Can the location be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	-	No footpath or cycleway crosses or is adjacent to this site.
11.3 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure? (same score as 7.1)	0	No loss of existing green infrastructure.
12. Protect, enhance and manage the character and appearance of the landscape and townscape, maintaining and strengthening distinctiveness and its special qualities.		
12.1 Will development adversely affect the separation of neighbouring settlements?	-	This site was assessed as having average potential for development in relation to avoiding settlement coalescence.
12.2 Will it protect the character of the countryside, coast, towns and/or villages, including views and settings?	-	The landscape within this site was assessed as having moderate sensitivity to development.
13. Protect and enhance and manage buildings, monuments, features, sites, places, areas and landscapes of archaeological, historical and cultural heritage importance.		
13.1 Will the development protect and enhance listed buildings and their settings, conservation areas, archaeological sites, historic landscapes and other	0	Development of the site will not affect heritage assets.

SA objective/ criterion	Justification
sites of local importance for heritage?	

Site 8: East of Allington Lane

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
1. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified local needs, including affordability and special needs		
1.1 Will the development provide a significant contribution towards meeting identified affordable housing needs?	++	This site has the capacity to provide 38 dwellings.
1.2 Will it provide other elements of identified housing need e.g. housing for older persons, self-build, support housing?	?	Uncertainty is recorded against all residential site options as information on provision of other elements of housing need is not available on a consistent basis.
2. Safeguard and improve community health, safety and wellbeing		
2.1 Are community facilities (community hall or library) available locally?	+	The northern part of the site lies within 400m of a community hall. The site also lies between 400m and 800m of Fair Oak Library a number of community halls.
2.2 Are health facilities available locally?	+	The site is between 400 and 800m of Stokewood surgery.
2.3 What effect would the development have on local provision of sports pitches and facilities?	0	Development would not lead to a loss of sports pitches and facilities.
2.4 Is public open space available locally?	++?	<p>Quobleigh Ponds, a green route, is located in the eastern part of the site. The Council has confirmed that this area will be retained as mitigation land, therefore this is expected to be enhanced and available for use by residents of any new development of this site. The mitigation to be implemented cannot be known until this is drawn up at the planning application stage, resulting in uncertainty.</p> <p>There are a number of other open spaces, particularly amenity space, within 300m of this site.</p>
2.5 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network?	0	An existing footpath crosses the site, which connects to a wider network of footpaths.
3. Develop a dynamic and diverse economy		
3.1(a) Is the location close to a major rail station?	--	This site is further than 1400m from a major rail station.
3.1 (b) Is the location close to a minor rail station?	--	This site is further than 1200m from a minor rail station.
3.1 (c) Is the location close to a frequent bus route?	++	The northern part of the site is located within 400m of the frequent Bluestar 2 bus route.
3.1 (d) Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route?	--	The site is located further than 800m from a semi-frequent bus route.
3.1 (e) Is the location close to a major employment centre?	-	The site is further than 1000m from a major employment centre.
3.2 Will the proposed development contribute towards meeting the need for new industrial, office or warehousing floorspace?	-	This site would be developed for residential use, therefore additional employment floorspace would not be provided.
3.3 Will the proposed development result in a net loss of existing employment land, or land which would be suitable for employment purposes?	0	The SLAA does not identify this site as being suitable for employment land and no employment land would be lost to residential development.
3.4 Will the proposed development increase the amount of commercial uses and other facilities in town, district or local centres?	0	The site is not located in a town, district or local centre.

SA objective/ criterion	Justification
4. Reduce road traffic and congestion through improved accessibility to services homes and jobs; reducing the need to travel by car/lorry and improving sustainable travel choice	
4.1 Is the location close to a major rail station? (same score as 3.1a)	-- This site is further than 1400m from a major rail station.
4.2 Is the location close to a minor rail station? (same score as 3.1b)	-- This site is further than 1200m from a minor rail station.
4.3 Is the location close to a frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1c)	++ The northern part of the site is located within 400m of the frequent Bluestar 2 bus route.
4.4 Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1d)	-- The site is located further than 800m from a semi-frequent bus route.
4.5(a) Will residential development at the location be close to a major employment centre? (same score as 3.1e)	- The site is further than 1000m from a major employment centre.
4.5(b) Will employment development at the location be close to a major population centre?	0 Development would be residential only.
4.6 Are health facilities available locally? (same score as 2.2)	+ The site is between 400 and 800m of Stokewood surgery.
4.7 Are shopping and related services available locally?	0 The northern part of this site is within 400 to 600m of Fair Oak centre.
4.8 Is the location close to a Primary school?	++ The site is adjacent to Fair Oak Junior School and Infant School.
4.9 Is the location close to a Secondary school?	++ The site is located within 800m of Wyvern College. The Kings School (an independent school) is located within the site. The council has confirmed that this will be retained.
4.10 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	0 An existing footpath crosses the site, which connects to a wider network of footpaths.
4.11 Are there Geographical barriers between the location and key facilities/ destinations?	+ No geographical barriers have been identified between the site and the facilities described above.
5. Protect and conserve natural resources	
5.1 Will development avoid the sterilisation of mineral resources?	-? The north eastern part of this site is located within a Mineral Safeguarding Area and a Mineral Consultation Area.
5.2 Will it result in the loss of higher grade agricultural land?	0 The site consists entirely of lower grade agricultural land.
5.3 Will it use previously developed land?	- This site consists of greenfield land.
5.4 Will it deliver or support allotments or community farms?	+? There will be no loss of allotments or community farms. The location could be suitable for these but this is unknown.
6. Reduce air, soil, water, light and noise pollution	
6.1 Will the location be affected by significant noise generating uses or Air Quality Management Areas?	0 The site is not within 200m of a railway, motorway, A-road or AQMA.
6.2 Will development increase pollution?	-? Commercial noise impact from adjacent school, opportunity to remediate former horticultural nursery site.
7. Plan for the anticipated levels of climate change	
7.1 Will the development provide additional or	+? Quobleigh Ponds, a green route, is located in the

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
improved green infrastructure?		eastern part of the site. The Council has confirmed that this area will be retained as mitigation land, therefore this is expected to be enhanced and available for use by residents of any new development of this site. The mitigation to be implemented cannot be known until this is drawn up at the planning application stage, resulting in uncertainty, but this is likely to improve this GI feature.
7.2 Is the location at risk from flooding, taking into account of the effects of climate change?	-?	There are small areas of 'less' surface water flood risk on the site. There is a large area of 'intermediate' surface water flood risk and a small area of Flood Zones 2 and 3 in the eastern part of the site, but these lie within the area reserved for mitigation land, therefore this is unlikely to affect the part of the site to be developed. There is uncertainty related to the extent to which mitigation at this site will further manage flood risk.
7.3 Will the development be at risk from coastal change? If so, can the Shoreline Management Plan Objectives be supported?	0	This site is not located near the coast.
8. Minimise Eastleigh's contribution to climate change by reducing the borough's carbon footprint and minimising other greenhouse gas emissions.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
9. Reduce waste generation and disposal, encourage waste prevention and reuse and achieve the sustainable management of waste.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
10. Protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and geodiversity, improving its quality and range.		
10.1 Could development negatively impact or lead to loss of an internationally or nationally designated site (either alone or in combination)?	-	The site drains into the Lower Itchen which in turn flows into the River Itchen SAC. Development at this site has potential for in combination effects with other sites on water quality. The EBC ecological appraisal recommends that naturalised SuDS with three forms of filtration should be required within the site policy to preserve water quality.
10.2 Could development negatively impact or lead or loss of a locally designated biodiversity site (either alone or in combination)?	--	The southern section of the site is covered by Quobleigh Woods SINC, which is designated for its Great Crested Newt population which would be lost to development in the absence of specific policy protection in the Plan. There is the potential for adverse in-combination effects on the Great Crested Newt population.
10.3 Will the development adversely affect areas with other nature conservation value, as identified in Biodiversity Action Plans (BAPs)?	-	Potential for in-combination effects on the Great Crested Newt population of Quobleigh Woods SINC.
10.4 Will the development adversely impact the biodiversity network (e.g. Priority Biodiversity Links (PBLs), Priority Biodiversity Areas (PBAs), hedgerows and other corridors for species movement)?	0	Development of this site will not adversely impact the biodiversity network.
10.5 Will the development adversely affect ancient woodland?	0	Development of this site will not adversely affect ancient woodland.
11. Enhance the Borough's multifunctional green infrastructure networks.		
11.1 Will the development affect TPO trees?	-?	Yes - TPO 552-E covering all tree species.
11.2 Can the location be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	0	An existing footpath crosses the site, which connects to a wider network of footpaths.

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
11.3 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure? (same score as 7.1)	+?	Quobleigh Ponds, a green route, is located in the eastern part of the site. The Council has confirmed that this area will be retained as mitigation land, therefore this is expected to be enhanced and available for use by residents of any new development of this site. The mitigation to be implemented cannot be known until this is drawn up at the planning application stage, resulting in uncertainty, but this is likely to improve this GI feature.
12. Protect, enhance and manage the character and appearance of the landscape and townscape, maintaining and strengthening distinctiveness and its special qualities.		
12.1 Will development adversely affect the separation of neighbouring settlements?	--	This site was assessed as having very poor/poor/average potential for development in relation to avoiding settlement coalescence.
12.2 Will it protect the character of the countryside, coast, towns and/or villages, including views and settings?	0	This site was assessed as having low sensitivity to development.
13. Protect and enhance and manage buildings, monuments, features, sites, places, areas and landscapes of archaeological, historical and cultural heritage importance.		
13.1 Will the development protect and enhance listed buildings and their settings, conservation areas, archaeological sites, historic landscapes and other sites of local importance for heritage?	-?	Development of the site may affect a park with a house dating from 16c.

Site 9: Firtree Farm

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
1. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified local needs, including affordability and special needs		
1.1 Will the development provide a significant contribution towards meeting identified affordable housing needs?	++	This site has the capacity to provide 450 dwellings.
1.2 Will it provide other elements of identified housing need e.g. housing for older persons, self-build, support housing?	?	Uncertainty is recorded against all residential site options as information on provision of other elements of housing need is not available on a consistent basis.
2. Safeguard and improve community health, safety and wellbeing		
2.1 Are community facilities (community hall or library) available locally?	0	The site lies between 400 and 800m of a community hall.
2.2 Are health facilities available locally?	+	The site is between 400 and 800m of Stokewood surgery.
2.3 What effect would the development have on local provision of sports pitches and facilities?	0	Development would not lead to a loss of sports pitches and facilities.
2.4 Is public open space available locally?	--?	Part of Quobleigh Ponds, a green route, is located in the eastern part of the site. Development may lead to a partial loss of this open space resource. This effect remains uncertain as it is not known whether any replacement facilities will be provided. The site is within 300m of a number of other open spaces.
2.5 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network?	0	An existing footpath crosses the site, which connects to a wider network of footpaths.
3. Develop a dynamic and diverse economy		
3.1(a) Is the location close to a major rail station?	--	This site is further than 1400m from a major rail station.
3.1 (b) Is the location close to a minor rail station?	--	This site is further than 1200m from a minor rail station.
3.1 (c) Is the location close to a frequent bus route?	-	The northern part of the site is located within 601 to 800m from the frequent Bluestar 2 bus route.
3.1 (d) Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route?	--	The site is further than 800m from a semi-frequent bus route.
3.1 (e) Is the location close to a major employment centre?	+	The southern part of this site is between 400 and 1000m of Chalcroft Business Park.
3.2 Will the proposed development contribute towards meeting the need for new industrial, office or warehousing floorspace?	-	This site would be developed for residential use, therefore additional employment floorspace would not be provided.
3.3 Will the proposed development result in a net loss of existing employment land, or land which would be suitable for employment purposes?	0	The SLAA does not identify this site as being suitable for employment uses and states that development would not lead to loss of employment land.
3.4 Will the proposed development increase the amount of commercial uses and other facilities in town, district or local centres?	0	The site is not located in a town, district or local centre.
4. Reduce road traffic and congestion through improved accessibility to services homes and jobs; reducing the need to travel by car/lorry and improving sustainable travel choice		
4.1 Is the location close to a major rail station?	--	This site is further than 1400m from a major rail

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
(same score as 3.1a)		station.
4.2 Is the location close to a minor rail station? (same score as 3.1b)	--	This site is further than 1200m from a minor rail station.
4.3 Is the location close to a frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1c)	-	The northern part of the site is located within 601 to 800m from the frequent Bluestar 2 bus route.
4.4 Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1d)	--	The site is further than 800m from a semi-frequent bus route.
4.5(a) Will residential development at the location be close to a major employment centre? (same score as 3.1e)	+	The southern part of this site is between 400 and 1000m of Chalcroft Business Park.
4.5(b) Will employment development at the location be close to a major population centre?	0	Development would be residential only.
4.6 Are health facilities available locally? (same score as 2.2)	+	The site is between 400 and 800m of Stokewood surgery.
4.7 Are shopping and related services available locally?	--	The site is further than 800m from a town, district or local centre.
4.8 Is the location close to a Primary school?	+	The site is within 400 and 600m of Fair Oak Junior School and Infant School.
4.9 Is the location close to a Secondary school?	++	The northern half of the site is located within 800m of Wyvern College.
4.10 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	0	An existing footpath crosses the site, which connects to a wider network of footpaths.
4.11 Are there Geographical barriers between the location and key facilities/ destinations?	+	No geographical barriers have been identified between the site and the facilities described above.
5. Protect and conserve natural resources		
5.1 Will development avoid the sterilisation of mineral resources?	-?	The southwestern part of this site is located within a Mineral Safeguarding Area and a Mineral Consultation Area.
5.2 Will it result in the loss of higher grade agricultural land?	0	The site consists entirely of lower grade agricultural land.
5.3 Will it use previously developed land?	-	This site consists of greenfield land.
5.4 Will it deliver or support allotments or community farms?	+?	There will be no loss of allotments or community farms. The location could be suitable for these but this is unknown.
6. Reduce air, soil, water, light and noise pollution		
6.1 Will the location be affected by significant noise generating uses or Air Quality Management Areas?	0	The site is not within 200m of a railway, motorway, A-road or AQMA.
6.2 Will development increase pollution?	-?	Noise impact from Allington Lane. Potential to remediate fruit farm.
7. Plan for the anticipated levels of climate change		
7.1 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure?	--?	Part of Quobleigh Ponds, a green route, is located in the eastern part of the site. Development may lead to a partial loss of this open space resource. This effect remains uncertain as it is not known whether any loss will be mitigated.
7.2 Is the location at risk from flooding, taking into account of the effects of climate change?	--?	Part of the site, associated with a stream, lies within Flood Zone 3. There are also areas of 'intermediate' risk of surface water flooding within the site.
7.3 Will the development be at risk from coastal	0	This site is not located near the coast.

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
change? If so, can the Shoreline Management Plan Objectives be supported?		
8. Minimise Eastleigh's contribution to climate change by reducing the borough's carbon footprint and minimising other greenhouse gas emissions.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
9. Reduce waste generation and disposal, encourage waste prevention and reuse and achieve the sustainable management of waste.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
10. Protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and geodiversity, improving its quality and range.		
10.1 Could development negatively impact or lead to loss of an internationally or nationally designated site (either alone or in combination)?	-	The Lower Itchen runs through the site and flows into the River Itchen SAC. Development has potential for adverse effects on water quality and in combination effects with other sites. The EBC ecological appraisal recommends significant buffering and SuDS including three forms of naturalised filtration to mitigate adverse effects.
10.2 Could development negatively impact or lead or loss of a locally designated biodiversity site (either alone or in combination)?	-	Parts of Quobleigh Woods SINC are incorporated within the boundary. The EBC site assessment suggests buffering the woodland but identifies that there is still a risk of increasing recreational pressure on the SINC, particularly in-combination with other potential development.
10.3 Will the development adversely affect areas with other nature conservation value, as identified in Biodiversity Action Plans (BAPs)?	-	There are priority habitats within the site but the EBC ecological appraisal suggests that these can be protected and buffered. Otter, bats and Great Crested Newts use the site, however mitigation is likely to be feasible.
10.4 Will the development adversely impact the biodiversity network (e.g. Priority Biodiversity Links (PBLs), Priority Biodiversity Areas (PBAs), hedgerows and other corridors for species movement)?	-	The Itchen Valley PBA runs through the site following the stream. The EBC ecological appraisal suggests that this impact can be mitigated through appropriate buffering.
10.5 Will the development adversely affect ancient woodland?	0	Development of the site will not adversely affect ancient woodland.
11. Enhance the Borough's multifunctional green infrastructure networks.		
11.1 Will the development affect TPO trees?	0	Development of the site will not affect TPO trees.
11.2 Can the location be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	0	An existing footpath crosses the site, which connects to a wider network of footpaths.
11.3 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure? (same score as 7.1)	--?	Part of Quobleigh Ponds, a green route, is located in the eastern part of the site. Development may lead to a partial loss of this open space resource. This effect remains uncertain as it is not known whether any loss will be mitigated.
12. Protect, enhance and manage the character and appearance of the landscape and townscape, maintaining and strengthening distinctiveness and its special qualities.		
12.1 Will development adversely affect the separation of neighbouring settlements?	--	This site was assessed as having very poor/poor/average potential for development in relation to avoiding settlement coalescence.
12.2 Will it protect the character of the countryside, coast, towns and/or villages, including views and	-	This site was assessed as having moderate sensitivity

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
settings?		to development.
13. Protect and enhance and manage buildings, monuments, features, sites, places, areas and landscapes of archaeological, historical and cultural heritage importance.		
13.1 Will the development protect and enhance listed buildings and their settings, conservation areas, archaeological sites, historic landscapes and other sites of local importance for heritage?	0	Development of this site will not affect heritage assets.

Site 10: Lechlade, Burnetts Lane

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
1. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified local needs, including affordability and special needs		
1.1 Will the development provide a significant contribution towards meeting identified affordable housing needs?	+	This site has capacity to provide 13 dwellings.
1.2 Will it provide other elements of identified housing need e.g. housing for older persons, self-build, support housing?	?	Uncertainty is recorded against all residential site options as information on provision of other elements of housing need is not available on a consistent basis.
2. Safeguard and improve community health, safety and wellbeing		
2.1 Are community facilities (community hall or library) available locally?	0	This site is within 400 to 800m of a community hall.
2.2 Are health facilities available locally?	-	The Stokewood Surgery is within 1201 and 1600m of this site.
2.3 What effect would the development have on local provision of sports pitches and facilities?	0	Development would not lead to loss of existing sports pitches and facilities.
2.4 Is public open space available locally?	+	The site is adjacent to Lapstone Farm (green route and outdoor sports facility) and within 300m of Whitetree Farm amenity space, Ascot Road green route and Fontwell Gardens green route, as well as additional amenity spaces.
2.5 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network?	-	There are no footpaths or cycle routes within or adjacent to the site.
3. Develop a dynamic and diverse economy		
3.1(a) Is the location close to a major rail station?	--	This site is further than 1400m from a major rail station.
3.1 (b) Is the location close to a minor rail station?	--	This site is further than 1200m from a minor rail station.
3.1 (c) Is the location close to a frequent bus route?	--	The site is located further than 800m from a frequent bus route.
3.1 (d) Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route?	--	The site is located more than 800m from a semi-frequent bus route.
3.1 (e) Is the location close to a major employment centre?	-	This site is further than 1000m from a major employment centre.
3.2 Will the proposed development contribute towards meeting the need for new industrial, office or warehousing floorspace?	-	This site would be developed for residential use, therefore additional employment floorspace would not be provided.
3.3 Will the proposed development result in a net loss of existing employment land, or land which would be suitable for employment purposes?	0	The SLAA does not identify this site as being suitable for employment uses and development would not lead to loss of any existing employment land.
3.4 Will the proposed development increase the amount of commercial uses and other facilities in town, district or local centres?	0	The site is not located within a town, district or local centre.
4. Reduce road traffic and congestion through improved accessibility to services homes and jobs; reducing the need to travel by car/lorry and improving sustainable travel choice		
4.1 Is the location close to a major rail station? (same score as 3.1a)	--	This site is further than 1400m from a major rail station.
4.2 Is the location close to a minor rail station?	--	This site is further than 1200m from a minor rail

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
(same score as 3.1b)		station.
4.3 Is the location close to a frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1c)	--	The site is located further than 800m from a frequent bus route.
4.4 Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1d)	--	The site is located more than 800m from a semi-frequent bus route.
4.5(a) Will residential development at the location be close to a major employment centre? (same score as 3.1e)	-	This site is further than 1000m from a major employment centre.
4.5(b) Will employment development at the location be close to a major population centre?	0	Development would be residential only.
4.6 Are health facilities available locally? (same score as 2.2)	-	The Stokewood Surgery is within 1201 and 1600m of this site.
4.7 Are shopping and related services available locally?	--	The site is further than 800m from a town, district or local centre.
4.8 Is the location close to a Primary school?	+	The site is within 401 to 600m of Fair Oak Infant and Junior Schools.
4.9 Is the location close to a Secondary school?	++	The site is located within 800m of Wyvern College.
4.10 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	-	There are no footpaths or cycle routes within or adjacent to the site.
4.11 Are there Geographical barriers between the location and key facilities/ destinations?	+	No geographical barriers exist on the most direct walking routes to the destinations above.
5. Protect and conserve natural resources		
5.1 Will development avoid the sterilisation of mineral resources?	0	This site does not lie within a Mineral Safeguarding Area or a Mineral Consultation Area.
5.2 Will it result in the loss of higher grade agricultural land?	0	The site consists entirely of lower quality agricultural land.
5.3 Will it use previously developed land?	-	This site consists primarily of greenfield land, although there a few buildings in the western part of the site.
5.4 Will it deliver or support allotments or community farms?	+?	There will be no loss of allotments or community farms. The location could be suitable for these but this is unknown.
6. Reduce air, soil, water, light and noise pollution		
6.1 Will the location be affected by significant noise generating uses or Air Quality Management Areas?	0	The site is not within 200m of an A-road, motorway or AQMA.
6.2 Will development increase pollution?	-?	Road Traffic noise impact from Botley Road / Burnetts Lane.
7. Plan for the anticipated levels of climate change		
7.1 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure?	0	No loss of existing green infrastructure.
7.2 Is the location at risk from flooding, taking into account of the effects of climate change?	0	This site is not at risk of surface water flooding and is outside of Flood Zones 2 and 3.
7.3 Will the development be at risk from coastal change? If so, can the Shoreline Management Plan Objectives be supported?	0	This site is not near the coast.
8. Minimise Eastleigh's contribution to climate change by reducing the borough's carbon footprint and minimising other greenhouse gas emissions.		

SA objective/ criterion	Justification	
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
9. Reduce waste generation and disposal, encourage waste prevention and reuse and achieve the sustainable management of waste.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
10. Protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and geodiversity, improving its quality and range.		
10.1 Could development negatively impact or lead to loss of an internationally or nationally designated site (either alone or in combination)?	-	The site may drain into the Lower Itchen, to the north of the site, which in turn flows into the River Itchen SAC, therefore there is potential for in combination effects on water quality. Naturalised SuDS with three forms of filtration has been identified as an appropriate mitigation measure to preserve water quality.
10.2 Could development negatively impact or lead or loss of a locally designated biodiversity site (either alone or in combination)?	0	Development of this site will not negatively impact or lead to loss of a locally designated biodiversity site.
10.3 Will the development adversely affect areas with other nature conservation value, as identified in Biodiversity Action Plans (BAPs)?	--	The site appears to be covered in mature trees which could be lost to development.
10.4 Will the development adversely impact the biodiversity network (e.g. Priority Biodiversity Links (PBLs), Priority Biodiversity Areas (PBAs), hedgerows and other corridors for species movement)?	0	Development of this site will not adversely impact the biodiversity network.
10.5 Will the development adversely affect ancient woodland?	0	Development of this site will not adversely affect ancient woodland.
11. Enhance the Borough's multifunctional green infrastructure networks.		
11.1 Will the development affect TPO trees?	-?	Yes - TPO 157-E covering 4 oaks.
11.2 Can the location be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	-	There are no footpaths or cycle routes within or adjacent to the site.
11.3 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure? (same score as 7.1)	0	No loss of existing green infrastructure.
12. Protect, enhance and manage the character and appearance of the landscape and townscape, maintaining and strengthening distinctiveness and its special qualities.		
12.1 Will development adversely affect the separation of neighbouring settlements?	-	The site was assessed as having average potential for development in relation to avoiding settlement coalescence.
12.2 Will it protect the character of the countryside, coast, towns and/or villages, including views and settings?	0	The landscape within this site was assessed as having low sensitivity to development.
13. Protect and enhance and manage buildings, monuments, features, sites, places, areas and landscapes of archaeological, historical and cultural heritage importance.		
13.1 Will the development protect and enhance listed buildings and their settings, conservation areas, archaeological sites, historic landscapes and other sites of local importance for heritage?	0	Development of this site will not affect heritage assets.

Site 11: Land and allotments south of Moorgreen Road

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
1. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified local needs, including affordability and special needs		
1.1 Will the development provide a significant contribution towards meeting identified affordable housing needs?	++	This site has capacity to provide 266 dwellings.
1.2 Will it provide other elements of identified housing need e.g. housing for older persons, self-build, support housing?	?	Uncertainty is recorded against all residential site options as information on provision of other elements of housing need is not available on a consistent basis.
2. Safeguard and improve community health, safety and wellbeing		
2.1 Are community facilities (community hall or library) available locally?	0	The site is within 400 to 800m of a community hall.
2.2 Are health facilities available locally?	+	The site is within 400 to 800m of Moorgreen Hospital, West End Surgery and St Luke's Surgery.
2.3 What effect would the development have on local provision of sports pitches and facilities?	0	The site would not lead to loss of any sports pitches and facilities.
2.4 Is public open space available locally?	--	Part of this site consists of Moorgreen Road Allotments, which would be lost to development. There are a range of areas of open space within 300m of this site.
2.5 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network?	0	A footpath crosses the southern part of this site and another runs adjacent to the northwest boundary of the site.
3. Develop a dynamic and diverse economy		
3.1(a) Is the location close to a major rail station?	-	The eastern part of this site is within 1201 to 1400m of Hedge End railway station.
3.1 (b) Is the location close to a minor rail station?	--	The site is further than 1200m from a minor railway station.
3.1 (c) Is the location close to a frequent bus route?	--	The site is further than 800m from a frequent bus route.
3.1 (d) Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route?	+	The southern and eastern parts of the site are within 400m of the semi-frequent First 8 bus route.
3.1 (e) Is the location close to a major employment centre?	++	The very southern tip of the site is within 400m of Hedge End Industrial Area.
3.2 Will the proposed development contribute towards meeting the need for new industrial, office or warehousing floorspace?	-	This site would be developed for residential use, therefore additional employment floorspace would not be provided.
3.3 Will the proposed development result in a net loss of existing employment land, or land which would be suitable for employment purposes?	0	The SLAA does not identify this site as being suitable for employment uses and no existing employment land would be lost to residential development.
3.4 Will the proposed development increase the amount of commercial uses and other facilities in town, district or local centres?	0	This site is not in a town, district or local centre.
4. Reduce road traffic and congestion through improved accessibility to services homes and jobs; reducing the need to travel by car/lorry and improving sustainable travel choice		
4.1 Is the location close to a major rail station? (same score as 3.1a)	-	The eastern part of this site is located within 1201 to 1400m of Hedge End rail station.
4.2 Is the location close to a minor rail station?	--	This site is further than 1200m from a minor rail

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
(same score as 3.1b)		station.
4.3 Is the location close to a frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1c)	--	The site is further than 800m from a frequent bus route.
4.4 Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1d)	+	The southern and eastern parts of the site are within 400m of the semi-frequent First 8 bus route.
4.5(a) Will residential development at the location be close to a major employment centre? (same score as 3.1e)	++	The very southern tip of the site is within 400m of Hedge End Industrial Area.
4.5(b) Will employment development at the location be close to a major population centre?	0	Development would be residential only.
4.6 Are health facilities available locally? (same score as 2.2)	+	The site is within 400 to 800m of Moorgreen Hospital, West End Surgery and St Luke's Surgery.
4.7 Are shopping and related services available locally?	-	The very southern corner of the site is located 601 to 800m from a town, district or local centre.
4.8 Is the location close to a Primary school?	++	The eastern half of the site is located within 400m from St James Church of England Primary School.
4.9 Is the location close to a Secondary school?	0	The southern half of the site is located within 1201 to 1600m from Wildern School.
4.10 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	0	A footpath crosses the southern part of this site and another runs adjacent to the northwest boundary of the site.
4.11 Are there Geographical barriers between the location and key facilities/ destinations?	0	The M27 forms a geographical barrier between the site and two of the above destinations including the primary school and the doctors surgery.
5. Protect and conserve natural resources		
5.1 Will development avoid the sterilisation of mineral resources?	0	The site is not located in a Minerals Safeguarding Area or a Mineral Consultation Area.
5.2 Will it result in the loss of higher grade agricultural land?	--	The eastern corner of the site is located in an area of high quality agricultural land.
5.3 Will it use previously developed land?	-	This site consists of greenfield land.
5.4 Will it deliver or support allotments or community farms?	++?	There will be no loss of allotments or community farms. The location could be suitable for these but this is unknown.
6. Reduce air, soil, water, light and noise pollution		
6.1 Will the location be affected by significant noise generating uses or Air Quality Management Areas?	-?	The western edge of the site is located within 200m of the M27 motorway.
6.2 Will development increase pollution?	--?	Significant noise and air quality impact from the M27 on the site.
7. Plan for the anticipated levels of climate change		
7.1 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure?	-?	Development of the site may result in the loss of Moorgreen Road allotments.
7.2 Is the location at risk from flooding, taking into account of the effects of climate change?	-?	The site includes small areas subject to 'less' surface water flood risk.
7.3 Will the development be at risk from coastal change? If so, can the Shoreline Management Plan Objectives be supported?	0	This site is not located near the coast.
8. Minimise Eastleigh's contribution to climate change by reducing the borough's carbon footprint and minimising other greenhouse gas emissions.		

SA objective/ criterion	Justification	
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
9. Reduce waste generation and disposal, encourage waste prevention and reuse and achieve the sustainable management of waste.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
10. Protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and geodiversity, improving its quality and range.		
10.1 Could development negatively impact or lead to loss of an internationally or nationally designated site (either alone or in combination)?	-	Moorgreen Meadows SSSI, designated for its wetland and woodland habitats wraps around the southern, eastern and western borders of the site so development of this site is likely to have impacts due to urban edge effects and increased recreational pressure. Air quality impacts have also been identified as a result of other developments in close proximity to the SSSI due to increased traffic on Tolbar Way. Development could also lead to changes in hydrology in the SSSI, resulting in the loss of the rare orchid for which the site is designated. The Moorgreen Stream runs through Moorgreen Meadows SSSI to the south of the site and joins Ford Lake which in turn flows into the River Hamble and the Solent and Southampton Water SPA, SAC and Ramsar site. There is potential for in combination adverse effects on the quality of these watercourses with other nearby development, if the site drains into the Moorgreen Stream. The EBC ecological appraisal recommends naturalised SuDS with three forms of filtration as mitigation to preserve water quality.
10.2 Could development negatively impact or lead to loss of a locally designated biodiversity site (either alone or in combination)?	0	Development of this site will not negatively impact or lead to loss of a locally designated biodiversity site.
10.3 Will the development adversely affect areas with other nature conservation value, as identified in Biodiversity Action Plans (BAPs)?	--	The site contains hedgerows that link into the woodland network within the SSSI. These could be lost to development.
10.4 Will the development adversely impact the biodiversity network (e.g. Priority Biodiversity Links (PBLs), Priority Biodiversity Areas (PBAs), hedgerows and other corridors for species movement)?	--	As well as potential loss of hedgerow links, an area of the M27 PBL is present along the western side of the site and could be lost to development. The EBC ecological appraisal recommends that this corridor should remain connected for biodiversity.
10.5 Will the development adversely affect ancient woodland?	0	Development of the site will not adversely affect ancient woodland.
11. Enhance the Borough's multifunctional green infrastructure networks.		
11.1 Will the development affect TPO trees?	-?	Yes- TPO94-E covering 3 Oak, 9 Oak, 2 Oak, All tree species, 1 Ash, 1 Oak, 8 Oak.
11.2 Can the location be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	0	A footpath crosses the southern part of this site and another runs adjacent to the northwest boundary of the site.
11.3 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure? (same score as 7.1)	-?	Development of the site may result in the loss of Moorgreen Road / Kanes Hill Allotments.
12. Protect, enhance and manage the character and appearance of the landscape and townscape, maintaining and strengthening distinctiveness and its special qualities.		
12.1 Will development adversely affect the separation of neighbouring settlements?	--	The site was assessed as having very poor / poor potential for development in relation to avoiding

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
		settlement coalescence.
12.2 Will it protect the character of the countryside, coast, towns and/or villages, including views and settings?	-	The landscape within this site was assessed as having moderate sensitivity to development.
13. Protect and enhance and manage buildings, monuments, features, sites, places, areas and landscapes of archaeological, historical and cultural heritage importance.		
13.1 Will the development protect and enhance listed buildings and their settings, conservation areas, archaeological sites, historic landscapes and other sites of local importance for heritage?	0	Development of this site will not affect heritage assets.

Site 12: North of Barbe Bake Avenue

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
1. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified local needs, including affordability and special needs		
1.1 Will the development provide a significant contribution towards meeting identified affordable housing needs?	++	The site has the capacity to provide 98 dwellings.
1.2 Will it provide other elements of identified housing need e.g. housing for older persons, self-build, support housing?	?	Uncertainty is recorded against all residential site options as information on provision of other elements of housing need is not available on a consistent basis.
2. Safeguard and improve community health, safety and wellbeing		
2.1 Are community facilities (community hall or library) available locally?	+	The southern corner of the site is located within 400m of West End Library and West End Parish Centre.
2.2 Are health facilities available locally?	+	The site is within 401 to 800m of Townhill GP Surgery.
2.3 What effect would the development have on local provision of sports pitches and facilities?	0	Development of this site will not lead to loss of any existing sports pitches or facilities.
2.4 Is public open space available locally?	+	The site is located within 300m of public open space including Barnsland amenity space, Hatch Grange and Megan Green.
2.5 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network?	0	An existing footpath runs around the internal perimeter of the site and links with a footpath to the west of the site.
3. Develop a dynamic and diverse economy		
3.1(a) Is the location close to a major rail station?	--	The site is located further than 1400m from a major railway station.
3.1 (b) Is the location close to a minor rail station?	--	The site is located further than 1200m from a minor railway station.
3.1 (c) Is the location close to a frequent bus route?	--	The site is located further than 800m from a frequent bus route.
3.1 (d) Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route?	+	The southern and western parts of the site are located within 400m of the semi-frequent First 8 bus service.
3.1 (e) Is the location close to a major employment centre?	-	The site is located further than 1000m from a major employment centre.
3.2 Will the proposed development contribute towards meeting the need for new industrial, office or warehousing floorspace?	-	This site would be developed for residential use, therefore additional employment floorspace would not be provided.
3.3 Will the proposed development result in a net loss of existing employment land, or land which would be suitable for employment purposes?	0	The SLAA does not identify this site as being suitable for employment uses and development would not lead to loss of any existing employment land?
3.4 Will the proposed development increase the amount of commercial uses and other facilities in town, district or local centres?	0	The site is not located within a town, district or local centre.
4. Reduce road traffic and congestion through improved accessibility to services homes and jobs; reducing the need to travel by car/lorry and improving sustainable travel choice		
4.1 Is the location close to a major rail station? (same score as 3.1a)	--	The site is located further than 1400m from a major railway station.
4.2 Is the location close to a minor rail station?	--	The site is located further than 1200m from a minor

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
(same score as 3.1b)		railway station.
4.3 Is the location close to a frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1c)	--	The site is located further than 800m from a frequent bus route.
4.4 Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1d)	+	The southern and western parts of the site are located within 400m of the semi-frequent First 8 bus service.
4.5(a) Will residential development at the location be close to a major employment centre? (same score as 3.1e)	-	The site is located further than 1000m from a major employment centre.
4.5(b) Will employment development at the location be close to a major population centre?	0	Development would be residential only.
4.6 Are health facilities available locally? (same score as 2.2)	+	The site is within 401 to 800m of Townhill GP Surgery.
4.7 Are shopping and related services available locally?	+	The southern corner of the site is located within 201 to 400m of a local centre.
4.8 Is the location close to a Primary school?	0	The western edge of the site is located 601 to 800m from Townhill Junior School.
4.9 Is the location close to a Secondary school?	--	The site is located further than 2000m from a secondary school.
4.10 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	0	An existing footpath runs around the internal perimeter of the site and links with a footpath to the west of the site.
4.11 Are there Geographical barriers between the location and key facilities/ destinations?	0	The M27 motorway forms a geographical barrier between the site and one or two of the destinations above, including the secondary school.
5. Protect and conserve natural resources		
5.1 Will development avoid the sterilisation of mineral resources?	0	The site is not located in a Mineral Safeguarding Area or Mineral Consultation Area.
5.2 Will it result in the loss of higher grade agricultural land?	-	The site is located entirely in an area of medium quality agricultural land.
5.3 Will it use previously developed land?	-	This site consists of greenfield land.
5.4 Will it deliver or support allotments or community farms?	+?	There will be no loss of allotments or community farms. The location could be suitable for these but this is unknown.
6. Reduce air, soil, water, light and noise pollution		
6.1 Will the location be affected by significant noise generating uses or Air Quality Management Areas?	-?	The northern third of the site is located within 200m of the M27 and the western edge of the site is within 200m of the A27.
6.2 Will development increase pollution?	--?	Road Traffic noise impact from M27. Air quality impact from M27 significant.
7. Plan for the anticipated levels of climate change		
7.1 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure?	0	No loss of existing green infrastructure.
7.2 Is the location at risk from flooding, taking into account of the effects of climate change?	--?	A small area along the western edge of the site is subject to 'intermediate' surface water flood risk.
7.3 Will the development be at risk from coastal change? If so, can the Shoreline Management Plan Objectives be supported?	0	This site is not located near the coast.

SA objective/ criterion	Justification	
8. Minimise Eastleigh's contribution to climate change by reducing the borough's carbon footprint and minimising other greenhouse gas emissions.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
9. Reduce waste generation and disposal, encourage waste prevention and reuse and achieve the sustainable management of waste.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
10. Protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and geodiversity, improving its quality and range.		
10.1 Could development negatively impact or lead to loss of an internationally or nationally designated site (either alone or in combination)?	-	The lower Itchen is present along the eastern boundary and a waterway is also present along the western boundary. Both of these flow into the River Itchen SAC. There is potential for adverse in combination effects with other developments nearby. Potential mitigation in the form of a 20m buffer from the top of each bank and naturalised SuDS with three forms of filtration is recommended by the EBC ecological appraisal to preserve water quality.
10.2 Could development negatively impact or lead or loss of a locally designated biodiversity site (either alone or in combination)?	-	Dummers Copse and Hatch Grange Meadow SINCS are adjacent to the site boundaries and could be adversely affected by development alone or in combination through urban edge effects. The EBC ecological appraisal recommends 20m buffers to mitigate this effect.
10.3 Will the development adversely affect areas with other nature conservation value, as identified in Biodiversity Action Plans (BAPs)?	--	Mature woodland is located in the northern part of the site that could be lost to development. Otters are likely to be using the Lower Itchen.
10.4 Will the development adversely impact the biodiversity network (e.g. Priority Biodiversity Links (PBLs), Priority Biodiversity Areas (PBAs), hedgerows and other corridors for species movement)?	--	The M27 PBL is present in the north of the site and could be lost to development. This corridor should remain connected for biodiversity. The site also contains woodland and hedgerow habitat connected to the SINC.
10.5 Will the development adversely affect ancient woodland?	0	Development will not adversely affect ancient woodland.
11. Enhance the Borough's multifunctional green infrastructure networks.		
11.1 Will the development affect TPO trees?	-?	Yes - TPO 92-H covering all tree species, 3 oaks.
11.2 Can the location be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	0	An existing footpath runs around the internal perimeter of the site and links with a footpath to the west of the site.
11.3 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure? (same score as 7.1)	0	No loss of existing green infrastructure.
12. Protect, enhance and manage the character and appearance of the landscape and townscape, maintaining and strengthening distinctiveness and its special qualities.		
12.1 Will development adversely affect the separation of neighbouring settlements?	0	The site was assessed as having good / very good potential for development in relation to avoiding settlement coalescence.
12.2 Will it protect the character of the countryside, coast, towns and/or villages, including views and settings?	-	The landscape within this site was assessed as having moderate / low sensitivity to development.
13. Protect and enhance and manage buildings, monuments,		

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
features, sites, places, areas and landscapes of archaeological, historical and cultural heritage importance.		
13.1 Will the development protect and enhance listed buildings and their settings, conservation areas, archaeological sites, historic landscapes and other sites of local importance for heritage?	0	Development of this site will not affect heritage assets.

Site 13: West of Woodhouse Lane

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
1. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified local needs, including affordability and special needs		
1.1 Will the development provide a significant contribution towards meeting identified affordable housing needs?	++	The site has the capacity to provide 650 dwellings.
1.2 Will it provide other elements of identified housing need e.g. housing for older persons, self-build, support housing?	?	Uncertainty is recorded against all residential site options as information on provision of other elements of housing need is not available on a consistent basis.
2. Safeguard and improve community health, safety and wellbeing		
2.1 Are community facilities (community hall or library) available locally?	0	The western third of the site is located within 401 to 800m of Drummond Community Centre, additionally the southern corner of the site is located within 401 to 800m of the Botley Centre.
2.2 Are health facilities available locally?	+	The western edge of the site is located within 401 to 800m of St Luke's Surgery.
2.3 What effect would the development have on local provision of sports pitches and facilities?	0	Development of this site will not lead to the loss of existing sports pitches or facilities.
2.4 Is public open space available locally?	+	The site is located within 300m of public open space including Bottom Copse Locke Road amenity space and Watkin Road green route.
2.5 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network?	+	An existing footpath runs adjacent to the north western boundary of the site, existing cycle routes run adjacent to the southern, western and north western boundaries of the site.
3. Develop a dynamic and diverse economy		
3.1(a) Is the location close to a major rail station?	+	The northern edge of the site is located within 401 to 800m of Hedge End Railway Station.
3.1 (b) Is the location close to a minor rail station?	--	The site is located more than 1200m from a minor railway station.
3.1 (c) Is the location close to a frequent bus route?	--	The site is located more than 800m from a frequent bus route.
3.1 (d) Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route?	+	The western quarter of the site is located within 400m of the semi-frequent First 8 bus route.
3.1 (e) Is the location close to a major employment centre?	+	The western third of the site is located within 401 to 1000m of Hedge End Industrial Area.
3.2 Will the proposed development contribute towards meeting the need for new industrial, office or warehousing floorspace?	-	This site would be developed for residential use, therefore additional employment floorspace would not be provided.
3.3 Will the proposed development result in a net loss of existing employment land, or land which would be suitable for employment purposes?	0	The SLAA does not identify this site as being suitable for employment uses and development would not lead to loss of any existing employment land.
3.4 Will the proposed development increase the amount of commercial uses and other facilities in town, district or local centres?	0	The site is not located within a town, district or local centre.
4. Reduce road traffic and congestion through improved accessibility to services homes and jobs; reducing the need to travel by car/lorry and improving sustainable travel choice		
4.1 Is the location close to a major rail station? (same score as 3.1a)	+	The northern edge of the site is located within 401 to 800m of Hedge End Railway Station.

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
4.2 Is the location close to a minor rail station? (same score as 3.1b)	--	The site is located more than 1200m from a minor railway station.
4.3 Is the location close to a frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1c)	--	The site is located more than 800m from a frequent bus route.
4.4 Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1d)	+	The western quarter of the site is located within 400m of the semi-frequent First 8 bus route.
4.5(a) Will residential development at the location be close to a major employment centre? (same score as 3.1e)	+	The western third of the site is located within 401 to 1000m of Hedge End Industrial Area.
4.5(b) Will employment development at the location be close to a major population centre?	0	Development would be residential only.
4.6 Are health facilities available locally? (same score as 2.2)	+	The western edge of the site is located within 401 to 800m of St Luke's Surgery.
4.7 Are shopping and related services available locally?	-	The western third of the site is located 601 to 800m from a district or local centre.
4.8 Is the location close to a Primary school?	++	The western half of the site is located within 400m of Berrywood Primary School.
4.9 Is the location close to a Secondary school?	++	The south western half of the site is located within 800m of Wildern School.
4.10 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	+	An existing footpath runs adjacent to the north western boundary of the site; existing cycle routes run adjacent to the southern, western and north western boundaries of the site.
4.11 Are there Geographical barriers between the location and key facilities/ destinations?	+	No geographical barriers exist on the most direct walking routes to the destinations above.
5. Protect and conserve natural resources		
5.1 Will development avoid the sterilisation of mineral resources?	-?	The majority of the site is located in a Mineral Consultation Area. A section of the southern part of the site is located in a mineral Safeguarding Area.
5.2 Will it result in the loss of higher grade agricultural land?	--	The southern corner of the site is located in an area of high quality agricultural land; the remainder of the site is in an area of medium quality agricultural land.
5.3 Will it use previously developed land?	-	This site consists of greenfield land.
5.4 Will it deliver or support allotments or community farms?	+?	There will be no loss of allotments or community farms. The location could be suitable for these but this is unknown.
6. Reduce air, soil, water, light and noise pollution		
6.1 Will the location be affected by significant noise generating uses or Air Quality Management Areas?	-?	The north western third of the site is located within 200m of a railway line.
6.2 Will development increase pollution?	--?	Road Traffic noise impact from Woodhouse Lane and Winchester Road/Street. Noise impact from train noise arising from the railway. Traffic generated by this development on may impact on existing AQMA in Botley High Street, and on Botley Road though Horton Heath and Fair Oak. Levels are close to annual target level .
7. Plan for the anticipated levels of climate change		
7.1 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure?	0	No loss of existing green infrastructure.
7.2 Is the location at risk from flooding, taking into account of the effects of climate change?	--?	An area of flood zone 3 runs through the centre of the site, following Bushy Copse. This area is also

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
		subject to 'intermediate' surface water flood risk.
7.3 Will the development be at risk from coastal change? If so, can the Shoreline Management Plan Objectives be supported?	0	This site is not located near the coast.
8. Minimise Eastleigh's contribution to climate change by reducing the borough's carbon footprint and minimising other greenhouse gas emissions.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
9. Reduce waste generation and disposal, encourage waste prevention and reuse and achieve the sustainable management of waste.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
10. Protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and geodiversity, improving its quality and range.		
10.1 Could development negatively impact or lead to loss of an internationally or nationally designated site (either alone or in combination)?	-	Shamblehurst Stream runs through the centre of the site and Bushey Copse SINC before draining into Pudbrook Lake and the Hamble at the Solent and Southampton Water SPA, SAC and Ramsar sites. There is potential for in combination effects with other sites that also drain into this stream. Potential mitigation has been identified by the EBC ecological appraisal, in the form of 20m buffers and naturalised SuDS with three forms of filtration to preserve water quality.
10.2 Could development negatively impact or lead to loss of a locally designated biodiversity site (either alone or in combination)?	--	Bushy Copse SINC runs through the centre of the site. This is designated for its wet ancient woodland. Development has the potential to significantly affect the SINC through loss, increases in recreational pressure and pollution. The EBC ecological appraisal advises that 20m buffers should be provided and harmful activities moved away from the site.
10.3 Will the development adversely affect areas with other nature conservation value, as identified in Biodiversity Action Plans (BAPs)?	--	There is an incomplete hedgerow network throughout the site linking into the SINC which could be lost to development. Potential adverse effects from lighting on bats in Bushy Copse, which runs through the centre of the site, is likely.
10.4 Will the development adversely impact the biodiversity network (e.g. Priority Biodiversity Links (PBLs), Priority Biodiversity Areas (PBAs), hedgerows and other corridors for species movement)?	--	The Railway and Wildern PBLs interlace the site and could be lost to development. The EBC ecological appraisal recommends that these corridors should remain connected for biodiversity.
10.5 Will the development adversely affect ancient woodland?	-	Bushy Copse runs through the centre of the site however, this may be protected and buffered through developmental design.
11. Enhance the Borough's multifunctional green infrastructure networks.		
11.1 Will the development affect TPO trees?	-?	Yes- TPO114-E covering all tree species.
11.2 Can the location be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	+	An existing footpath runs adjacent to the north western boundary of the site, existing cycle routes run adjacent to the southern, western and north western boundaries of the site.
11.3 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure? (same score as 7.1)	0	No loss of existing green infrastructure.
12. Protect, enhance and manage the character and appearance of the landscape and townscape, maintaining and strengthening distinctiveness and its special qualities.		

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
12.1 Will development adversely affect the separation of neighbouring settlements?	--	The site was assessed as having very poor / poor / average potential for development in relation to avoiding settlement coalescence.
12.2 Will it protect the character of the countryside, coast, towns and/or villages, including views and settings?	0	The landscape within this site was assessed as having low sensitivity to development.
13. Protect and enhance and manage buildings, monuments, features, sites, places, areas and landscapes of archaeological, historical and cultural heritage importance.		
13.1 Will the development protect and enhance listed buildings and their settings, conservation areas, archaeological sites, historic landscapes and other sites of local importance for heritage?	0	Development of this site will not affect heritage assets.

Site 14: Rickwood Farm, Upper Northam Road

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
1. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified local needs, including affordability and special needs		
1.1 Will the development provide a significant contribution towards meeting identified affordable housing needs?	++	The site has the capacity to provide 54 dwellings.
1.2 Will it provide other elements of identified housing need e.g. housing for older persons, self-build, support housing?	?	Uncertainty is recorded against all residential site options as information on provision of other elements of housing need is not available on a consistent basis.
2. Safeguard and improve community health, safety and wellbeing		
2.1 Are community facilities (community hall or library) available locally?	-	The site is not located within 800m of community facilities.
2.2 Are health facilities available locally?	-	The site is located 1201 to 1600m from Hedge End Medical Centre.
2.3 What effect would the development have on local provision of sports pitches and facilities?	0	The site will not result in the loss of any existing sports pitches or facilities.
2.4 Is public open space available locally?	+	The site is located within 300m of public open space, including Kanes Hill Allotments.
2.5 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network?	0	An existing cycle path only runs adjacent to the sites south western boundary.
3. Develop a dynamic and diverse economy		
3.1(a) Is the location close to a major rail station?	--	The site is located further than 1400m from a major railway station.
3.1 (b) Is the location close to a minor rail station?	--	The site is located more than 1200m from a minor railway station.
3.1 (c) Is the location close to a frequent bus route?	--	The site is located more than 800m from a frequent bus route.
3.1 (d) Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route?	--	The site is located more than 800m from a semi-frequent bus route.
3.1 (e) Is the location close to a major employment centre?	-	The site is located just further than 1000m from a major employment centre.
3.2 Will the proposed development contribute towards meeting the need for new industrial, office or warehousing floorspace?	-	This site would be developed for residential use, therefore additional employment floorspace would not be provided.
3.3 Will the proposed development result in a net loss of existing employment land, or land which would be suitable for employment purposes?	0	The SLAA does not identify this site as being suitable for employment uses and development would not lead to loss of any existing employment land.
3.4 Will the proposed development increase the amount of commercial uses and other facilities in town, district or local centres?	0	This site is not located within a town, district or local centre.
4. Reduce road traffic and congestion through improved accessibility to services homes and jobs; reducing the need to travel by car/lorry and improving sustainable travel choice		
4.1 Is the location close to a major rail station? (same score as 3.1a)	--	The site is located further than 1400m from a major railway station.
4.2 Is the location close to a minor rail station? (same score as 3.1b)	--	The site is located more than 1200m from a minor railway station.
4.3 Is the location close to a frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1c)	--	The site is located more than 800m from a frequent bus route.

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
4.4 Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1d)	--	The site is located more than 800m from a semi-frequent bus route.
4.5(a) Will residential development at the location be close to a major employment centre? (same score as 3.1e)	-	The site is located just further than 1000m from a major employment centre.
4.5(b) Will employment development at the location be close to a major population centre?	0	Development would be residential only.
4.6 Are health facilities available locally? (same score as 2.2)	-	The site is located 1201 to 1600m from Hedge End Medical Centre.
4.7 Are shopping and related services available locally?	--	The site is not located within 800m of a town, district or local centre.
4.8 Is the location close to a Primary school?	++	The site is located within 400m of Kanes Hill Primary School.
4.9 Is the location close to a Secondary school?	0	The site is located 1201 to 1600m from Wildern School.
4.10 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	0	An existing cycle path only runs adjacent to the sites south western boundary.
4.11 Are there Geographical barriers between the location and key facilities/ destinations?	-	The M27 motorway forms a geographical barrier between the site and three or more of the destinations above including; the secondary school, a doctor's surgery and a local centre.
5. Protect and conserve natural resources		
5.1 Will development avoid the sterilisation of mineral resources?	-?	The northern corner of the site is located in a Mineral Consultation Area.
5.2 Will it result in the loss of higher grade agricultural land?	-	The site is located entirely in an area of medium quality agricultural land.
5.3 Will it use previously developed land?	-	This site consists of greenfield land.
5.4 Will it deliver or support allotments or community farms?	++	There will be no loss of allotments or community farms. The location could be suitable for these but this is unknown.
6. Reduce air, soil, water, light and noise pollution		
6.1 Will the location be affected by significant noise generating uses or Air Quality Management Areas?	-?	The eastern edge of the site is located within 200m of the M27 motorway. The western most corner of the site is also within 200m of the A27.
6.2 Will development increase pollution?	--?	Road Traffic noise impact from M27 is significant, also noise impacts from adjacent commercial land uses.
7. Plan for the anticipated levels of climate change		
7.1 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure?	0	No loss of existing green infrastructure.
7.2 Is the location at risk from flooding, taking into account of the effects of climate change?	-?	A very small area of the site in the western corner is subject to 'less' surface water flood risk. However, it should be noted that this is a very small area, approximately 1% of the site.
7.3 Will the development be at risk from coastal change? If so, can the Shoreline Management Plan Objectives be supported?	0	This site is not located near the coast.
8. Minimise Eastleigh's contribution to climate change by reducing the borough's carbon footprint and minimising other greenhouse gas emissions.		

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
9. Reduce waste generation and disposal, encourage waste prevention and reuse and achieve the sustainable management of waste.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
10. Protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and geodiversity, improving its quality and range.		
10.1 Could development negatively impact or lead to loss of an internationally or nationally designated site (either alone or in combination)?	0	Development will not negatively impact or lead to loss if an internationally or nationally designated site.
10.2 Could development negatively impact or lead or loss of a locally designated biodiversity site (either alone or in combination)?	0	Development will not negatively impact or lead to loss of a locally designated biodiversity site.
10.3 Will the development adversely affect areas with other nature conservation value, as identified in Biodiversity Action Plans (BAPs)?	0	Development will not adversely affect areas with other nature conservation value.
10.4 Will the development adversely impact the biodiversity network (e.g. Priority Biodiversity Links (PBLs), Priority Biodiversity Areas (PBAs), hedgerows and other corridors for species movement)?	0	Development will not adversely impact the biodiversity network.
10.5 Will the development adversely affect ancient woodland?	0	Development will not adversely affect ancient woodland.
11. Enhance the Borough's multifunctional green infrastructure networks.		
11.1 Will the development affect TPO trees?	0	Development of the site will not affect TPO trees.
11.2 Can the location be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	0	An existing cycle path only runs adjacent to the sites south western boundary.
11.3 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure? (same score as 7.1)	0	No loss of existing green infrastructure.
12. Protect, enhance and manage the character and appearance of the landscape and townscape, maintaining and strengthening distinctiveness and its special qualities.		
12.1 Will development adversely affect the separation of neighbouring settlements?	--	The site was assessed as having very poor / poor potential for development in relation to avoiding settlement coalescence.
12.2 Will it protect the character of the countryside, coast, towns and/or villages, including views and settings?	0	The landscape within this site was assessed as having low sensitivity to development.
13. Protect and enhance and manage buildings, monuments, features, sites, places, areas and landscapes of archaeological, historical and cultural heritage importance.		
13.1 Will the development protect and enhance listed buildings and their settings, conservation areas, archaeological sites, historic landscapes and other sites of local importance for heritage?	0	Development of this site will not affect heritage assets.

Site 15: Land at Sundays Hill and Land North of Pewitt Hill Close

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
1. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified local needs, including affordability and special needs		
1.1 Will the development provide a significant contribution towards meeting identified affordable housing needs?	++	The site has the capacity to provide 106 dwellings.
1.2 Will it provide other elements of identified housing need e.g. housing for older persons, self-build, support housing?	?	Uncertainty is recorded against all residential site options as information on provision of other elements of housing need is not available on a consistent basis.
2. Safeguard and improve community health, safety and wellbeing		
2.1 Are community facilities (community hall or library) available locally?	-	The site is further than 800m from a community hall or library.
2.2 Are health facilities available locally?	-	The northern half of the site is located within 1201 to 1600m of Bursledon GP Practice.
2.3 What effect would the development have on local provision of sports pitches and facilities?	0	The site will not result in the loss of existing sports pitches or facilities.
2.4 Is public open space available locally?	0	The site is located within 800m of public open space including Netley Common.
2.5 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network?	-	No footpath or cycle path crosses the site or is adjacent to its boundary.
3. Develop a dynamic and diverse economy		
3.1(a) Is the location close to a major rail station?	--	The site is further than 1400m from a major railway station.
3.1 (b) Is the location close to a minor rail station?	--	The site is further than 1200m from a minor railway station.
3.1 (c) Is the location close to a frequent bus route?	--	The site is located more than 800m from a frequent bus route.
3.1 (d) Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route?	--	The site is located more than 800m from a semi-frequent bus route.
3.1 (e) Is the location close to a major employment centre?	-	The site is located more than 1000m from a major employment centre.
3.2 Will the proposed development contribute towards meeting the need for new industrial, office or warehousing floorspace?	-	This site would be developed for residential use, therefore additional employment floorspace would not be provided.
3.3 Will the proposed development result in a net loss of existing employment land, or land which would be suitable for employment purposes?	0	EBC have confirmed that this site is not suitable for employment use and will not result in the loss of employment land.
3.4 Will the proposed development increase the amount of commercial uses and other facilities in town, district or local centres?	0	The site is not located within a town, district or local centre.
4. Reduce road traffic and congestion through improved accessibility to services homes and jobs; reducing the need to travel by car/lorry and improving sustainable travel choice		
4.1 Is the location close to a major rail station? (same score as 3.1a)	--	The site is further than 1400m from a major railway station.
4.2 Is the location close to a minor rail station? (same score as 3.1b)	--	The site is further than 1200m from a minor railway station.
4.3 Is the location close to a frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1c)	--	The site is located more than 800m from a frequent bus route.

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
4.4 Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1d)	--	The site is located more than 800m from a semi-frequent bus route.
4.5(a) Will residential development at the location be close to a major employment centre? (same score as 3.1e)	-	The site is located more than 1000m from a major employment centre.
4.5(b) Will employment development at the location be close to a major population centre?	0	Development would be residential only.
4.6 Are health facilities available locally? (same score as 2.2)	-	The site is located 1201 to 1600 of Bursledon GP Practice.
4.7 Are shopping and related services available locally?	--	The site is located more than 800m from a town, district or local centre.
4.8 Is the location close to a Primary school?	-	The north eastern part of the site is located within 801 to 1000m of Kings Copse Primary School.
4.9 Is the location close to a Secondary school?	-	The site is located 1601 to 2000m from Wildern School.
4.10 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	-	No footpath or cycle path crosses the site or is adjacent to its boundary.
4.11 Are there Geographical barriers between the location and key facilities/ destinations?	+	No geographical barriers exist on the most direct walking routes to the destinations above.
5. Protect and conserve natural resources		
5.1 Will development avoid the sterilisation of mineral resources?	-?	A small area in the north west corner of the site is located in a Mineral Consultation Area.
5.2 Will it result in the loss of higher grade agricultural land?	-	The north east corner of the site is located in an area of medium quality agricultural land. The remainder of the site is in an area of low quality agricultural land.
5.3 Will it use previously developed land?	-	This site consists of greenfield land.
5.4 Will it deliver or support allotments or community farms?	+	There will be no loss of allotments or community farms. The location could be suitable for these but this is unknown.
6. Reduce air, soil, water, light and noise pollution		
6.1 Will the location be affected by significant noise generating uses or Air Quality Management Areas?	-?	The majority of the site is located within 200m of the M27.
6.2 Will development increase pollution?	--?	Air quality impact from M27 is significant. Separation between sensitive development and roads will be necessary. Road Traffic noise impact from M27 is significant. Separation between noise sensitive development and roads will be necessary.
7. Plan for the anticipated levels of climate change		
7.1 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure?	0	No loss of existing green infrastructure.
7.2 Is the location at risk from flooding, taking into account of the effects of climate change?	-?	The site includes an area in the centre subject to 'less' surface water flood risk.
7.3 Will the development be at risk from coastal change? If so, can the Shoreline Management Plan Objectives be supported?	0	This site is not located near the coast.
8. Minimise Eastleigh's contribution to climate change by reducing the borough's carbon footprint and minimising other greenhouse gas emissions.		

SA objective/ criterion	Justification	
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
9. Reduce waste generation and disposal, encourage waste prevention and reuse and achieve the sustainable management of waste.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
10. Protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and geodiversity, improving its quality and range.		
10.1 Could development negatively impact or lead to loss of an internationally or nationally designated site (either alone or in combination)?	-	Badnum Creek which runs through the centre of the site flows into the Solent at the Solent and Southampton Water SPA, SAC and Ramsar sites. There is potential for in combination effects with other sites and a number of developments that already run into the creek. Potential mitigation has been suggested by the EBC ecological appraisal in the form of 20m buffers along the banks and naturalised SuDS with three forms of filtration to preserve water quality.
10.2 Could development negatively impact or lead or loss of a locally designated biodiversity site (either alone or in combination)?	-	The EBC ecological appraisal identifies that The headwaters of Badnum Creek that feed a number of SINC's have been severely compromised within Phase 1 of this development. The EBC ecological appraisal recommends that development of the remaining land parcels should conserve and buffer the headwaters that remain and the creek itself.
10.3 Will the development adversely affect areas with other nature conservation value, as identified in Biodiversity Action Plans (BAPs)?	--	There are headwaters, stream and woodland habitat and veteran trees within the site that could be adversely affected by development. Adders are known to use the site.
10.4 Will the development adversely impact the biodiversity network (e.g. Priority Biodiversity Links (PBLs), Priority Biodiversity Areas (PBAs), hedgerows and other corridors for species movement)?	--	The M27 PBL is present within the western part of the site and could be lost through development of the site. The EBC ecological appraisal recommends that this corridor should remain connected for biodiversity.
10.5 Will the development adversely affect ancient woodland?	0	Development will not adversely affect ancient woodland.
11. Enhance the Borough's multifunctional green infrastructure networks.		
11.1 Will the development affect TPO trees?	-?	Yes - TPO 741-E covering all tree species.
11.2 Can the location be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	-	No footpath or cycle path crosses the site or is adjacent to its boundary.
11.3 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure? (same score as 7.1)	0	No loss of existing green infrastructure.
12. Protect, enhance and manage the character and appearance of the landscape and townscape, maintaining and strengthening distinctiveness and its special qualities.		
12.1 Will development adversely affect the separation of neighbouring settlements?	?	Currently uncertain. Awaiting updated Gap Appraisal.
12.2 Will it protect the character of the countryside, coast, towns and/or villages, including views and settings?	?	Currently uncertain. Awaiting updated Landscape Appraisal.
13. Protect and enhance and manage buildings, monuments, features, sites, places, areas and landscapes of archaeological, historical and cultural heritage importance.		

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
13.1 Will the development protect and enhance listed buildings and their settings, conservation areas, archaeological sites, historic landscapes and other sites of local importance for heritage?	0	Development of this site will not affect heritage assets.

Site 16: Land between Woodhouse Lane and Grange Road and land at Grange Road

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
1. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified local needs, including affordability and special needs		
1.1 Will the development provide a significant contribution towards meeting identified affordable housing needs?	++	The site has the capacity to provide 137 dwellings.
1.2 Will it provide other elements of identified housing need e.g. housing for older persons, self-build, support housing?	?	Uncertainty is recorded against all residential site options as information on provision of other elements of housing need is not available on a consistent basis.
2. Safeguard and improve community health, safety and wellbeing		
2.1 Are community facilities (community hall or library) available locally?	0	The site is located within 401 to 800m of the Botley Centre.
2.2 Are health facilities available locally?	+	The western corner of the site is located within 401 to 800m of Hedge End Medical Centre.
2.3 What effect would the development have on local provision of sports pitches and facilities?	0	Development of this site would not lead to the loss of any existing sports pitches or facilities.
2.4 Is public open space available locally?	+	The site is located within 300m of public open space, including Woodhouse Lane Recreation Ground.
2.5 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network?	-	No footpath or cycle path crosses the site or is adjacent to its boundary.
3. Develop a dynamic and diverse economy		
3.1(a) Is the location close to a major rail station?	--	The site is located further than 1400m from a major railway station.
3.1 (b) Is the location close to a minor rail station?	--	The site is located more than 1200m from a minor railway station
3.1 (c) Is the location close to a frequent bus route?	--	The site is located more than 800m from a frequent bus route.
3.1 (d) Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route?	-	The north western edge of the site is located within 800m of the semi- frequent First 8 bus route.
3.1 (e) Is the location close to a major employment centre?	-	The site is located more than 1000m from a major employment centre.
3.2 Will the proposed development contribute towards meeting the need for new industrial, office or warehousing floorspace?	-	This site would be developed for residential use, therefore additional employment floorspace would not be provided.
3.3 Will the proposed development result in a net loss of existing employment land, or land which would be suitable for employment purposes?	-	EBC have confirmed that there will be no loss of existing employment land. Existing planning permission for employment use therefore there would be loss of land suitable for employment purposes.
3.4 Will the proposed development increase the amount of commercial uses and other facilities in town, district or local centres?	0	This site is not located within a town, district or local centre.
4. Reduce road traffic and congestion through improved accessibility to services homes and jobs; reducing the need to travel by car/lorry and improving sustainable travel choice		
4.1 Is the location close to a major rail station? (same score as 3.1a)	--	The site is located further than 1400m from a major railway station.
4.2 Is the location close to a minor rail station? (same score as 3.1b)	--	The site is located more than 1200m from a minor railway station.
4.3 Is the location close to a frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1c)	--	The site is located more than 800m from a frequent bus route.

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
4.4 Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1d)	-	The north western edge of the site is located with 800m of the semi- frequent First 8 bus route.
4.5(a) Will residential development at the location be close to a major employment centre? (same score as 3.1e)	-	The site is located more than 1000m from a major employment centre.
4.5(b) Will employment development at the location be close to a major population centre?	0	Development would be residential only.
4.6 Are health facilities available locally? (same score as 2.2)	+	The western corner of the site is located within 401 to 800m of Hedge End Medical Centre.
4.7 Are shopping and related services available locally?	--	The site is located further than 800m from a town, district or local centre.
4.8 Is the location close to a Primary school?	+	The site is located within 401 to 600m from Freergrounds Junior School.
4.9 Is the location close to a Secondary school?	++	The site is located within 800m of Wildern Secondary School.
4.10 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	-	No footpath or cycle path crosses the site or is adjacent to its boundary.
4.11 Are there Geographical barriers between the location and key facilities/ destinations?	+	No geographical barriers exist on the most direct walking routes to the destinations above.
5. Protect and conserve natural resources		
5.1 Will development avoid the sterilisation of mineral resources?	0	The site is not located in a Mineral Safeguarding Area or a Mineral Consultation Area.
5.2 Will it result in the loss of higher grade agricultural land?	--	The majority of the site is located in an area of high quality agricultural land.
5.3 Will it use previously developed land?	-	This site consists of greenfield land.
5.4 Will it deliver or support allotments or community farms?	+?	There will be no loss of allotments or community farms. The location could be suitable for these but this is unknown.
6. Reduce air, soil, water, light and noise pollution		
6.1 Will the location be affected by significant noise generating uses or Air Quality Management Areas?	--?	The site is located within 200m of the A334 and the southern edge of the site borders the High Street Botley AQMA.
6.2 Will development increase pollution?	--?	Noise impacts form Woodhouse Lane (Botley By Pass), and Botley Road. Air quality impacts from road traffic. Impacts of noise and odour from existing commercial uses if not redeveloped as part of this proposal.
7. Plan for the anticipated levels of climate change		
7.1 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure?	0	No loss of existing green infrastructure.
7.2 Is the location at risk from flooding, taking into account of the effects of climate change?	0	The site is not in an area of surface water flood risk and is not located in Flood Zones 2 or 3.
7.3 Will the development be at risk from coastal change? If so, can the Shoreline Management Plan Objectives be supported?	0	This site is not located near the coast.
8. Minimise Eastleigh's contribution to climate change by reducing the borough's carbon footprint and minimising other greenhouse gas emissions.		

SA objective/ criterion	Justification	
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
9. Reduce waste generation and disposal, encourage waste prevention and reuse and achieve the sustainable management of waste.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
10. Protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and geodiversity, improving its quality and range.		
10.1 Could development negatively impact or lead to loss of an internationally or nationally designated site (either alone or in combination)?	-	The site is 180m from Woodhouse Gully to the north and 170m from Marls Road Tributary to the south. Both streams run into the Solent and Southampton Water SPA, SAC and Ramsar sites. There is potential for in combination effects with other nearby development. The EBC ecological appraisal recommends that naturalised SuDS with three forms of filtration are required to preserve water quality.
10.2 Could development negatively impact or lead or loss of a locally designated biodiversity site (either alone or in combination)?	0	Development will not negatively impact or lead to loss of a locally designated biodiversity site.
10.3 Will the development adversely affect areas with other nature conservation value, as identified in Biodiversity Action Plans (BAPs)?	0	Development will not adversely affect areas with other nature conservation value.
10.4 Will the development adversely impact the biodiversity network (e.g. Priority Biodiversity Links (PBLs), Priority Biodiversity Areas (PBAs), hedgerows and other corridors for species movement)?	0	Development will not adversely impact the biodiversity network.
10.5 Will the development adversely affect ancient woodland?	0	Development will not adversely affect ancient woodland.
11. Enhance the Borough's multifunctional green infrastructure networks.		
11.1 Will the development affect TPO trees?	-?	Yes- TPO658-E covering Oak.
11.2 Can the location be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	-	No footpath or cycle path crosses the site or is adjacent to its boundary.
11.3 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure? (same score as 7.1)	0	No loss of existing green infrastructure.
12. Protect, enhance and manage the character and appearance of the landscape and townscape, maintaining and strengthening distinctiveness and its special qualities.		
12.1 Will development adversely affect the separation of neighbouring settlements?	--	The site was assessed as having very poor / poor potential for development in relation to avoiding settlement coalescence.
12.2 Will it protect the character of the countryside, coast, towns and/or villages, including views and settings?	-	The landscape within the site was assessed as having moderate / low sensitivity to development.
13. Protect and enhance and manage buildings, monuments, features, sites, places, areas and landscapes of archaeological, historical and cultural heritage importance.		
13.1 Will the development protect and enhance listed buildings and their settings, conservation areas, archaeological sites, historic landscapes and other sites of local importance for heritage?	0	Development of this site will not affect heritage assets.

Site 17: Land north of Bubb Lane and land north of Hedge End (part)

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
1. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified local needs, including affordability and special needs		
1.1 Will the development provide a significant contribution towards meeting identified affordable housing needs?	++	The site has the capacity to provide 69 dwellings.
1.2 Will it provide other elements of identified housing need e.g. housing for older persons, self-build, support housing?	?	Uncertainty is recorded against all residential site options as information on provision of other elements of housing need is not available on a consistent basis.
2. Safeguard and improve community health, safety and wellbeing		
2.1 Are community facilities (community hall or library) available locally?	0	The site is located 401 to 800m from Horton Heath Community Centre.
2.2 Are health facilities available locally?	--	The site is located further than 1600m from a medical centre.
2.3 What effect would the development have on local provision of sports pitches and facilities?	0	Development of the site would not result in the loss of existing sports pitches or facilities.
2.4 Is public open space available locally?	0	The site is located within 301 to 800m of public open space including Valerian Close / Burnetts Lane green route.
2.5 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network?	0	An existing footpath runs through the centre of the site.
3. Develop a dynamic and diverse economy		
3.1(a) Is the location close to a major rail station?	0	The southern half of the site is located 801 to 1200m from Hedge End Railway Station.
3.1 (b) Is the location close to a minor rail station?	--	The site is located further than 1200m from a minor railway station.
3.1 (c) Is the location close to a frequent bus route?	--	The site is located further than 800m from a frequent bus route.
3.1 (d) Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route?	--	The site is located further than 800m from a semi-frequent bus route.
3.1 (e) Is the location close to a major employment centre?	+	The site is located within 401 to 1000m of Chalcraft Business Park.
3.2 Will the proposed development contribute towards meeting the need for new industrial, office or warehousing floorspace?	-	This site would be developed for residential use, therefore additional employment floorspace would not be provided.
3.3 Will the proposed development result in a net loss of existing employment land, or land which would be suitable for employment purposes?	0	The SLAA does not identify this site as being suitable for employment uses and development would not lead to loss of any existing employment land.
3.4 Will the proposed development increase the amount of commercial uses and other facilities in town, district or local centres?	0	This site is not located within a town, district or local centre.
4. Reduce road traffic and congestion through improved accessibility to services homes and jobs; reducing the need to travel by car/lorry and improving sustainable travel choice		
4.1 Is the location close to a major rail station? (same score as 3.1a)	0	The southern half of the site is located 801 to 1200m from Hedge End Railway Station.
4.2 Is the location close to a minor rail station? (same score as 3.1b)	--	The site is located further than 1200m from a minor railway station.
4.3 Is the location close to a frequent bus route?	--	The site is located further than 800m from a frequent

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
(same score as 3.1c)		bus route.
4.4 Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1d)	--	The site is located further than 800m from a semi-frequent bus route.
4.5(a) Will residential development at the location be close to a major employment centre? (same score as 3.1e)	+	The site is located within 401 to 1000m of Chalcroft Business Park.
4.5(b) Will employment development at the location be close to a major population centre?	0	Development would be residential only.
4.6 Are health facilities available locally? (same score as 2.2)	--	The site is located further than 1600m from a medical centre.
4.7 Are shopping and related services available locally?	--	The site is located further than 800m from a town, district or local centre.
4.8 Is the location close to a Primary school?	--	The site is located further than 1000m from a primary school.
4.9 Is the location close to a Secondary school?	-	The site is located 1600 to 2000m from Wyvern College.
4.10 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	0	An existing footpath runs through the centre of the site.
4.11 Are there Geographical barriers between the location and key facilities/ destinations?	0	The railway track to the south of the site forms a geographical barrier to one or two of the destinations above including a secondary school.
5. Protect and conserve natural resources		
5.1 Will development avoid the sterilisation of mineral resources?	0	The site is not located in a Mineral Safeguarding Area or a Mineral Consultation Area.
5.2 Will it result in the loss of higher grade agricultural land?	--	The southern half of the site is located in an area of high quality agricultural land, the remainder of the site is located in an area of medium quality agricultural land.
5.3 Will it use previously developed land?	-	This site consists of greenfield land.
5.4 Will it deliver or support allotments or community farms?	+?	There will be no loss of allotments or community farms. The location could be suitable for these but this is unknown.
6. Reduce air, soil, water, light and noise pollution		
6.1 Will the location be affected by significant noise generating uses or Air Quality Management Areas?	0	The site is not located within 200m of a railway, A-road or motorway or an AQMA.
6.2 Will development increase pollution?	--?	Noise and air quality impacts from Botley road, noise for Bubb Lane will constrain site. Adjacent commercial uses generate noise.
7. Plan for the anticipated levels of climate change		
7.1 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure?	0	No loss of existing green infrastructure.
7.2 Is the location at risk from flooding, taking into account of the effects of climate change?	-?	An area in the centre of the site is subject to 'less' surface water flood risk.
7.3 Will the development be at risk from coastal change? If so, can the Shoreline Management Plan Objectives be supported?	0	This site is not located near the coast.
8. Minimise Eastleigh's contribution to climate change by reducing the borough's carbon footprint and minimising other greenhouse gas emissions.		

SA objective/ criterion	Justification	
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
9. Reduce waste generation and disposal, encourage waste prevention and reuse and achieve the sustainable management of waste.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
10. Protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and geodiversity, improving its quality and range.		
10.1 Could development negatively impact or lead to loss of an internationally or nationally designated site (either alone or in combination)?	-	A drain is present to the south of the site which flows into Ford Lake which then joins the Hamble which flows through the Solent and Southampton SPA, SAC and Ramsar sites. There is potential for in combination effects if other nearby sites are developed. The EBC ecological appraisal identifies potential mitigation in the form of a buffer and naturalised SuDS with three forms of filtration to preserve water quality.
10.2 Could development negatively impact or lead or loss of a locally designated biodiversity site (either alone or in combination)?	0?	Development will not negatively impact or lead to loss of a locally designated biodiversity site. Scorey's Copse SINC is located just to east of the site, potential for increased recreational pressure. The sites are however, split by the B3354 and this issue was not raised in the EBC ecological appraisal.
10.3 Will the development adversely affect areas with other nature conservation value, as identified in Biodiversity Action Plans (BAPs)?	--	The site has a mature tree belt running though the centre which would be lost to development.
10.4 Will the development adversely impact the biodiversity network (e.g. Priority Biodiversity Links (PBLs), Priority Biodiversity Areas (PBAs), hedgerows and other corridors for species movement)?	--	The Chalcroft PBL covers the northern half of the site and would be lost through development. The EBC ecological appraisal recommends that this corridor should remain connected for biodiversity.
10.5 Will the development adversely affect ancient woodland?	0	Development will not adversely affect ancient woodland.
11. Enhance the Borough's multifunctional green infrastructure networks.		
11.1 Will the development affect TPO trees?	0	Development of the site will not affect TPO trees.
11.2 Can the location be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	0	An existing footpath runs through the centre of the site.
11.3 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure? (same score as 7.1)	0	No loss of existing green infrastructure.
12. Protect, enhance and manage the character and appearance of the landscape and townscape, maintaining and strengthening distinctiveness and its special qualities.		
12.1 Will development adversely affect the separation of neighbouring settlements?	--	The site was assessed as having very poor / poor potential for development in relation to avoiding settlement coalescence.
12.2 Will it protect the character of the countryside, coast, towns and/or villages, including views and settings?	-	The landscape within this site was assessed as having moderate / low sensitivity to development.
13. Protect and enhance and manage buildings, monuments, features, sites, places, areas and landscapes of archaeological, historical and cultural heritage importance.		
13.1 Will the development protect and enhance listed buildings and their settings, conservation areas, archaeological sites, historic landscapes and other	0	Development of this site will not affect heritage assets.

SA objective/ criterion	Justification
sites of local importance for heritage?	

Site 18: Land north of Hedge End (part) and land north of Hedge End Railway Station

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
1. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified local needs, including affordability and special needs		
1.1 Will the development provide a significant contribution towards meeting identified affordable housing needs?	++	The site has the capacity to provide 793 dwellings.
1.2 Will it provide other elements of identified housing need e.g. housing for older persons, self-build, support housing?	?	Uncertainty is recorded against all residential site options as information on provision of other elements of housing need is not available on a consistent basis.
2. Safeguard and improve community health, safety and wellbeing		
2.1 Are community facilities (community hall or library) available locally?	-	The very northern tip of the site is within 800m of Horton Heath Community Centre however a minor negative score has been given as the area of the site within 800m is a very small proportion of this large site as a whole.
2.2 Are health facilities available locally?	0	The southern third of the site is located within 801 to 1200m from St Luke's Surgery.
2.3 What effect would the development have on local provision of sports pitches and facilities?	0	Development of this site would not lead to the loss of existing sports pitches or facilities.
2.4 Is public open space available locally?	+	The south western third of the site is located within 300m of public open space, including Cheltenham Gardens.
2.5 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network?	0	A footpath cuts across the most northern corner of the site, two other footpaths also run adjacent to the site.
3. Develop a dynamic and diverse economy		
3.1(a) Is the location close to a major rail station?	++	The southern third of the site is located within 400m of Hedge End Railway Station.
3.1 (b) Is the location close to a minor rail station?	--	The site is located further than 1200m from a minor railway station.
3.1 (c) Is the location close to a frequent bus route?	--	The site is located further than 800m from a frequent bus route.
3.1 (d) Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route?	+	The southern edge of the site is located within 400m of the semi-frequent First 8 bus route.
3.1 (e) Is the location close to a major employment centre?	+	The north western half of the site is located within 401 to 1000m from Chalcroft Business Park.
3.2 Will the proposed development contribute towards meeting the need for new industrial, office or warehousing floorspace?	-	This site would be developed for residential use, therefore additional employment floorspace would not be provided.
3.3 Will the proposed development result in a net loss of existing employment land, or land which would be suitable for employment purposes?	-	The SLAA identifies the possible loss of existing employment land as the southern half of the site contains Mereworth Industrial Estate used for industrial light engineering.
3.4 Will the proposed development increase the amount of commercial uses and other facilities in town, district or local centres?	0	The site is not located within a town, district or local centre.
4. Reduce road traffic and congestion through improved accessibility to services homes and jobs; reducing the need to travel by car/lorry and improving sustainable travel choice		
4.1 Is the location close to a major rail station? (same score as 3.1a)	++	The southern third of the site is located within 400m of Hedge End Railway Station.

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
4.2 Is the location close to a minor rail station? (same score as 3.1b)	--	The site is located further than 1200m from a minor railway station.
4.3 Is the location close to a frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1c)	--	The site is located further than 800m from a frequent bus route.
4.4 Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1d)	+	The southern edge of the site is located within 400m of the semi-frequent First 8 bus route.
4.5(a) Will residential development at the location be close to a major employment centre? (same score as 3.1e)	+	The north western half of the site is located within 401 to 1000m from Chalcroft Business Park.
4.5(b) Will employment development at the location be close to a major population centre?	0	Development would be residential only.
4.6 Are health facilities available locally? (same score as 2.2)	0	The southern third of the site is located within 801 to 1200m from St Luke's Surgery.
4.7 Are shopping and related services available locally?	--	The site is located more than 800m from a town, district or local centre.
4.8 Is the location close to a Primary school?	0	The southern edge of the site is located 601 to 800m from Wellstead Primary School.
4.9 Is the location close to a Secondary school?	0	The very southern corner of the site is located 1201 to 1600m from Wildern School.
4.10 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	0	A footpath cuts across the most northern corner of the site, two other footpaths also run adjacent to the site.
4.11 Are there Geographical barriers between the location and key facilities/ destinations?	-	The railway line that runs along the south western border of the site forms a geographical barrier between the site and three or more of the above destinations including; the schools, local centre, open space and doctors surgery.
5. Protect and conserve natural resources		
5.1 Will development avoid the sterilisation of mineral resources?	0	The site is not located in a Minerals Safeguarding Area or a Mineral Consultation Area.
5.2 Will it result in the loss of higher grade agricultural land?	--	The northern half of the site is located in an area of high quality agricultural land. The remainder of the site is in an area of medium quality agricultural land.
5.3 Will it use previously developed land?	-	This site consists of greenfield land.
5.4 Will it deliver or support allotments or community farms?	+?	There will be no loss of allotments or community farms. The location could be suitable for these but this is unknown.
6. Reduce air, soil, water, light and noise pollution		
6.1 Will the location be affected by significant noise generating uses or Air Quality Management Areas?	-?	The south western edge of the site is located within 200m of the railway line.
6.2 Will development increase pollution?	--?	Noise and air quality impacts from Botley road, noise from Bubb Lane will constrain site. Railway noise impacts on site. Adjacent commercial uses generate noise.
7. Plan for the anticipated levels of climate change		
7.1 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure?	0	No loss of existing green infrastructure.
7.2 Is the location at risk from flooding, taking into account of the effects of climate change?	--?	There is an area in the southern corner of the site that is within Flood Zone 3. There are also areas within the centre of the site that are subject to 'intermediate' surface water flooding.

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
7.3 Will the development be at risk from coastal change? If so, can the Shoreline Management Plan Objectives be supported?	0	This site is not located near the coast.
8. Minimise Eastleigh's contribution to climate change by reducing the borough's carbon footprint and minimising other greenhouse gas emissions.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
9. Reduce waste generation and disposal, encourage waste prevention and reuse and achieve the sustainable management of waste.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
10. Protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and geodiversity, improving its quality and range.		
10.1 Could development negatively impact or lead to loss of an internationally or nationally designated site (either alone or in combination)?	-	Ford Lake runs through the site into the Hamble, which flows through the Solent and Southampton Water SPA, SAC and Ramsar sites. There is potential for adverse in combination effects from this site along with Hedge End North. The EBC ecological assessment recommends that naturalised SuDS with three forms of filtration and 20m buffers from the top of each bank are required to preserve water quality.
10.2 Could development negatively impact or lead to loss of a locally designated biodiversity site (either alone or in combination)?	--	Ford Lake runs through the site into Botley Golf Course Wood SINC. Alder Strip SINC is located just to the east of the site. There is potential for adverse effects on water quality and in combination effects from this site and other development.
10.3 Will the development adversely affect areas with other nature conservation value, as identified in Biodiversity Action Plans (BAPs)?	--	There are significant tree belts and woodland in the site, which could be lost to development.
10.4 Will the development adversely impact the biodiversity network (e.g. Priority Biodiversity Links (PBLs), Priority Biodiversity Areas (PBAs), hedgerows and other corridors for species movement)?	--	The Chalcroft PBL runs along the southern boundary of the site with the Ford Lake, the Railway PBL runs along the western edge of the site. The EBC ecological assessment recommends that these corridors should remain connected for biodiversity.
10.5 Will the development adversely affect ancient woodland?	0	Development will not adversely affect ancient woodland.
11. Enhance the Borough's multifunctional green infrastructure networks.		
11.1 Will the development affect TPO trees?	0	Development of the site will not affect TPO trees.
11.2 Can the location be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	0	A footpaths cuts across the most northern corner of the site, two other footpaths also run adjacent to the site.
11.3 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure? (same score as 7.1)	0	No loss of existing green infrastructure.
12. Protect, enhance and manage the character and appearance of the landscape and townscape, maintaining and strengthening distinctiveness and its special qualities.		
12.1 Will development adversely affect the separation of neighbouring settlements?	--	The site was assessed as having very poor / poor potential for development in relation to avoiding settlement coalescence.
12.2 Will it protect the character of the countryside, coast, towns and/or villages, including views and settings?	-	The landscape within this site was assessed as having moderate sensitivity to development.

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
13. Protect and enhance and manage buildings, monuments, features, sites, places, areas and landscapes of archaeological, historical and cultural heritage importance.		
13.1 Will the development protect and enhance listed buildings and their settings, conservation areas, archaeological sites, historic landscapes and other sites of local importance for heritage?	0	Development of this site will not affect heritage assets.

Site 19: Land south of Maddoxford Lane and east of Crows Nest Lane.

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
1. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified local needs, including affordability and special needs		
1.1 Will the development provide a significant contribution towards meeting identified affordable housing needs?	++	The site has the capacity to provide 30 dwellings.
1.2 Will it provide other elements of identified housing need e.g. housing for older persons, self-build, support housing?	?	Uncertainty is recorded against all residential site options as information on provision of other elements of housing need is not available on a consistent basis.
2. Safeguard and improve community health, safety and wellbeing		
2.1 Are community facilities (community hall or library) available locally?	-	The site is located further than 800m from community facilities.
2.2 Are health facilities available locally?	0	The southern corner of the site is located 801 to 1200m from Botley Health Care Centre.
2.3 What effect would the development have on local provision of sports pitches and facilities?	0	Development of this site will not lead to loss of any existing sports pitches or facilities.
2.4 Is public open space available locally?	0	The site is located within 800m of public open space, including Flacon Way amenity space.
2.5 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network?	-	No footpaths or cycle paths cross the site or are adjacent to its boundary.
3. Develop a dynamic and diverse economy		
3.1(a) Is the location close to a major rail station?	-	The site is within 1201 to 1400m of Botley Railway Station.
3.1 (b) Is the location close to a minor rail station?	--	The site is further than 1200m from a minor railway station.
3.1 (c) Is the location close to a frequent bus route?	--	The site is more than 800m from a frequent bus stop.
3.1 (d) Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route?	--	The site is more than 800m from a semi- frequent bus route.
3.1 (e) Is the location close to a major employment centre?	--	The site is more than 1000m from a major employment centre.
3.2 Will the proposed development contribute towards meeting the need for new industrial, office or warehousing floorspace?	-	This site would be developed for residential use, therefore additional employment floorspace would not be provided.
3.3 Will the proposed development result in a net loss of existing employment land, or land which would be suitable for employment purposes?	0	EBC confirms that this site is not suitable for employment uses and development would not lead to loss of any existing employment land.
3.4 Will the proposed development increase the amount of commercial uses and other facilities in town, district or local centres?	0	This site is not located within a town, district and local centre.
4. Reduce road traffic and congestion through improved accessibility to services homes and jobs; reducing the need to travel by car/lorry and improving sustainable travel choice		
4.1 Is the location close to a major rail station? (same score as 3.1a)	-	The eastern half of the site is within 1201 to 1400m of Botley Railway Station.
4.2 Is the location close to a minor rail station? (same score as 3.1b)	--	The site is further than 1200m from a minor railway station.
4.3 Is the location close to a frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1c)	--	The site is more than 800m from a frequent bus stop.

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
4.4 Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1d)	--	The site is more than 800m from a semi- frequent bus route.
4.5(a) Will residential development at the location be close to a major employment centre? (same score as 3.1e)	--	The site is more than 1000m from a major employment centre.
4.5(b) Will employment development at the location be close to a major population centre?	0	Development would be residential only.
4.6 Are health facilities available locally? (same score as 2.2)	0	The site is located 801 to 1200m from Botley Health Care Centre.
4.7 Are shopping and related services available locally?	--	The site is located more than 800m from a town, district or local centre.
4.8 Is the location close to a Primary school?	-	The southern corner of the site is located 801 to 1000m from Botley Church of England Primary School.
4.9 Is the location close to a Secondary school?	-	The western half of the site is located 1601 to 2000m from Wildern School
4.10 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	-	No footpaths or cycle paths cross the site or are adjacent to its boundary.
4.11 Are there Geographical barriers between the location and key facilities/ destinations?	-	The railway line forms a geographical barrier between the site and three or more of the above destinations including the schools and the local centres.
5. Protect and conserve natural resources		
5.1 Will development avoid the sterilisation of mineral resources?	-?	The site is in a Mineral Consultation Area. A small part of the site is in a Mineral Safeguarding Area.
5.2 Will it result in the loss of higher grade agricultural land?	--	The eastern part of the site is located in an area of high quality agricultural land. The remainder of the site is in an area of medium quality agricultural land.
5.3 Will it use previously developed land?	-	This site consists of greenfield land.
5.4 Will it deliver or support allotments or community farms?	+?	There will be no loss of allotments or community farms. The location could be suitable for these but this is unknown.
6. Reduce air, soil, water, light and noise pollution		
6.1 Will the location be affected by significant noise generating uses or Air Quality Management Areas?	0	The site is not located within 200m of a motorway, A-road or railway line or in a AQMA.
6.2 Will development increase pollution?	-?	Noise impact from Maddoxford land and railway, also potential noise impact from Botley By Pass.
7. Plan for the anticipated levels of climate change		
7.1 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure?	0	No loss of existing green infrastructure.
7.2 Is the location at risk from flooding, taking into account of the effects of climate change?	0	The site is not located in an area of surface water flood risk and is not located within Flood Zones 2 or 3.
7.3 Will the development be at risk from coastal change? If so, can the Shoreline Management Plan Objectives be supported?	0	This site is not located near the coast.
8. Minimise Eastleigh's contribution to climate change by reducing the borough's carbon footprint and minimising other greenhouse gas emissions.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		

SA objective/ criterion	Justification	
9. Reduce waste generation and disposal, encourage waste prevention and reuse and achieve the sustainable management of waste.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
10. Protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and geodiversity, improving its quality and range.		
10.1 Could development negatively impact or lead to loss of an internationally or nationally designated site (either alone or in combination)?	-	A tributary of the Hamble runs to the south of the site and into the Hamble which then flows into the Solent and Southampton Water SPA, SAC and Ramsar sites. Potential for in-combination effects has been identified by the EBC ecological appraisal.
10.2 Could development negatively impact or lead or loss of a locally designated biodiversity site (either alone or in combination)?	-	The waterway to the south of the site runs into Marshy Grassland, Botley SINC. The EBC ecological appraisal suggests that any adverse effects can be mitigated.
10.3 Will the development adversely affect areas with other nature conservation value, as identified in Biodiversity Action Plans (BAPs)?	-	There is a hedgerow running along the edge of the site, which could be lost to development.
10.4 Will the development adversely impact the biodiversity network (e.g. Priority Biodiversity Links (PBLs), Priority Biodiversity Areas (PBAs), hedgerows and other corridors for species movement)?	-	The railway PBL runs just south of the site but is not included within the site itself. The Ecological Appraisal has suggested that this could be fully buffered.
10.5 Will the development adversely affect ancient woodland?	0	Development will not adversely affect ancient woodland.
11. Enhance the Borough's multifunctional green infrastructure networks.		
11.1 Will the development affect TPO trees?	0	Development of the site will not affect TPO trees.
11.2 Can the location be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	-	No footpaths or cycle paths cross the site or are adjacent to its boundary.
11.3 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure? (same score as 7.1)	0	No loss of existing green infrastructure.
12. Protect, enhance and manage the character and appearance of the landscape and townscape, maintaining and strengthening distinctiveness and its special qualities.		
12.1 Will development adversely affect the separation of neighbouring settlements?	?	This is currently uncertain. Awaiting updated Gap Appraisal.
12.2 Will it protect the character of the countryside, coast, towns and/or villages, including views and settings?	?	This is currently uncertain. Awaiting updated Landscape Appraisal.
13. Protect and enhance and manage buildings, monuments, features, sites, places, areas and landscapes of archaeological, historical and cultural heritage importance.		
13.1 Will the development protect and enhance listed buildings and their settings, conservation areas, archaeological sites, historic landscapes and other sites of local importance for heritage?	0	Development of this site will not affect heritage assets.

Site 20: Land west of Uplands Farm Botley

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
1. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified local needs, including affordability and special needs		
1.1 Will the development provide a significant contribution towards meeting identified affordable housing needs?	++	The site has the capacity to provide 450 dwellings.
1.2 Will it provide other elements of identified housing need e.g. housing for older persons, self-build, support housing?	?	Uncertainty is recorded against all residential site options as information on provision of other elements of housing need is not available on a consistent basis.
2. Safeguard and improve community health, safety and wellbeing		
2.1 Are community facilities (community hall or library) available locally?	0	The site is located within 401 to 800m of Botley Market Hall and the Botley Centre.
2.2 Are health facilities available locally?	++	The site is located within 400m of Botley Health Care Centre.
2.3 What effect would the development have on local provision of sports pitches and facilities?	0	Development of this site will not lead of loss of any existing sports pitches or facilities.
2.4 Is public open space available locally?	+	The southern half of the site is located within 300m of public open space including, Kanes Hill Allotments and Sycamore Walk.
2.5 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network?	0	An existing footpath crosses through the eastern side of the site.
3. Develop a dynamic and diverse economy		
3.1(a) Is the location close to a major rail station?	+	The eastern half of the site is located within 401 to 800m of Botley Railway Station.
3.1 (b) Is the location close to a minor rail station?	--	The site is located further than 1200m from a minor railway station.
3.1 (c) Is the location close to a frequent bus route?	--	The site is located further than 800m from a frequent bus route.
3.1 (d) Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route?	--	The site is located more than 800m from a semi-frequent bus route.
3.1 (e) Is the location close to a major employment centre?	-	The site is located more than 1000m from a major employment centre.
3.2 Will the proposed development contribute towards meeting the need for new industrial, office or warehousing floorspace?	-	This site would be developed for residential use, therefore additional employment floorspace would not be provided.
3.3 Will the proposed development result in a net loss of existing employment land, or land which would be suitable for employment purposes?	-	The SLAA form indicates that there will be no loss of employment land however, up to 1.5ha of the site would be available for employment uses.
3.4 Will the proposed development increase the amount of commercial uses and other facilities in town, district or local centres?	0	The site is not located within a town, district or local centre.
4. Reduce road traffic and congestion through improved accessibility to services homes and jobs; reducing the need to travel by car/lorry and improving sustainable travel choice		
4.1 Is the location close to a major rail station? (same score as 3.1a)	+	The eastern half of the site is located within 401 to 800m of Botley Railway Station.
4.2 Is the location close to a minor rail station? (same score as 3.1b)	--	The site is located further than 1200m from a minor railway station.

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
4.3 Is the location close to a frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1c)	--	The site is located further than 800m from a frequent bus route.
4.4 Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1d)	--	The site is located more than 800m from a semi-frequent bus route.
4.5(a) Will residential development at the location be close to a major employment centre? (same score as 3.1e)	-	The site is located more than 1000m from a major employment centre.
4.5(b) Will employment development at the location be close to a major population centre?	0	Development would be residential only.
4.6 Are health facilities available locally? (same score as 2.2)	++	The site is located within 400m of Botley Health Care Centre.
4.7 Are shopping and related services available locally?	++	The southern corner of the site is located within 200m of Botley Village Centre.
4.8 Is the location close to a Primary school?	++	The southern section of the site is located within 400m of Botley Church of England Primary School.
4.9 Is the location close to a Secondary school?	0	The western edge of the site is located 1201 to 1600m from Wildern School.
4.10 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	0	An existing footpath crosses through the eastern side of the site.
4.11 Are there Geographical barriers between the location and key facilities/ destinations?	+	No geographical barriers exist on the most direct walking routes to the destinations above.
5. Protect and conserve natural resources		
5.1 Will development avoid the sterilisation of mineral resources?	-?	The majority of the site is located in a Mineral Consultation Area, the south eastern half of the site is located in a Mineral Safeguarding Area.
5.2 Will it result in the loss of higher grade agricultural land?	--	The majority of the site is located in an area of high quality agricultural land.
5.3 Will it use previously developed land?	-	This site consists of greenfield land.
5.4 Will it deliver or support allotments or community farms?	+?	There will be no loss of allotments or community farms. The location could be suitable for these but this is unknown.
6. Reduce air, soil, water, light and noise pollution		
6.1 Will the location be affected by significant noise generating uses or Air Quality Management Areas?	-?	The northern half of the site is located within 200m of the railway line.
6.2 Will development increase pollution?	-?	Road Traffic noise impact from Winchester Street, line of Botley By Pass runs through this site which will have significant implications for any noise sensitive development proposed on this land. Separation between noise sensitive development and roads will be necessary. Noise impact from train noise arising from the railway. Separation between noise sensitive development and railway required. Noise impacts from existing commercial uses.
7. Plan for the anticipated levels of climate change		
7.1 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure?	0	No loss of existing green infrastructure.
7.2 Is the location at risk from flooding, taking into account of the effects of climate change?	--?	Small areas of the site are subject to 'intermediate' surface water flood risk. Other areas of the site are subject to 'less' surface water flood risk.

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
7.3 Will the development be at risk from coastal change? If so, can the Shoreline Management Plan Objectives be supported?	0	This site is not located near the coast.
8. Minimise Eastleigh's contribution to climate change by reducing the borough's carbon footprint and minimising other greenhouse gas emissions.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
9. Reduce waste generation and disposal, encourage waste prevention and reuse and achieve the sustainable management of waste.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
10. Protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and geodiversity, improving its quality and range.		
10.1 Could development negatively impact or lead to loss of an internationally or nationally designated site (either alone or in combination)?	-	The River Hamble runs just the other side of the eastern boundary of the site. This river flows through the Solent and Southampton Water SPA, SAC and Ramsar sites. The EBC ecological appraisal recommends that a 20m buffer the naturalised SuDS with three form of filtration should be required to preserve water quality.
10.2 Could development negatively impact or lead or loss of a locally designated biodiversity site (either alone or in combination)?	-	Botley Mill Woodland SINC is adjacent to the eastern boundary of the site. This is designated for its wet woodland. The EBC ecological appraisal recommends that a 20m buffer should be provided to mitigate adverse impacts on the SINC. Sherecroft Farm Meadow SINC is located close the eastern border of the site. The SINCs could be subject to in-combination recreational pressure.
10.3 Will the development adversely affect areas with other nature conservation value, as identified in Biodiversity Action Plans (BAPs)?	--	Hedgerow with more mature standards is located on the site and could be lost to development.
10.4 Will the development adversely impact the biodiversity network (e.g. Priority Biodiversity Links (PBLs), Priority Biodiversity Areas (PBAs), hedgerows and other corridors for species movement)?	--	Part of the railway PBL runs along the northern edge of the site and would be lost if developed. The EBC ecological appraisal recommends that the corridor should remain connected for biodiversity.
10.5 Will the development adversely affect ancient woodland?	0	Development will not adversely affect ancient woodland.
11. Enhance the Borough's multifunctional green infrastructure networks.		
11.1 Will the development affect TPO trees?	0	Development of the site will not affect TPO trees.
11.2 Can the location be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	0	An existing footpath crosses through the eastern side of the site.
11.3 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure? (same score as 7.1)	0	No loss of existing green infrastructure. (Policy BO2 in the Revised pre-submission Local Plan, February 2014 allocated this site as a potential location for a cemetery).
12. Protect, enhance and manage the character and appearance of the landscape and townscape, maintaining and strengthening distinctiveness and its special qualities.		
12.1 Will development adversely affect the separation of neighbouring settlements?	-	The site was assessed as having average potential for development in relation to avoiding settlement coalescence.
12.2 Will it protect the character of the countryside,	0	The landscape within this site was assessed as having

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
coast, towns and/or villages, including views and settings?		low sensitivity to development.
13. Protect and enhance and manage buildings, monuments, features, sites, places, areas and landscapes of archaeological, historical and cultural heritage importance.		
13.1 Will the development protect and enhance listed buildings and their settings, conservation areas, archaeological sites, historic landscapes and other sites of local importance for heritage?	-?	Uplands Farm is located on the site. The Farm-house, timber barn and brick barn are all Grade II listed. These buildings should not be crowded with new development. There is a natural curved curtilage to the farmstead that should be respected.

Site 21: Land east of Kings Copse Avenue and east of Tanhouse Lane

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
1. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified local needs, including affordability and special needs		
1.1 Will the development provide a significant contribution towards meeting identified affordable housing needs?	++	The site has the capacity to provide 70 dwellings.
1.2 Will it provide other elements of identified housing need e.g. housing for older persons, self-build, support housing?	?	Uncertainty is recorded against all residential site options as information on provision of other elements of housing need is not available on a consistent basis.
2. Safeguard and improve community health, safety and wellbeing		
2.1 Are community facilities (community hall or library) available locally?	+	The south western half of the site is located within 400m of the Pavilion at Norman Rodaway District Park.
2.2 Are health facilities available locally?	0	The site is located 801 to 1200m from Hedge End Medical Centre.
2.3 What effect would the development have on local provision of sports pitches and facilities?	0	Development will not result in the loss of sport pitches or facilities.
2.4 Is public open space available locally?	--	The northern and eastern edges of the site are located within the Manor Farm Country Park and therefore development will result in the loss of publically accessible open space.
2.5 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network?	-	No footpaths or cycle paths cross the site or are adjacent to its boundary.
3. Develop a dynamic and diverse economy		
3.1(a) Is the location close to a major rail station?	--	The site is further than 1400m from a major railway station.
3.1 (b) Is the location close to a minor rail station?	--	The site is located further than 1200m from a minor railway station.
3.1 (c) Is the location close to a frequent bus route?	--	The site is further than 800m from a frequent bus route.
3.1 (d) Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route?	--	The site is further than 800m from a semi-frequent bus route.
3.1 (e) Is the location close to a major employment centre?	-	The site is located more than 1000m from a major employment centre.
3.2 Will the proposed development contribute towards meeting the need for new industrial, office or warehousing floorspace?	-	This site would be developed for residential use, therefore additional employment floorspace would not be provided.
3.3 Will the proposed development result in a net loss of existing employment land, or land which would be suitable for employment purposes?	0	The SLAA does not identify this site as being suitable for employment uses and development would not lead to loss of existing employment land.
3.4 Will the proposed development increase the amount of commercial uses and other facilities in town, district or local centres?	0	The site is not located within a town, district or local centre.
4. Reduce road traffic and congestion through improved accessibility to services homes and jobs; reducing the need to travel by car/lorry and improving sustainable travel choice		
4.1 Is the location close to a major rail station? (same score as 3.1a)	--	The site is further than 1400m from a major railway station.
4.2 Is the location close to a minor rail station?	--	The site is located further than 1200m from a minor

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
(same score as 3.1b)		railway station.
4.3 Is the location close to a frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1c)	--	The site is further than 800m from a frequent bus route.
4.4 Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1d)	--	The site is further than 800m from a semi-frequent bus route.
4.5(a) Will residential development at the location be close to a major employment centre? (same score as 3.1e)	-	The site is located more than 1000m from a major employment centre.
4.5(b) Will employment development at the location be close to a major population centre?	0	Development would be residential only.
4.6 Are health facilities available locally? (same score as 2.2)	0	The site is located 801 to 1200m from Hedge End Medical Centre.
4.7 Are shopping and related services available locally?	--	The site is located further than 800m from a town, district or local centre.
4.8 Is the location close to a Primary school?	++	The site is located within 400m of Kings Copse Primary School
4.9 Is the location close to a Secondary school?	0	The site is located within 1201 to 1600m from Wildern School.
4.10 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	-	No footpath or cycle path crosses the site or is adjacent to its boundary.
4.11 Are there Geographical barriers between the location and key facilities/ destinations?	+	No geographical barriers exist on the most direct walking routes to the destinations above.
5. Protect and conserve natural resources		
5.1 Will development avoid the sterilisation of mineral resources?	-?	The majority of the site is located in a Mineral Consultation Area.
5.2 Will it result in the loss of higher grade agricultural land?	--	The site is located entirely in an area of high quality agricultural land.
5.3 Will it use previously developed land?	-	This site consists of greenfield land.
5.4 Will it deliver or support allotments or community farms?	+	There will be no loss of allotments or community farms. The location could be suitable for these but this is unknown.
6. Reduce air, soil, water, light and noise pollution		
6.1 Will the location be affected by significant noise generating uses or Air Quality Management Areas?	0	The site is not located within 200m of an A-road, motorway or an AQMA.
6.2 Will development increase pollution?	-?	Road Traffic noise impact from Heath House Lane (increasing traffic flow with opening of Pylands By Pass / Link road, and Botley By Pass). Separation between noise sensitive development and roads uses will be necessary.
7. Plan for the anticipated levels of climate change		
7.1 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure?	-?	Development of the site will lead to the loss part of the Manor Farm Country Park.
7.2 Is the location at risk from flooding, taking into account of the effects of climate change?	--?	The northern edge of the site is located within Food Zone 3. Parts of the site are subject to 'less' surface water flooding.
7.3 Will the development be at risk from coastal change? If so, can the Shoreline Management Plan Objectives be supported?	0	This site is not located near the coast.

SA objective/ criterion	Justification	
8. Minimise Eastleigh's contribution to climate change by reducing the borough's carbon footprint and minimising other greenhouse gas emissions.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
9. Reduce waste generation and disposal, encourage waste prevention and reuse and achieve the sustainable management of waste.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
10. Protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and geodiversity, improving its quality and range.		
10.1 Could development negatively impact or lead to loss of an internationally or nationally designated site (either alone or in combination)?	-	The Hedge End Stream runs along the northern boundary of the site, this stream runs into the Solent and Southampton Water SPA, SAC and Ramsar Site. There is potential for in combination effects with other nearby development. The EBC ecological appraisal proposes mitigation in the form of a 20m buffer and naturalised SuDS with three form of filtration to preserve water quality.
10.2 Could development negatively impact or lead or loss of a locally designated biodiversity site (either alone or in combination)?	-	Tanhouse Meadow SINC, designated for its grassland habitat, curls around the north of the site. The site also incorporates a part of the Manor Farm Local Nature Reserve, which includes Tanhouse Meadow SINC. Development has potential for effects alone as well as in-combination increased recreational effects. The EBC ecological appraisal suggests that a significant buffer between development and these sites will be required.
10.3 Will the development adversely affect areas with other nature conservation value, as identified in Biodiversity Action Plans (BAPs)?	-?	Mature hedgerows are present around the boundaries if the site. As these are located around the boundaries of the site they may not be lost to development.
10.4 Will the development adversely impact the biodiversity network (e.g. Priority Biodiversity Links (PBLs), Priority Biodiversity Areas (PBAs), hedgerows and other corridors for species movement)?	0	Development will not adversely impact the biodiversity network.
10.5 Will the development adversely affect ancient woodland?	0	Development will not adversely affect ancient woodland.
11. Enhance the Borough's multifunctional green infrastructure networks.		
11.1 Will the development affect TPO trees?	0	Development of the site will not affect TPO trees.
11.2 Can the location be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	-	No footpath or cycle path crosses the site or is adjacent to its boundary.
11.3 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure? (same score as 7.1)	-?	Development of the site will lead to the loss part of the Manor Farm Country Park.
12. Protect, enhance and manage the character and appearance of the landscape and townscape, maintaining and strengthening distinctiveness and its special qualities.		
12.1 Will development adversely affect the separation of neighbouring settlements?	0	The site was assessed as having good / very good potential for development in relation to avoiding settlement coalescence.
12.2 Will it protect the character of the countryside, coast, towns and/or villages, including views and settings?	0	The landscape within this site was assessed as having low sensitivity to development.

SA objective/ criterion	Justification	
13. Protect and enhance and manage buildings, monuments, features, sites, places, areas and landscapes of archaeological, historical and cultural heritage importance.		
13.1 Will the development protect and enhance listed buildings and their settings, conservation areas, archaeological sites, historic landscapes and other sites of local importance for heritage?	0	Development of this site will not affect heritage assets.

Site 22: Land east of Precosa Road

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
1. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified local needs, including affordability and special needs		
1.1 Will the development provide a significant contribution towards meeting identified affordable housing needs?	++	The site has the capacity to provide 431 dwellings.
1.2 Will it provide other elements of identified housing need e.g. housing for older persons, self-build, support housing?	?	Uncertainty is recorded against all residential site options as information on provision of other elements of housing need is not available on a consistent basis.
2. Safeguard and improve community health, safety and wellbeing		
2.1 Are community facilities (community hall or library) available locally?	0	The northern half of the site is within 401 to 800m of the Botley Centre. The southern corner of the site is within 401 to 800m of the Pavilion at Norman Rodaway District Park.
2.2 Are health facilities available locally?	+	The north eastern third of the site is within 401 to 800m of Botley Health Care Centre.
2.3 What effect would the development have on local provision of sports pitches and facilities?	-	Development of this site will result in the loss of a very small area of Manor Farm Country Park to the south of the site. Loss would usually score significantly negative however, the score has been downgraded in this case as the area lost will be a very small part of a very large country park and therefore is not likely to result in significant adverse effects.
2.4 Is public open space available locally?	--	Development of this site will result in the loss of Little Hatts Recreation Ground as well as a very small corner of Manor Farm Country Park.
2.5 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network?	0	A footpath crosses through the northern part of the site.
3. Develop a dynamic and diverse economy		
3.1(a) Is the location close to a major rail station?	--	The site is further than 1400m from a major railway station.
3.1 (b) Is the location close to a minor rail station?	--	The site is further than 1200m from a minor railway station.
3.1 (c) Is the location close to a frequent bus route?	--	The site is further than 800m from a frequent bus route.
3.1 (d) Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route?	--	The site is further than 800m from a semi-frequent bus route.
3.1 (e) Is the location close to a major employment centre?	-	The site is further than 1000m from a major employment centre.
3.2 Will the proposed development contribute towards meeting the need for new industrial, office or warehousing floorspace?	-	This site would be developed for residential use, therefore additional employment floorspace would not be provided.
3.3 Will the proposed development result in a net loss of existing employment land, or land which would be suitable for employment purposes?	0	The SLAA does not identify this site as being suitable for employment uses and no existing employment land would be lost to residential development.
3.4 Will the proposed development increase the amount of commercial uses and other facilities in town, district or local centres?	0	This site is not located in a town, district or local centre.
4. Reduce road traffic and congestion through improved accessibility to services homes and jobs; reducing the need to travel by car/lorry and improving		

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
sustainable travel choice		
4.1 Is the location close to a major rail station? (same score as 3.1a)	--	The site is further than 1400m from a major railway station.
4.2 Is the location close to a minor rail station? (same score as 3.1b)	--	The site is further than 1200m from a minor railway station.
4.3 Is the location close to a frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1c)	--	The site is further than 800m from a frequent bus route.
4.4 Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1d)	--	The site is further than 800m from a semi-frequent bus route.
4.5(a) Will residential development at the location be close to a major employment centre? (same score as 3.1e)	-	The site is further than 1000m from a major employment centre.
4.5(b) Will employment development at the location be close to a major population centre?	0	Development would be residential only.
4.6 Are health facilities available locally? (same score as 2.2)	+	The north eastern third of the site is within 401 to 800m of Botley Health Care Centre.
4.7 Are shopping and related services available locally?	--	The site is located further than 800m from a town, district or local centre.
4.8 Is the location close to a Primary school?	++	The north western corner of the site is located within 400m of Freegrounds Infant School
4.9 Is the location close to a Secondary school?	+	The northern half of the site is located 801 to 1200m from Wildern School.
4.10 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	0	A footpath crosses through the northern part of the site.
4.11 Are there Geographical barriers between the location and key facilities/ destinations?	+	No geographical barriers exist on the most direct walking routes to the destinations above.
5. Protect and conserve natural resources		
5.1 Will development avoid the sterilisation of mineral resources?	-?	The southern half of the site is located in a Mineral Consultation Area.
5.2 Will it result in the loss of higher grade agricultural land?	--	A section in the south of the site is covered by an area of high quality agricultural land. The remainder of the site is covered by medium quality agricultural land.
5.3 Will it use previously developed land?	-	This site consists of greenfield land.
5.4 Will it deliver or support allotments or community farms?	++?	There will be no loss of allotments or community farms. The location could be suitable for these but this is unknown.
6. Reduce air, soil, water, light and noise pollution		
6.1 Will the location be affected by significant noise generating uses or Air Quality Management Areas?	0	The site is not within 200m of an A-road, motorway or AQMA.
6.2 Will development increase pollution?	0	Development of this site will not impact upon pollution.
7. Plan for the anticipated levels of climate change		
7.1 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure?	-?	Development of the site will result in the loss of Little Hatts Recreation Ground amenity space.
7.2 Is the location at risk from flooding, taking into account of the effects of climate change?	--?	An area in the centre of the site is subject to 'intermediate' surface water flood risk. A very small area along the southern boundary of the site is located within Flood Zone 3.

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
7.3 Will the development be at risk from coastal change? If so, can the Shoreline Management Plan Objectives be supported?	0	This site is not located near the coast.
8. Minimise Eastleigh's contribution to climate change by reducing the borough's carbon footprint and minimising other greenhouse gas emissions.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
9. Reduce waste generation and disposal, encourage waste prevention and reuse and achieve the sustainable management of waste.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
10. Protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and geodiversity, improving its quality and range.		
10.1 Could development negatively impact or lead to loss of an internationally or nationally designated site (either alone or in combination)?	-	The Hedge End Stream runs along the southern boundary of the site, this stream runs into the Solent and Southampton Water SPA, SAC and Ramsar Site. Potential for in combination effects with nearby development have been identified. Mitigation is proposed in the EBC ecological appraisal in the form of a 20m buffer and naturalised SuDS with three form of filtration to preserve water quality.
10.2 Could development negatively impact or lead or loss of a locally designated biodiversity site (either alone or in combination)?	-	The site backs onto, and incorporates a very small part of, the Manor Farm Local Nature Reserve. There is potential for development to increase recreational effects. The EBC ecological appraisal suggests that a significant buffer will be required.
10.3 Will the development adversely affect areas with other nature conservation value, as identified in Biodiversity Action Plans (BAPs)?	--	The site includes woodland blocks and hedgerows which could be lost to development.
10.4 Will the development adversely impact the biodiversity network (e.g. Priority Biodiversity Links (PBLs), Priority Biodiversity Areas (PBAs), hedgerows and other corridors for species movement)?	--	There is significant woodland network on the site that could be fragmented by development.
10.5 Will the development adversely affect ancient woodland?	0	Development will not adversely affect ancient woodland.
11. Enhance the Borough's multifunctional green infrastructure networks.		
11.1 Will the development affect TPO trees?	0	Development of the site will not affect TPO trees.
11.2 Can the location be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	0	A footpath crosses through the northern part of the site.
11.3 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure? (same score as 7.1)	-?	Development of the site will result in the loss of Little Hatts Recreation Ground amenity space.
12. Protect, enhance and manage the character and appearance of the landscape and townscape, maintaining and strengthening distinctiveness and its special qualities.		
12.1 Will development adversely affect the separation of neighbouring settlements?	--	The site was assessed as having very poor / poor potential for development in relation to avoiding settlement coalescence.
12.2 Will it protect the character of the countryside, coast, towns and/or villages, including views and settings?	-	The landscape within this site was assessed as having moderate sensitivity to development.
13. Protect and enhance and manage buildings,		

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
monuments, features, sites, places, areas and landscapes of archaeological, historical and cultural heritage importance.		
13.1 Will the development protect and enhance listed buildings and their settings, conservation areas, archaeological sites, historic landscapes and other sites of local importance for heritage?	0	Development of this site will not affect heritage assets.

Site 23: Land west of Cobbett Way; garage of Broad Oak; north of Broad Oak and west of Holmesland Way; and land north of Grange Road.

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
1. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified local needs, including affordability and special needs		
1.1 Will the development provide a significant contribution towards meeting identified affordable housing needs?	++	The site has the capacity to provide 251 dwellings.
1.2 Will it provide other elements of identified housing need e.g. housing for older persons, self-build, support housing?	?	Uncertainty is recorded against all residential site options as information on provision of other elements of housing need is not available on a consistent basis.
2. Safeguard and improve community health, safety and wellbeing		
2.1 Are community facilities (community hall or library) available locally?	+	The site is located within 400m of the Botley Centre and Brook House Masonic Centre.
2.2 Are health facilities available locally?	++	The south eastern corner of the site is located within 400m of Botley Health Care Centre.
2.3 What effect would the development have on local provision of sports pitches and facilities?	0	Development will not lead to a loss of sport pitches and facilities.
2.4 Is public open space available locally?	+	The majority of the site is located within 300m of public open space including the Botley Recreation Ground.
2.5 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network?	-	No footpath or cycle path crosses the site or runs adjacent to its boundary.
3. Develop a dynamic and diverse economy		
3.1(a) Is the location close to a major rail station?	-	The eastern edge of the site is located 1201 to 1400m from Botley Railway Station.
3.1 (b) Is the location close to a minor rail station?	--	The site is more than 1200m from a minor railway station.
3.1 (c) Is the location close to a frequent bus route?	--	The site is further than 800m from a frequent bus route.
3.1 (d) Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route?	--	The site is further than 800m from a semi-frequent bus route.
3.1 (e) Is the location close to a major employment centre?	-	The site is further than 1000m from a major employment centre.
3.2 Will the proposed development contribute towards meeting the need for new industrial, office or warehousing floorspace?	-	This site would be developed for residential use, therefore additional employment floorspace would not be provided.
3.3 Will the proposed development result in a net loss of existing employment land, or land which would be suitable for employment purposes?	-	The SLAA forms identify the potential for loss of employment land, as part of the site on the western edge is used for commercial purposes, including storage.
3.4 Will the proposed development increase the amount of commercial uses and other facilities in town, district or local centres?	0	The site is not located in a town, district or local centre.
4. Reduce road traffic and congestion through improved accessibility to services homes and jobs; reducing the need to travel by car/lorry and improving sustainable travel choice		
4.1 Is the location close to a major rail station? (same score as 3.1a)	-	The eastern edge of the site is located 1201 to 1400m from Botley Railway Station.
4.2 Is the location close to a minor rail station?	--	The site is more than 1200m from a minor railway

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
(same score as 3.1b)		station.
4.3 Is the location close to a frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1c)	--	The site is further than 800m from a frequent bus route.
4.4 Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1d)	--	The site is further than 800m from a semi-frequent bus route.
4.5(a) Will residential development at the location be close to a major employment centre? (same score as 3.1e)	-	The site is further than 1000m from a major employment centre.
4.5(b) Will employment development at the location be close to a major population centre?	0	Development would be residential only.
4.6 Are health facilities available locally? (same score as 2.2)	++	The south eastern corner of the site is located within 400m of Botley Health Care Centre.
4.7 Are shopping and related services available locally?	0	The eastern corner of the site is located 401 to 600m from a local centre.
4.8 Is the location close to a Primary school?	++	The eastern part of the site is located within 400m of Botley Church of England Primary School.
4.9 Is the location close to a Secondary school?	+	The eastern two thirds of the site is located 801 to 1200m from Wildern Secondary School.
4.10 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	-	No footpath or cycle path crosses the site or runs adjacent to its boundary.
4.11 Are there Geographical barriers between the location and key facilities/ destinations?	+	No geographical barriers have been identified between the site and the facilities described above.
5. Protect and conserve natural resources		
5.1 Will development avoid the sterilisation of mineral resources?	-?	The centre of the site is covered by a Mineral Consultation Area. A section of the site is also covered by a Mineral Safeguarding Area.
5.2 Will it result in the loss of higher grade agricultural land?	--	The eastern half of the site is in an area of high quality agricultural land. The remainder of the site is covered by medium quality agricultural land.
5.3 Will it use previously developed land?	-	This site consists of greenfield land.
5.4 Will it deliver or support allotments or community farms?	+?	There will be no loss of allotments or community farms. The location could be suitable for these but this is unknown.
6. Reduce air, soil, water, light and noise pollution		
6.1 Will the location be affected by significant noise generating uses or Air Quality Management Areas?	--?	The majority of the site is within 200m of the A334. The High Street Botley AQMA also runs through the site along the A334.
6.2 Will development increase pollution?	--?	Road Traffic noise impact from A334 Botley Road Separation between noise sensitive development and roads will be necessary. Within existing Botley AQMA, likely negative impact on air quality.
7. Plan for the anticipated levels of climate change		
7.1 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure?	0	No loss of existing green infrastructure.
7.2 Is the location at risk from flooding, taking into account of the effects of climate change?	--?	An area of Flood Zone 3 runs through the centre of the site, parts of the site are also subject to 'intermediate' surface water flood risk.
7.3 Will the development be at risk from coastal change? If so, can the Shoreline Management Plan	0	This site is not located near the coast.

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
Objectives be supported?		
8. Minimise Eastleigh's contribution to climate change by reducing the borough's carbon footprint and minimising other greenhouse gas emissions.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
9. Reduce waste generation and disposal, encourage waste prevention and reuse and achieve the sustainable management of waste.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
10. Protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and geodiversity, improving its quality and range.		
10.1 Could development negatively impact or lead to loss of an internationally or nationally designated site (either alone or in combination)?	-	Woodhouse Gully runs through the centre of the site to Solent and Southampton Water SPA, SAC and Ramsar site. There is a potential for adverse in-combination effects with other sites the Gully runs through. Mitigation is proposed in the EBC ecological appraisal in the form of 20m buffers from the top of each bank and three forms of filtration required through the sites to preserve water quality.
10.2 Could development negatively impact or lead or loss of a locally designated biodiversity site (either alone or in combination)?	--	The site incorporates Woodhouse Gully SINC which runs through the middle of the site. Mitigation is proposed in the EBC ecological appraisal in the form of 20m development free buffers around the SINC. Development of this site is likely to have a recreational impact on the SINC, even if a 20m buffer was in place.
10.3 Will the development adversely affect areas with other nature conservation value, as identified in Biodiversity Action Plans (BAPs)?	--	There is significant tree cover throughout the site which could be lost to development..
10.4 Will the development adversely impact the biodiversity network (e.g. Priority Biodiversity Links (PBLs), Priority Biodiversity Areas (PBAs), hedgerows and other corridors for species movement)?	--	The Wildern PBA runs through the centre of the site. The EBC site assessment recommends that this corridor should remain connected for biodiversity.
10.5 Will the development adversely affect ancient woodland?	0	Development will not adversely affect ancient woodland.
11. Enhance the Borough's multifunctional green infrastructure networks.		
11.1 Will the development affect TPO trees?	0	Development of the site will not affect TPO trees.
11.2 Can the location be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	-	No footpath or cycle path crosses the site or runs adjacent to its boundary.
11.3 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure? (same score as 7.1)	0	No loss of existing green infrastructure.
12. Protect, enhance and manage the character and appearance of the landscape and townscape, maintaining and strengthening distinctiveness and its special qualities.		
12.1 Will development adversely affect the separation of neighbouring settlements?	--	The site was assessed as having very poor / poor potential for development in relation to avoiding settlement coalescence.
12.2 Will it protect the character of the countryside, coast, towns and/or villages, including views and settings?	-	The landscape within this site was assessed as having moderate sensitivity to development.

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
13. Protect and enhance and manage buildings, monuments, features, sites, places, areas and landscapes of archaeological, historical and cultural heritage importance.		
13.1 Will the development protect and enhance listed buildings and their settings, conservation areas, archaeological sites, historic landscapes and other sites of local importance for heritage?	-?	Development may affect Homesland Registered Park from 1800s with a walled garden.

Site 24: Garage at Broad Oak

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
1. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified local needs, including affordability and special needs		
1.1 Will the development provide a significant contribution towards meeting identified affordable housing needs?	++	The site has the capacity to provide 16 dwellings.
1.2 Will it provide other elements of identified housing need e.g. housing for older persons, self-build, support housing?	?	Uncertainty is recorded against all residential site options as information on provision of other elements of housing need is not available on a consistent basis.
2. Safeguard and improve community health, safety and wellbeing		
2.1 Are community facilities (community hall or library) available locally?	+	The site is located within 400m of The Botley Centre
2.2 Are health facilities available locally?	+	The site is located 401 to 800m from Botley Health Care Centre.
2.3 What effect would the development have on local provision of sports pitches and facilities?	0	Development of this site would not result in the loss of existing sports pitches or facilities.
2.4 Is public open space available locally?	+	The site is within 300m of public open space including Botley Recreation Ground.
2.5 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network?	+	An existing footpath runs adjacent to the western corner of the site.
3. Develop a dynamic and diverse economy		
3.1(a) Is the location close to a major rail station?	--	The site is further than 1400m from a major railway station.
3.1 (b) Is the location close to a minor rail station?	--	The site is more than 1200m from a minor railway station.
3.1 (c) Is the location close to a frequent bus route?	--	The site is further than 800m from a frequent bus route.
3.1 (d) Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route?	--	The site is further than 800m from a semi-frequent bus route.
3.1 (e) Is the location close to a major employment centre?	-	The site is further than 1000m from a major employment centre.
3.2 Will the proposed development contribute towards meeting the need for new industrial, office or warehousing floorspace?	-	This site would be developed for residential use, therefore additional employment floorspace would not be provided.
3.3 Will the proposed development result in a net loss of existing employment land, or land which would be suitable for employment purposes?	-	The SLAA form for the site indicated there would be loss of employment land as a car showroom is currently located on the site.
3.4 Will the proposed development increase the amount of commercial uses and other facilities in town, district or local centres?	0	This site is not located within a town, district and local centre.
4. Reduce road traffic and congestion through improved accessibility to services homes and jobs; reducing the need to travel by car/lorry and improving sustainable travel choice		
4.1 Is the location close to a major rail station? (same score as 3.1a)	--	The site is further than 1400m from a major railway station.
4.2 Is the location close to a minor rail station? (same score as 3.1b)	--	The site is more than 1200m from a minor railway station.
4.3 Is the location close to a frequent bus route?	--	The site is further than 800m from a frequent bus

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
(same score as 3.1c)		route.
4.4 Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1d)	--	The site is further than 800m from a semi-frequent bus route.
4.5(a) Will residential development at the location be close to a major employment centre? (same score as 3.1e)	-	The site is further than 1000m from a major employment centre.
4.5(b) Will employment development at the location be close to a major population centre?	0	Development would be residential only.
4.6 Are health facilities available locally? (same score as 2.2)	+	The site is located 401 to 800m from Botley Health Care Centre.
4.7 Are shopping and related services available locally?	-	The site is located 601 to 800m from Botley Village Centre.
4.8 Is the location close to a Primary school?	+	The site is located 401 to 600m from Botley Church of England Primary School.
4.9 Is the location close to a Secondary school?	+	The site is located 801 to 1200m from Wildern Secondary School.
4.10 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	+	An existing footpath runs adjacent to the western corner of the site.
4.11 Are there Geographical barriers between the location and key facilities/ destinations?	+	There are no geographical barriers on the most direct walking routes to the above destinations.
5. Protect and conserve natural resources		
5.1 Will development avoid the sterilisation of mineral resources?	0	The site is not located in a Mineral Safeguarding Area or a Mineral Consultation Area.
5.2 Will it result in the loss of higher grade agricultural land?	--	The northern corner of the site is located in an area of high quality agricultural land.
5.3 Will it use previously developed land?	++	This site consists of previously developed land.
5.4 Will it deliver or support allotments or community farms?	+?	There will be no loss of allotments or community farms. The location could be suitable for these but this is unknown.
6. Reduce air, soil, water, light and noise pollution		
6.1 Will the location be affected by significant noise generating uses or Air Quality Management Areas?	--?	The site is located within 200m of the A334 and the northern edge of the site touches the High Street Botley AQMA.
6.2 Will development increase pollution?	--?	Road Traffic noise impact from A334 Botley Road Separation between noise sensitive development and roads will be necessary. Site is within existing Botley AQMA, likely negative impact on air quality.
7. Plan for the anticipated levels of climate change		
7.1 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure?	0	No loss of existing green infrastructure.
7.2 Is the location at risk from flooding, taking into account of the effects of climate change?	--?	The southern corner of the site is located within Flood Zone 3 and the majority of the site is located in areas subject to 'intermediate' surface water flood risk.
7.3 Will the development be at risk from coastal change? If so, can the Shoreline Management Plan Objectives be supported?	0	This site is not near the coast.
8. Minimise Eastleigh's contribution to climate change by reducing the borough's carbon footprint and minimising other greenhouse gas emissions.		

SA objective/ criterion	Justification	
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
9. Reduce waste generation and disposal, encourage waste prevention and reuse and achieve the sustainable management of waste.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
10. Protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and geodiversity, improving its quality and range.		
10.1 Could development negatively impact or lead to loss of an internationally or nationally designated site (either alone or in combination)?	-	Marles Road Stream, a tributary of the Hamble runs to the west of the site, Woodhouse Gully runs to the east. Both stream run into the Hamble which in turn flows into the Solent and Southampton Water SPA, SAC and Ramsar Site. There is potential for in combination effects on water quality. EBC Ecological Appraisal recommends providing 20m buffers and the use of SuDS to preserve water quality.
10.2 Could development negatively impact or lead or loss of a locally designated biodiversity site (either alone or in combination)?	-	The site is directly adjacent to Woodhouse Gully Woods SINC. Potential for increased urban edge and recreation effects. EBC Ecological Appraisal recommends that a 20m buffer is provided.
10.3 Will the development adversely affect areas with other nature conservation value, as identified in Biodiversity Action Plans (BAPs)?	0	Development will not adversely affect areas with other nature conservation value.
10.4 Will the development adversely impact the biodiversity network (e.g. Priority Biodiversity Links (PBLs), Priority Biodiversity Areas (PBAs), hedgerows and other corridors for species movement)?	--	The Wildern PBA covers the eastern half of the site. This corridor should remain connected for biodiversity.
10.5 Will the development adversely affect ancient woodland?	0	Development will not adversely affect ancient woodland.
11. Enhance the Borough's multifunctional green infrastructure networks.		
11.1 Will the development affect TPO trees?	0	Development of the site will not affect TPO trees.
11.2 Can the location be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	+	An existing footpath runs adjacent to the western corner of the site.
11.3 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure? (same score as 7.1)	0	No loss of existing green infrastructure.
12. Protect, enhance and manage the character and appearance of the landscape and townscape, maintaining and strengthening distinctiveness and its special qualities.		
12.1 Will development adversely affect the separation of neighbouring settlements?	0	The site was assessed as having good / very good potential for development in relation to avoiding settlement coalescence.
12.2 Will it protect the character of the countryside, coast, towns and/or villages, including views and settings?	?	Currently uncertain. Awaiting updated Landscape Appraisal.
13. Protect and enhance and manage buildings, monuments, features, sites, places, areas and landscapes of archaeological, historical and cultural heritage importance.		
13.1 Will the development protect and enhance listed buildings and their settings, conservation areas, archaeological sites, historic landscapes and other sites of local importance for heritage?	0	Development of this site will not affect heritage assets.

Site 25: Land south of Snakemoor Lane; Land at Denhams Corner and Land at Ford Lake

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
1. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified local needs, including affordability and special needs		
1.1 Will the development provide a significant contribution towards meeting identified affordable housing needs?	++	The site has a potential capacity of 716 dwellings
1.2 Will it provide other elements of identified housing need e.g. housing for older persons, self-build, support housing?	?	Uncertainty is recorded against all residential site options as information on provision of other elements of housing need is not available on a consistent basis.
2. Safeguard and improve community health, safety and wellbeing		
2.1 Are community facilities (community hall or library) available locally?	+	The northern tip of the site is located within 400m of Horton Heath Village Hall, half of the site is located within 800m.
2.2 Are health facilities available locally?	--	The site is located further than 1600m from healthcare facilities.
2.3 What effect would the development have on local provision of sports pitches and facilities?	0	Development would not lead to loss of existing sports pitches and facilities.
2.4 Is public open space available locally?	+	The northern tip of the site is located within 300m of public open space, including Valerian Close green route, half of the site is within 800m.
2.5 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network?	0	An existing footpath crosses the northern end of the site.
3. Develop a dynamic and diverse economy		
3.1(a) Is the location close to a major rail station?	0	The southern half of the site is located 801 to 1200m from Hedge End Railway Station.
3.1 (b) Is the location close to a minor rail station?	--	The site is located further than 1200m from a minor railway station.
3.1 (c) Is the location close to a frequent bus route?	--	The site is located further than 800m from a frequent bus route.
3.1 (d) Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route?	--	The site is located further than 800m from a semi-frequent bus route.
3.1 (e) Is the location close to a major employment centre?	-	The site is located just further than 1000m from a major employment centre.
3.2 Will the proposed development contribute towards meeting the need for new industrial, office or warehousing floorspace?	-	This site would be developed for residential use, therefore additional employment floorspace would not be provided.
3.3 Will the proposed development result in a net loss of existing employment land, or land which would be suitable for employment purposes?	0	The SLAA does not identify this site as being suitable for employment uses and development would not lead to loss of any existing employment land.
3.4 Will the proposed development increase the amount of commercial uses and other facilities in town, district or local centres?	0	The site is not located within a town, district or local centre.
4. Reduce road traffic and congestion through improved accessibility to services homes and jobs; reducing the need to travel by car/lorry and improving sustainable travel choice		
4.1 Is the location close to a major rail station? (same score as 3.1a)	0	The southern half of the site is located 801 to 1200m from Hedge End Railway Station.
4.2 Is the location close to a minor rail station? (same score as 3.1b)	--	The site is located further than 1200m from a minor railway station.

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
4.3 Is the location close to a frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1c)	--	The site is located further than 800m from a frequent bus route.
4.4 Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1d)	--	The site is located further than 800m from a semi-frequent bus route.
4.5(a) Will residential development at the location be close to a major employment centre? (same score as 3.1e)	-	The site is located just further than 1000m from a major employment centre.
4.5(b) Will employment development at the location be close to a major population centre?	0	Development would be residential only.
4.6 Are health facilities available locally? (same score as 2.2)	--	The site is located further than 1600m from healthcare facilities.
4.7 Are shopping and related services available locally?	--	The site is further than 800m from a town, district or local centre.
4.8 Is the location close to a Primary school?	--	The site is located further than 1000m from a primary school.
4.9 Is the location close to a Secondary school?	0	The northern end of the site is located 1200 to 1600m from Wyvern College.
4.10 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	0	An existing footpath crosses the northern end of the site.
4.11 Are there Geographical barriers between the location and key facilities/ destinations?	-	The railway tracks 750m to the south east of the site form a geographical barrier between the site and the local centre, primary schools and secondary schools as well as a semi-frequent bus route.
5. Protect and conserve natural resources		
5.1 Will development avoid the sterilisation of mineral resources?	0	The site is not in a Mineral Safeguarding Area or a Mineral Consultation Area.
5.2 Will it result in the loss of higher grade agricultural land?	--	The southern third of the site is in an area of high quality agricultural land. The middle of the site is in an area of medium quality agricultural land and the northern section of the site is in an area of low quality agricultural land.
5.3 Will it use previously developed land?	-	This site consists of greenfield land.
5.4 Will it deliver or support allotments or community farms?	+	There will be no loss of allotments or community farms. The location could be suitable for these but this is unknown.
6. Reduce air, soil, water, light and noise pollution		
6.1 Will the location be affected by significant noise generating uses or Air Quality Management Areas?	0	The site is not within 200m of an A-road, motorway or AQMA.
6.2 Will development increase pollution?	--?	The northern part of site impacted by Botley road noise and air quality. Likely impact on Botley AQMA for traffic generated by development.
7. Plan for the anticipated levels of climate change		
7.1 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure?	0	No loss of existing green infrastructure.
7.2 Is the location at risk from flooding, taking into account of the effects of climate change?	--?	The eastern edge of the site is boarded by Flood Zone 3 and is an area subject to 'intermediate' surface water flooding.
7.3 Will the development be at risk from coastal change? If so, can the Shoreline Management Plan Objectives be supported?	0	This site is not located next to the coast.

SA objective/ criterion	Justification	
8. Minimise Eastleigh's contribution to climate change by reducing the borough's carbon footprint and minimising other greenhouse gas emissions.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
9. Reduce waste generation and disposal, encourage waste prevention and reuse and achieve the sustainable management of waste.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
10. Protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and geodiversity, improving its quality and range.		
10.1 Could development negatively impact or lead to loss of an internationally or nationally designated site (either alone or in combination)?	-	Ford lake runs along the east of the site and then on into the Solent and Southampton Water SPA, SAC and Ramsar site.. Potential for in-combination effects on water quality within the Solent and Southampton Water SPA, SAC and Ramsar site. Potential mitigation has been identified e.g. a 20m buffer will be required and Naturalised SuDS with three forms of filtration should be required throughout the sites to preserve water quality.
10.2 Could development negatively impact or lead or loss of a locally designated biodiversity site (either alone or in combination)?	--	Three SINC's are present within the site; Scorleys Copse, Scorleys Copse Rush Pasture and Alder Strip. Development of the site could cause loss or fragmentation of these and an increase in recreational impacts and urban edge effects.
10.3 Will the development adversely affect areas with other nature conservation value, as identified in Biodiversity Action Plans (BAPs)?	--	The site supports significant areas of woodland, which would be lost to development.
10.4 Will the development adversely impact the biodiversity network (e.g. Priority Biodiversity Links (PBLs), Priority Biodiversity Areas (PBAs), hedgerows and other corridors for species movement)?	--	The Chalcroft PBL covers the site. The EBC ecological appraisal suggests that this corridor should remain connected for biodiversity.
10.5 Will the development adversely affect ancient woodland?	--	Ancient woodland is present on the site. If the site is fully developed a significant area of ancient woodland would be lost.
11. Enhance the Borough's multifunctional green infrastructure networks.		
11.1 Will the development affect TPO trees?	-?	Yes- TPO 782-E covering Mixed Species. TPO 29-E covering all tree species.
11.2 Can the location be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	0	An existing footpath crosses the northern end of the site.
11.3 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure? (same score as 7.1)	0	No loss of existing green infrastructure.
12. Protect, enhance and manage the character and appearance of the landscape and townscape, maintaining and strengthening distinctiveness and its special qualities.		
12.1 Will development adversely affect the separation of neighbouring settlements?	--	The site was assessed as having very poor / poor potential for development in relation to avoiding settlement coalescence.
12.2 Will it protect the character of the countryside, coast, towns and/or villages, including views and settings?	--	The landscape within this site was assessed as having high / moderate sensitivity to development.
13. Protect and enhance and manage buildings,		

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
monuments, features, sites, places, areas and landscapes of archaeological, historical and cultural heritage importance.		
13.1 Will the development protect and enhance listed buildings and their settings, conservation areas, archaeological sites, historic landscapes and other sites of local importance for heritage?	0	Development of this site will not affect heritage assets.

Site 26: Braxells Farm Winchester Road

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
1. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified local needs, including affordability and special needs		
1.1 Will the development provide a significant contribution towards meeting identified affordable housing needs?	+?	The site has the capacity to provide 14 dwellings.
1.2 Will it provide other elements of identified housing need e.g. housing for older persons, self-build, support housing?	?	Uncertainty is recorded against all residential site options as information on provision of other elements of housing need is not available on a consistent basis.
2. Safeguard and improve community health, safety and wellbeing		
2.1 Are community facilities (community hall or library) available locally?	-	The site is located further than 800m from community facilities.
2.2 Are health facilities available locally?	-	The site is located 1201 to 1600m from St Luke's Surgery.
2.3 What effect would the development have on local provision of sports pitches and facilities?	0	Development would not lead to loss of existing sports pitches and facilities.
2.4 Is public open space available locally?	0	The site is located within 301 to 800m of public open space including Watkin Road green route and Cheltenham Gardens.
2.5 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network?	-	No footpath or cycle path cross the site or run adjacent to its boundary.
3. Develop a dynamic and diverse economy		
3.1(a) Is the location close to a major rail station?	+	The site is located within 800m of Hedge End Railway Station
3.1 (b) Is the location close to a minor rail station?	--	The site is not located within 1200m of a minor railway station.
3.1 (c) Is the location close to a frequent bus route?	--	The site is not located within 800m of a frequent bus route.
3.1 (d) Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route?	-	The western half of the site is located within 401 to 800m of the semi-frequent First 8 bus route.
3.1 (e) Is the location close to a major employment centre?	-	The site is located more than 1000m from a major employment centre.
3.2 Will the proposed development contribute towards meeting the need for new industrial, office or warehousing floorspace?	-	This site would be developed for residential use, therefore additional employment floorspace would not be provided.
3.3 Will the proposed development result in a net loss of existing employment land, or land which would be suitable for employment purposes?	-	Development will lead to loss of employment land, the site is in B1a, B2 and B8 use.
3.4 Will the proposed development increase the amount of commercial uses and other facilities in town, district or local centres?	0	The site is not located within a town, district or local centre.
4. Reduce road traffic and congestion through improved accessibility to services homes and jobs; reducing the need to travel by car/lorry and improving sustainable travel choice		
4.1 Is the location close to a major rail station? (same score as 3.1a)	+	The site is located within 800m of Hedge End Railway Station
4.2 Is the location close to a minor rail station? (same score as 3.1b)	--	The site is not located within 1200m of a minor railway station.
4.3 Is the location close to a frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1c)	--	The site is not located within 800m of a frequent bus route.

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
4.4 Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1d)	-	The western half of the site is located within 401 to 800m of the semi-frequent First 8 bus route.
4.5(a) Will residential development at the location be close to a major employment centre? (same score as 3.1e)	-	The site is located more than 1000m from a major employment centre.
4.5(b) Will employment development at the location be close to a major population centre?	0	Development would be residential only.
4.6 Are health facilities available locally? (same score as 2.2)	-	The site is located 1201 to 1600 from St Luke's Surgery.
4.7 Are shopping and related services available locally?	--	The site is further than 800m from a town, district or local centre.
4.8 Is the location close to a Primary school?	--	The site is located further than 1000m from a primary school.
4.9 Is the location close to a Secondary school?	-	The site is located 1601 to 2000m from Wildern School.
4.10 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	-	No footpath or cycle path cross the site or run adjacent to its boundary.
4.11 Are there Geographical barriers between the location and key facilities/ destinations?	-	The railway line 500m to the south west of the site forms a geographical barrier between the site and schools, the doctors surgery and the local centre.
5. Protect and conserve natural resources		
5.1 Will development avoid the sterilisation of mineral resources?	0	The site is not located in a Mineral Safeguarding Area or Mineral Consultation Area.
5.2 Will it result in the loss of higher grade agricultural land?	--	The northern half of the site is located in an area of high quality agricultural land, the remainder of the site is in an area of medium quality agricultural land.
5.3 Will it use previously developed land?	-	This site consists of greenfield land.
5.4 Will it deliver or support allotments or community farms?	+?	There will be no loss of allotments or community farms. The location could be suitable for these but this is unknown.
6. Reduce air, soil, water, light and noise pollution		
6.1 Will the location be affected by significant noise generating uses or Air Quality Management Areas?	0	The site is not within 200m of an A-road, motorway or AQMA.
6.2 Will development increase pollution?	-?	Noise impact Winchester Road, limited options for use of layout to mitigate noise. Adjacent commercial uses.
7. Plan for the anticipated levels of climate change		
7.1 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure?	0	No loss of existing green infrastructure.
7.2 Is the location at risk from flooding, taking into account of the effects of climate change?	0	The site is not located in an area of surface water flood risk and is not in Flood Zone 2 or 3.
7.3 Will the development be at risk from coastal change? If so, can the Shoreline Management Plan Objectives be supported?	0	This site is not located on the coast.
8. Minimise Eastleigh's contribution to climate change by reducing the borough's carbon footprint and minimising other greenhouse gas emissions.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		

SA objective/ criterion	Justification	
9. Reduce waste generation and disposal, encourage waste prevention and reuse and achieve the sustainable management of waste.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
10. Protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and geodiversity, improving its quality and range.		
10.1 Could development negatively impact or lead to loss of an internationally or nationally designated site (either alone or in combination)?	-	Ford Lake runs to the north of the site and runs into the Solent and Southampton Water SPA, SAC and Ramsar site. Mitigation is proposed in the form of Naturalised SuDS with three forms of filtration to preserve water quality.
10.2 Could development negatively impact or lead to loss of a locally designated biodiversity site (either alone or in combination)?	-?	The site is just south of Ford Lake, although this is not designated along this stretch of Hedge end north and this site are developed there may be an adverse in combination effect with other nearby development on water quality.
10.3 Will the development adversely affect areas with other nature conservation value, as identified in Biodiversity Action Plans (BAPs)?	0	Development will not adversely affect areas with other nature conservation value. Tree lines connecting into the SuDS should be retained.
10.4 Will the development adversely impact the biodiversity network (e.g. Priority Biodiversity Links (PBLs), Priority Biodiversity Areas (PBAs), hedgerows and other corridors for species movement)?	0	Development will not adversely impact the biodiversity network.
10.5 Will the development adversely affect ancient woodland?	0	Development will not adversely affect ancient woodland.
11. Enhance the Borough's multifunctional green infrastructure networks.		
11.1 Will the development affect TPO trees?	0	Development of the site will not affect TPO trees.
11.2 Can the location be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	-	No footpaths or cycle paths cross the site or run adjacent to its boundary.
11.3 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure? (same score as 7.1)	0	No loss of existing green infrastructure.
12. Protect, enhance and manage the character and appearance of the landscape and townscape, maintaining and strengthening distinctiveness and its special qualities.		
12.1 Will development adversely affect the separation of neighbouring settlements?	-	The site was assessed as having very average potential for development in relation to avoiding settlement coalescence.
12.2 Will it protect the character of the countryside, coast, towns and/or villages, including views and settings?	0	The landscape within this site was assessed as having low sensitivity to development.
13. Protect and enhance and manage buildings, monuments, features, sites, places, areas and landscapes of archaeological, historical and cultural heritage importance.		
13.1 Will the development protect and enhance listed buildings and their settings, conservation areas, archaeological sites, historic landscapes and other sites of local importance for heritage?	0	Development of this site will not affect heritage assets.

Site 27: Land north of Blundell Lane and south of M27

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
1. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified local needs, including affordability and special needs		
1.1 Will the development provide a significant contribution towards meeting identified affordable housing needs?	++	The site has the capacity to provide 52 dwellings.
1.2 Will it provide other elements of identified housing need e.g. housing for older persons, self-build, support housing?	?	Uncertainty is recorded against all residential site options as information on provision of other elements of housing need is not available on a consistent basis.
2. Safeguard and improve community health, safety and wellbeing		
2.1 Are community facilities (community hall or library) available locally?	0	The western half of the site is located 401 to 800m from Bursledon Village Hall.
2.2 Are health facilities available locally?	0	The western half of the site is located 801 to 1200m from Bursledon GP Practice.
2.3 What effect would the development have on local provision of sports pitches and facilities?	0	Development would not lead to loss of existing sports pitches and facilities.
2.4 Is public open space available locally?	+	The western edge of the site is located within 300m of Bridge Close amenity space. The remainder of the site is within 800m of Long Lane Recreation Ground.
2.5 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network?	0	An existing footpath runs adjacent to the eastern edge of the site.
3. Develop a dynamic and diverse economy		
3.1(a) Is the location close to a major rail station?	--	The site is located further than 1400m from a major railway station.
3.1 (b) Is the location close to a minor rail station?	-	The site is located 401 to 1200m from a Bursledon Railway Station.
3.1 (c) Is the location close to a frequent bus route?	++	The majority of the site is located within 400m of the frequent First X4/X5 bus service.
3.1 (d) Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route?	--	The site is located further than 800m from a semi-frequent bus route.
3.1 (e) Is the location close to a major employment centre?	-	The site is located more than 1000m from a major employment centre.
3.2 Will the proposed development contribute towards meeting the need for new industrial, office or warehousing floorspace?	-	This site would be developed for residential use, therefore additional employment floorspace would not be provided.
3.3 Will the proposed development result in a net loss of existing employment land, or land which would be suitable for employment purposes?	0	The SLAA does not identify this site as being suitable for employment uses and development would not lead to loss of any existing employment land.
3.4 Will the proposed development increase the amount of commercial uses and other facilities in town, district or local centres?	0	The site is not located within a town, district or local centre.
4. Reduce road traffic and congestion through improved accessibility to services homes and jobs; reducing the need to travel by car/lorry and improving sustainable travel choice		
4.1 Is the location close to a major rail station? (same score as 3.1a)	--	The site is located further than 1400m from a major railway station.
4.2 Is the location close to a minor rail station? (same score as 3.1b)	-	The site is located 401 to 1200m from a Bursledon Railway Station.
4.3 Is the location close to a frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1c)	++	The majority of the site is located within 400m of the frequent First X4/X5 bus service.

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
4.4 Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1d)	--	The site is located further than 800m from a semi-frequent bus route.
4.5(a) Will residential development at the location be close to a major employment centre? (same score as 3.1e)	-	The site is located more than 1000m from a major employment centre.
4.5(b) Will employment development at the location be close to a major population centre?	0	Development would be residential only.
4.6 Are health facilities available locally? (same score as 2.2)	0	The western half of the site is located 801 to 1200m from Bursledon GP Practice.
4.7 Are shopping and related services available locally?	--	The site is located further than 800m from a town, district or local centre.
4.8 Is the location close to a Primary school?	-	The eastern half of the site is located within 801 to 1000m of Bursledon Junior School.
4.9 Is the location close to a Secondary school?	--	The site is located more than 2000m from a secondary school.
4.10 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	0	An existing footpath runs adjacent to the eastern edge of the site.
4.11 Are there Geographical barriers between the location and key facilities/ destinations?	+	No geographical barriers exist on the most direct walking routes to the destinations above.
5. Protect and conserve natural resources		
5.1 Will development avoid the sterilisation of mineral resources?	0	The site is not in a Mineral Safeguarding Area or a Mineral Consultation Area.
5.2 Will it result in the loss of higher grade agricultural land?	--	The site is located entirely in an area of high quality agricultural land.
5.3 Will it use previously developed land?	-	This site consists of greenfield land.
5.4 Will it deliver or support allotments or community farms?	+?	There will be no loss of allotments or community farms. The location could be suitable for these but this is unknown.
6. Reduce air, soil, water, light and noise pollution		
6.1 Will the location be affected by significant noise generating uses or Air Quality Management Areas?	-?	The site is located within 200m of the M27, and the southern corner of the site is also located within 200m of the railway line.
6.2 Will development increase pollution?	--?	Road Traffic noise impact from M27 is significant, noise impacts from adjacent commercial land uses. Air quality impact from M27 may affect layout. Separation between noise sensitive development and roads will be necessary. Noise impact from train noise arising from the railway. Air quality – Impact from M27 significant. Separation between sensitive development and roads will be necessary. Careful consideration of traffic impacts generated by this development on existing AQMA in Hamble Lane, and on adjacent road network.
7. Plan for the anticipated levels of climate change		
7.1 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure?	0	No loss of existing green infrastructure.
7.2 Is the location at risk from flooding, taking into account of the effects of climate change?	-?	The eastern corner of the site is subject to 'less' surface water flood risk. A very small proportion of the site (<1%) along the eastern edge is covered by flood zone 3. This has not been reflected in the score however, it should be noted as this site is located near to a large area of Flood Zone 3 and is near to the River Hamble.

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
7.3 Will the development be at risk from coastal change? If so, can the Shoreline Management Plan Objectives be supported?	0	This site is not located near the coast.
8. Minimise Eastleigh's contribution to climate change by reducing the borough's carbon footprint and minimising other greenhouse gas emissions.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
9. Reduce waste generation and disposal, encourage waste prevention and reuse and achieve the sustainable management of waste.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
10. Protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and geodiversity, improving its quality and range.		
10.1 Could development negatively impact or lead to loss of an internationally or nationally designated site (either alone or in combination)?	--	The site is within 100m of Solent Maritime SAC and is adjacent to supporting habitat for the SAC. Development of the site would be likely to lead to impacts on the SAC due to either deterioration of supporting habitats or changes in hydrological processes.
10.2 Could development negatively impact or lead or loss of a locally designated biodiversity site (either alone or in combination)?	--	The site is adjacent to Brixdone saltmarsh and mudflat SINC. Development of this site could impact on the sensitive balance between fresh and saltwater impacts leading to adverse effects.
10.3 Will the development adversely affect areas with other nature conservation value, as identified in Biodiversity Action Plans (BAPs)?	--	The site has significant woodland cover, which could be lost to development.
10.4 Will the development adversely impact the biodiversity network (e.g. Priority Biodiversity Links (PBLs), Priority Biodiversity Areas (PBAs), hedgerows and other corridors for species movement)?	--	The site incorporates the M27 PBL. The EBC ecological assessment suggests that this corridor should remain connected for biodiversity.
10.5 Will the development adversely affect ancient woodland?	0	The development will not adversely affect ancient woodland.
11. Enhance the Borough's multifunctional green infrastructure networks.		
11.1 Will the development affect TPO trees?	-?	Yes - TPO 77-H covering all tree species, TPO 77-H covering 7 chestnuts, TPO 77-H covering 9 oaks.
11.2 Can the location be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	0	An existing footpath runs adjacent to the eastern edge of the site.
11.3 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure? (same score as 7.1)	0	No loss of existing green infrastructure.
12. Protect, enhance and manage the character and appearance of the landscape and townscape, maintaining and strengthening distinctiveness and its special qualities.		
12.1 Will development adversely affect the separation of neighbouring settlements?	0	The site was assessed as having good / very good potential for development in relation to avoiding settlement coalescence.
12.2 Will it protect the character of the countryside, coast, towns and/or villages, including views and settings?	-	The landscape within this site was assessed as having moderate sensitivity to development.
13. Protect and enhance and manage buildings, monuments, features, sites, places, areas and landscapes of archaeological, historical and cultural heritage importance.		

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
13.1 Will the development protect and enhance listed buildings and their settings, conservation areas, archaeological sites, historic landscapes and other sites of local importance for heritage?	-?	Maidenstone House is located on the opposite side of Blundell Lane to the south-west of the site. It has a garden from the early 1800's previously owned by the Bishop of Winchester.

Site 28: Land north of Bridge Road

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
1. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified local needs, including affordability and special needs		
1.1 Will the development provide a significant contribution towards meeting identified affordable housing needs?	+?	The site has the capacity to provide 11 dwellings.
1.2 Will it provide other elements of identified housing need e.g. housing for older persons, self-build, support housing?	?	Uncertainty is recorded against all residential site options as information on provision of other elements of housing need is not available on a consistent basis.
2. Safeguard and improve community health, safety and wellbeing		
2.1 Are community facilities (community hall or library) available locally?	0	The site is located within 401 to 800m from Bursledon Village Hall.
2.2 Are health facilities available locally?	0	The site is located within 801 to 1200m from Bursledon GP Practice.
2.3 What effect would the development have on local provision of sports pitches and facilities?	0	Development would not lead to loss of existing sports pitches or facilities.
2.4 Is public open space available locally?	+	The site is located within 300m of public open space including Bridge Close and Bursledon Heights amenity space.
2.5 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network?	-	No footpath or cycle path crosses the site or runs adjacent to its boundary.
3. Develop a dynamic and diverse economy		
3.1(a) Is the location close to a major rail station?	--	The site is located more than 1400m from a major railway station.
3.1 (b) Is the location close to a minor rail station?	+	The southern end of the site is located within 400m of Bursledon Railway Station.
3.1 (c) Is the location close to a frequent bus route?	++	The site is located within 400m of the frequent First X4/X5 bus route.
3.1 (d) Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route?	--	The site is not located within 800m of a frequent bus route.
3.1 (e) Is the location close to a major employment centre?	-	The site is located further than 1000m from a major employment centre.
3.2 Will the proposed development contribute towards meeting the need for new industrial, office or warehousing floorspace?	-	This site would be developed for residential use, therefore additional employment floorspace would not be provided.
3.3 Will the proposed development result in a net loss of existing employment land, or land which would be suitable for employment purposes?	0	The SLAA does not identify this site as being suitable for employment uses and development would not lead to loss of any existing employment land.
3.4 Will the proposed development increase the amount of commercial uses and other facilities in town, district or local centres?	0	The site is not located within a town, district or local centre.
4. Reduce road traffic and congestion through improved accessibility to services homes and jobs; reducing the need to travel by car/lorry and improving sustainable travel choice		
4.1 Is the location close to a major rail station? (same score as 3.1a)	--	The site is located more than 1400m from a major railway station.
4.2 Is the location close to a minor rail station? (same score as 3.1b)	+	The southern end of the site is located within 400m of Bursledon Railway Station.
4.3 Is the location close to a frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1c)	++	The site is located within 400m of the frequent First X4/X5 bus route.

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
4.4 Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1d)	--	The site is not located within 800m of a frequent bus route.
4.5(a) Will residential development at the location be close to a major employment centre? (same score as 3.1e)	-	The site is located further than 1000m from a major employment centre.
4.5(b) Will employment development at the location be close to a major population centre?	0	Development would be residential only.
4.6 Are health facilities available locally? (same score as 2.2)	0	The site is located within 801 to 1200m from Bursledon GP Practice.
4.7 Are shopping and related services available locally?	-	The site is located within 601 to 800m from a district or local centre.
4.8 Is the location close to a Primary school?	0	The site is located 601 to 800m from Bursledon Junior School.
4.9 Is the location close to a Secondary school?	--	The site is located just further than 2000m from a secondary school.
4.10 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	-	No footpath or cycle path crosses the site or run adjacent to its boundary.
4.11 Are there Geographical barriers between the location and key facilities/ destinations?	+	No geographical barriers exist on the most direct walking routes to the destinations above.
5. Protect and conserve natural resources		
5.1 Will development avoid the sterilisation of mineral resources?	0	The site is not located in a Mineral Safeguarding Area or Mineral Consultation Area.
5.2 Will it result in the loss of higher grade agricultural land?	--	The site is located entirely in an area of high quality agricultural land.
5.3 Will it use previously developed land?	-	This site consists of greenfield land.
5.4 Will it deliver or support allotments or community farms?	+?	There will be no loss of allotments or community farms. The location could be suitable for these but this is unknown.
6. Reduce air, soil, water, light and noise pollution		
6.1 Will the location be affected by significant noise generating uses or Air Quality Management Areas?	-?	The site is located within 200m of the A27.
6.2 Will development increase pollution?	--?	Noise and air quality impacts form A27 significant, brownfield impact issue.
7. Plan for the anticipated levels of climate change		
7.1 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure?	0	No loss of existing green infrastructure.
7.2 Is the location at risk from flooding, taking into account of the effects of climate change?	0	The site is not located in an area of surface water flood risk and is not in Flood Zone 2 or 3.
7.3 Will the development be at risk from coastal change? If so, can the Shoreline Management Plan Objectives be supported?	0	This site is not located by the coast.
8. Minimise Eastleigh's contribution to climate change by reducing the borough's carbon footprint and minimising other greenhouse gas emissions.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
9. Reduce waste generation and disposal, encourage waste prevention and reuse and achieve the sustainable management of waste.		

SA objective/ criterion	Justification
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.	
10. Protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and geodiversity, improving its quality and range.	
10.1 Could development negatively impact or lead to loss of an internationally or nationally designated site (either alone or in combination)?	-- The site is close to Brixdone saltmarsh and mudflat supporting habitat for the Solent Maritime SAC and development is likely to impact on the sensitive saltwater / freshwater balance.
10.2 Could development negatively impact or lead or loss of a locally designated biodiversity site (either alone or in combination)?	-- Brixdone saltmarsh and mudflat SINC, located close to the site, is likely to be affected by changes in hydrology. Land North of Bridge Road SINC is located just to the north of the site. Potential for increased recreational and urban edge effects.
10.3 Will the development adversely affect areas with other nature conservation value, as identified in Biodiversity Action Plans (BAPs)?	- Wetland outside of the SINC and maritime grassland are likely to be impacted by recreational pressure arising from development of this site.
10.4 Will the development adversely impact the biodiversity network (e.g. Priority Biodiversity Links (PBLs), Priority Biodiversity Areas (PBAs), hedgerows and other corridors for species movement)?	0 Development will not adversely impact the biodiversity network.
10.5 Will the development adversely affect ancient woodland?	0 Development will not adversely affect ancient woodland.
11. Enhance the Borough's multifunctional green infrastructure networks.	
11.1 Will the development affect TPO trees?	-? Yes - TPO 746-E covering all tree species.
11.2 Can the location be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	- No footpath or cycle path crosses the site or run adjacent to its boundary.
11.3 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure? (same score as 7.1)	0 No loss of existing green infrastructure.
12. Protect, enhance and manage the character and appearance of the landscape and townscape, maintaining and strengthening distinctiveness and its special qualities.	
12.1 Will development adversely affect the separation of neighbouring settlements?	0 The site was assessed as having good / very good potential for development in relation to avoiding settlement coalescence.
12.2 Will it protect the character of the countryside, coast, towns and/or villages, including views and settings?	- The landscape within this site was assessed as having moderate sensitivity to development.
13. Protect and enhance and manage buildings, monuments, features, sites, places, areas and landscapes of archaeological, historical and cultural heritage importance.	
13.1 Will the development protect and enhance listed buildings and their settings, conservation areas, archaeological sites, historic landscapes and other sites of local importance for heritage?	0 Development of this site will not affect heritage assets.

Site 29: Land at Providence Hill and Oakhill

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
1. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified local needs, including affordability and special needs		
1.1 Will the development provide a significant contribution towards meeting identified affordable housing needs?	+	The site has the capacity to provide 10 dwellings.
1.2 Will it provide other elements of identified housing need e.g. housing for older persons, self-build, support housing?	?	Uncertainty is recorded against all residential site options as information on provision of other elements of housing need is not available on a consistent basis.
2. Safeguard and improve community health, safety and wellbeing		
2.1 Are community facilities (community hall or library) available locally?	+	The site is located 401 to 800m from the Lowford Centre and within 400m of Bursledon Village Hall
2.2 Are health facilities available locally?	+	The site is located 401 to 800m from Bursledon GP Surgery.
2.3 What effect would the development have on local provision of sports pitches and facilities?	0	Development of the site will not result in the loss of existing sports pitches or facilities.
2.4 Is public open space available locally?	+	The site is located within 300m of existing public open space including Long Lane Recreation Ground.
2.5 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network?	-	No footpath or cycle path crosses the site or is adjacent to its boundary.
3. Develop a dynamic and diverse economy		
3.1(a) Is the location close to a major rail station?	--	The site is located further than 1400m from a major railway station.
3.1 (b) Is the location close to a minor rail station?	-	The site is located 401 to 1200m from Bursledon Railway Station.
3.1 (c) Is the location close to a frequent bus route?	++	The site is located within 400m of the frequent First X4/X5 bus route.
3.1 (d) Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route?	--	The site is located more than 800m from a semi-frequent bus route.
3.1 (e) Is the location close to a major employment centre?	-	The site is located more than 1000m from a major employment centre.
3.2 Will the proposed development contribute towards meeting the need for new industrial, office or warehousing floorspace?	-	This site would be developed for residential use, therefore additional employment floorspace would not be provided.
3.3 Will the proposed development result in a net loss of existing employment land, or land which would be suitable for employment purposes?	-	The SLAA for indicated that development of this site may result in the loss of some open storage.
3.4 Will the proposed development increase the amount of commercial uses and other facilities in town, district or local centres?	0	This site is not located within a town, district and local centre.
4. Reduce road traffic and congestion through improved accessibility to services homes and jobs; reducing the need to travel by car/lorry and improving sustainable travel choice		
4.1 Is the location close to a major rail station? (same score as 3.1a)	--	The site is located further than 1400m from a major railway station.
4.2 Is the location close to a minor rail station? (same score as 3.1b)	-	The site is located 401 to 1200m from Bursledon Railway Station.
4.3 Is the location close to a frequent bus route?	++	The site is located within 400m of the frequent First

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
(same score as 3.1c)		X4/X5 bus route.
4.4 Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1d)	--	The site is located more than 800m from a semi-frequent bus route.
4.5(a) Will residential development at the location be close to a major employment centre? (same score as 3.1e)	-	The site is located more than 1000m from a major employment centre.
4.5(b) Will employment development at the location be close to a major population centre?	0	Development would be residential only.
4.6 Are health facilities available locally? (same score as 2.2)	+	The site is located 401 to 800m from Bursledon GP Surgery.
4.7 Are shopping and related services available locally?	+	The site is located 201 to 400m from Lowford / Portsmouth Road Local Centre.
4.8 Is the location close to a Primary school?	+	The site is located 401 to 600m from Bursledon Junior School.
4.9 Is the location close to a Secondary school?	--	The site is located further than 2000m from a secondary school.
4.10 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	-	No footpath or cycle path crosses the site or is adjacent to its boundary.
4.11 Are there Geographical barriers between the location and key facilities/ destinations?	+	There are no geographical barriers on the most direct walking route to the above destinations.
5. Protect and conserve natural resources		
5.1 Will development avoid the sterilisation of mineral resources?	0	The site is not located in a Mineral Safeguarding Area or a Mineral Consultation Area.
5.2 Will it result in the loss of higher grade agricultural land?	0	The site is located entirely in an area of low quality agricultural land.
5.3 Will it use previously developed land?	+/-	The southern half of the site is previously developed land while the northern half of the site is greenfield land.
5.4 Will it deliver or support allotments or community farms?	+?	There will be no loss of allotments or community farms. The location could be suitable for these but this is unknown.
6. Reduce air, soil, water, light and noise pollution		
6.1 Will the location be affected by significant noise generating uses or Air Quality Management Areas?	-?	The site is located within 200m of the A27 and the M27.
6.2 Will development increase pollution?	--?	Road Traffic noise impact from A27 and M27 significant. Separation between noise sensitive development and roads will be necessary. Adjacent to former landfill. Development site adjacent to A27 with elevated NO2, separation between sensitive development and roads will be necessary. Careful consideration of traffic impacts generated by this development on existing AQMA at Hamble Lane.
7. Plan for the anticipated levels of climate change		
7.1 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure?	0	No loss of existing green infrastructure.
7.2 Is the location at risk from flooding, taking into account of the effects of climate change?	--?	The site is almost entirely covered by areas subject to 'intermediate' surface water flood risk.
7.3 Will the development be at risk from coastal change? If so, can the Shoreline Management Plan Objectives be supported?	0	This site is not near the coast.

SA objective/ criterion	Justification	
8. Minimise Eastleigh's contribution to climate change by reducing the borough's carbon footprint and minimising other greenhouse gas emissions.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
9. Reduce waste generation and disposal, encourage waste prevention and reuse and achieve the sustainable management of waste.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
10. Protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and geodiversity, improving its quality and range.		
10.1 Could development negatively impact or lead to loss of an internationally or nationally designated site (either alone or in combination)?	-	Badnum Creek and another unnamed watercourse run through the site. These streams run into the Hamble at the Solent and Southampton Water SAC, SPA and Ramsar site. Potential for in combination effects with other development on water quality. EBC Ecological Appraisal suggests 20m buffers for both streams and the use of SuDS with three forms of filtration.
10.2 Could development negatively impact or lead or loss of a locally designated biodiversity site (either alone or in combination)?	0	Development will not negatively impact or lead to loss of a locally designated biodiversity site.
10.3 Will the development adversely affect areas with other nature conservation value, as identified in Biodiversity Action Plans (BAPs)?	-?	Reptiles are known to be present in the area, but unknown which areas of the site are being used.
10.4 Will the development adversely impact the biodiversity network (e.g. Priority Biodiversity Links (PBLs), Priority Biodiversity Areas (PBAs), hedgerows and other corridors for species movement)?	--	The northern half of the site is covered by the M27 PBL. This corridor should remain connected for biodiversity. There are significant tree belts connecting into Windmill Woods SINC. EBC Ecological Appraisal suggests these should be retained and buffered.
10.5 Will the development adversely affect ancient woodland?	0	Development will not adversely affect ancient woodland.
11. Enhance the Borough's multifunctional green infrastructure networks.		
11.1 Will the development affect TPO trees?	-?	Yes - TPO 143-E covering all tree species.
11.2 Can the location be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	-	No footpath or cycle path crosses the site or is adjacent to its boundary.
11.3 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure? (same score as 7.1)	0	No loss of existing green infrastructure.
12. Protect, enhance and manage the character and appearance of the landscape and townscape, maintaining and strengthening distinctiveness and its special qualities.		
12.1 Will development adversely affect the separation of neighbouring settlements?	0	The site was assessed as having good / very good potential for development in relation to avoiding settlement coalescence.
12.2 Will it protect the character of the countryside, coast, towns and/or villages, including views and settings?	-	The landscape within the site is assessed as having moderate / low sensitivity to development.
13. Protect and enhance and manage buildings, monuments, features, sites, places, areas and landscapes of archaeological, historical and cultural heritage importance.		

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
13.1 Will the development protect and enhance listed buildings and their settings, conservation areas, archaeological sites, historic landscapes and other sites of local importance for heritage?	0	Development of this site will not affect heritage assets.

Site 30: Land north of Providence Hill and the Morellos and Forge Mount, Providence Hill

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
1. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified local needs, including affordability and special needs		
1.1 Will the development provide a significant contribution towards meeting identified affordable housing needs?	++	The site has the capacity to provide 19 dwellings.
1.2 Will it provide other elements of identified housing need e.g. housing for older persons, self-build, support housing?	?	Uncertainty is recorded against all residential site options as information on provision of other elements of housing need is not available on a consistent basis.
2. Safeguard and improve community health, safety and wellbeing		
2.1 Are community facilities (community hall or library) available locally?	+	The southern third of the site is within 400m of Lowford Community Library and the Pilands Wood Centre.
2.2 Are health facilities available locally?	++	The majority of the site is located within 400m of Bursledon GP Practice.
2.3 What effect would the development have on local provision of sports pitches and facilities?	0	Development would not lead to loss of existing sports pitches and facilities.
2.4 Is public open space available locally?	+	The site is located within 300m of public open space, including Lionheart Way Ecology Park and Devonshire Gardens.
2.5 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network?	0	There is an existing footpath adjacent to the site's north western corner although this is separated from the site by the A27.
3. Develop a dynamic and diverse economy		
3.1(a) Is the location close to a major rail station?	--	The site is located further than 1400m from a major railway station.
3.1 (b) Is the location close to a minor rail station?	-	The eastern third of the site is located within 401 to 1200m of Bursledon Railway Station.
3.1 (c) Is the location close to a frequent bus route?	++	The site is located within 400m of the frequent First X4/X5 bus route.
3.1 (d) Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route?	--	The site is located more than 800m from a semi-frequent bus route.
3.1 (e) Is the location close to a major employment centre?	-	The site is located further than 1000m from a major employment centre.
3.2 Will the proposed development contribute towards meeting the need for new industrial, office or warehousing floorspace?	-	This site would be developed for residential use, therefore additional employment floorspace would not be provided.
3.3 Will the proposed development result in a net loss of existing employment land, or land which would be suitable for employment purposes?	0	The SLAA does not identify the site as being suitable for employment uses and development would not lead to the loss of any existing employment land.
3.4 Will the proposed development increase the amount of commercial uses and other facilities in town, district or local centres?	0	The site is not located within a town, district or local centre.
4. Reduce road traffic and congestion through improved accessibility to services homes and jobs; reducing the need to travel by car/lorry and improving sustainable travel choice		
4.1 Is the location close to a major rail station? (same score as 3.1a)	--	The site is located further than 1400m from a major railway station.
4.2 Is the location close to a minor rail station? (same score as 3.1b)	-	The eastern third of the site is located within 1200m of Bursledon Railway Station.

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
4.3 Is the location close to a frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1c)	++	The site is located within 400m of the frequent First X4/X5 bus route.
4.4 Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1d)	--	The site is located more than 800m from a semi-frequent bus route.
4.5(a) Will residential development at the location be close to a major employment centre? (same score as 3.1e)	-	The site is located further than 1000m from a major employment centre.
4.5(b) Will employment development at the location be close to a major population centre?	0	Development would be residential only.
4.6 Are health facilities available locally? (same score as 2.2)	++	The majority of the site is located within 400m of Bursledon GP Practice.
4.7 Are shopping and related services available locally?	+	The site is within 201 to 400m from a town, district or local centre.
4.8 Is the location close to a Primary school?	0	The site is within 601 to 800m of Bursledon Junior School.
4.9 Is the location close to a Secondary school?	--	The site is located further than 2000m from a secondary school.
4.10 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	0	There is an existing footpath adjacent to the site's north western corner however, this is separated from the site by the A27.
4.11 Are there Geographical barriers between the location and key facilities/ destinations?	+	No geographical barriers exist on the most direct walking routes to the destinations above.
5. Protect and conserve natural resources		
5.1 Will development avoid the sterilisation of mineral resources?	-?	Approximately two thirds of the site is located in a Mineral Consultation Area.
5.2 Will it result in the loss of higher grade agricultural land?	0	The site is located entirely in an area of low quality agricultural land.
5.3 Will it use previously developed land?	-	This site consists of greenfield land.
5.4 Will it deliver or support allotments or community farms?	+?	There will be no loss of allotments or community farms. The location could be suitable for these but this is unknown.
6. Reduce air, soil, water, light and noise pollution		
6.1 Will the location be affected by significant noise generating uses or Air Quality Management Areas?	-?	The site is located within 200m of the A27.
6.2 Will development increase pollution?	--?	Road Traffic noise impact from A27 and M27 significant. Separation between noise sensitive development and roads will be necessary. Adjacent to former landfill. Development site adjacent to A27 with elevated NO2, separation between sensitive development and roads will be necessary. Careful consideration of traffic impacts generated by this development on existing AQMA at Hamble Lane.
7. Plan for the anticipated levels of climate change		
7.1 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure?	0	No loss of existing green infrastructure.
7.2 Is the location at risk from flooding, taking into account of the effects of climate change?	-?	The site contains small areas subject to 'less' surface water flood risk.
7.3 Will the development be at risk from coastal change? If so, can the Shoreline Management Plan Objectives be supported?	0	This site is not located on the coast.

SA objective/ criterion	Justification	
8. Minimise Eastleigh's contribution to climate change by reducing the borough's carbon footprint and minimising other greenhouse gas emissions.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
9. Reduce waste generation and disposal, encourage waste prevention and reuse and achieve the sustainable management of waste.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
10. Protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and geodiversity, improving its quality and range.		
10.1 Could development negatively impact or lead to loss of an internationally or nationally designated site (either alone or in combination)?	-	A watercourse runs along the northern boundary of the sites and runs onto the Solent and Southampton Water SPA, SAC and Ramsar site. Other sites also drain into this water system so there is potential for adverse in combination effects. The EBC ecological appraisal suggests that mitigation could consist of a 20m buffer to the watercourse and use of naturalised SuDS with three forms of filtration.
10.2 Could development negatively impact or lead or loss of a locally designated biodiversity site (either alone or in combination)?	-	Windmill Woods SINC, located to the east of the site could be impacted by recreation pressure from this site and other proposed and permitted sites.
10.3 Will the development adversely affect areas with other nature conservation value, as identified in Biodiversity Action Plans (BAPs)?	--	Much of the site is wooded and likely to be an important part of the network. Headwaters of a small unnamed stream art present along the southern boundary, which the EBC ecological appraisal suggests would need to be buffered. A very small reptile population and foraging bats are known to use the site.
10.4 Will the development adversely impact the biodiversity network (e.g. Priority Biodiversity Links (PBLs), Priority Biodiversity Areas (PBAs), hedgerows and other corridors for species movement)?	0	Development will not adversely impact the biodiversity network.
10.5 Will the development adversely affect ancient woodland?	0	Development will not adversely affect ancient woodland.
11. Enhance the Borough's multifunctional green infrastructure networks.		
11.1 Will the development affect TPO trees?	-?	Yes - TPO 736-E covering all tree species, Bursledon Windmill conservation area.
11.2 Can the location be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	0	There is an existing footpath adjacent to the site's north western corner, although this is separated from the site by the A27.
11.3 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure? (same score as 7.1)	0	No loss of existing green infrastructure.
12. Protect, enhance and manage the character and appearance of the landscape and townscape, maintaining and strengthening distinctiveness and its special qualities.		
12.1 Will development adversely affect the separation of neighbouring settlements?	0	The site was assessed as having good / very good potential for development in relation to avoiding settlement coalescence.
12.2 Will it protect the character of the countryside, coast, towns and/or villages, including views and settings?	-	The landscape within this site was assessed as having moderate / low sensitivity to development.
13. Protect and enhance and manage buildings, monuments, features, sites, places, areas and landscapes of archaeological, historical and cultural heritage importance.		

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
13.1 Will the development protect and enhance listed buildings and their settings, conservation areas, archaeological sites, historic landscapes and other sites of local importance for heritage?	--	Development of the site has potential to adversely affect the setting of a listed windmill.

Site 31: Land south of j8 of M27 south of Peewit Hill west of Dodwell Lane

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
1. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified local needs, including affordability and special needs		
1.1 Will the development provide a significant contribution towards meeting identified affordable housing needs?	++	The site has the capacity to provide 15 dwellings.
1.2 Will it provide other elements of identified housing need e.g. housing for older persons, self-build, support housing?	?	Uncertainty is recorded against all residential site options as information on provision of other elements of housing need is not available on a consistent basis.
2. Safeguard and improve community health, safety and wellbeing		
2.1 Are community facilities (community hall or library) available locally?	-	The site is further than 800m from community facilities.
2.2 Are health facilities available locally?	0	The southern half of the site is located within 801 to 1200m of Bursledon GP Practice.
2.3 What effect would the development have on local provision of sports pitches and facilities?	0	Development of this site would not result in the loss of sports pitches or facilities.
2.4 Is public open space available locally?	0	The site is located within 301 to 800m of public open space including Manor Farm Country Park.
2.5 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network?	-	No footpath or cycle path crosses the site or runs adjacent to its boundary.
3. Develop a dynamic and diverse economy		
3.1(a) Is the location close to a major rail station?	--	The site is located further than 1400m from a major railway station.
3.1 (b) Is the location close to a minor rail station?	--	The site is located more than 1200m from a minor railway station.
3.1 (c) Is the location close to a frequent bus route?	--	The site is located further than 800m from a frequent bus route.
3.1 (d) Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route?	--	The site is located further than 800m from a semi-frequent bus route.
3.1 (e) Is the location close to a major employment centre?	--	The site is located further than 1000m from a major employment centre.
3.2 Will the proposed development contribute towards meeting the need for new industrial, office or warehousing floorspace?	-	This site would be developed for residential use, therefore additional employment floorspace would not be provided.
3.3 Will the proposed development result in a net loss of existing employment land, or land which would be suitable for employment purposes?	-	The SLAA forms indicates that there would be some loss of employment land (a photographic studio) and that the site is suitable for employment uses, including business park, industrial and warehouse.
3.4 Will the proposed development increase the amount of commercial uses and other facilities in town, district or local centres?	0	The site is not located within a town, district or local centre.
4. Reduce road traffic and congestion through improved accessibility to services homes and jobs; reducing the need to travel by car/lorry and improving sustainable travel choice		
4.1 Is the location close to a major rail station? (same score as 3.1a)	--	The site is located further than 1400m from a major railway station.
4.2 Is the location close to a minor rail station? (same score as 3.1b)	--	The site is located more than 1200m from a minor railway station.
4.3 Is the location close to a frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1c)	--	The site is located further than 800m from a frequent bus route.

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
4.4 Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1d)	--	The site is located further than 800m from a semi-frequent bus route.
4.5(a) Will residential development at the location be close to a major employment centre? (same score as 3.1e)	--	The site is located further than 1000m from a major employment centre.
4.5(b) Will employment development at the location be close to a major population centre?	0	Development would be residential only.
4.6 Are health facilities available locally? (same score as 2.2)	0	The southern half of the site is located within 801 to 1200m of Bursledon GP Practice.
4.7 Are shopping and related services available locally?	--	The site is located further than 800m from a town, district or local centre.
4.8 Is the location close to a Primary school?	--	The site is located just further than 1000m from a primary school.
4.9 Is the location close to a Secondary school?	-	The north east corner of the site is located 1601 to 2000m away from Wildern School.
4.10 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	-	No footpath or cycle path crosses the site or runs adjacent to its boundary.
4.11 Are there Geographical barriers between the location and key facilities/ destinations?	0	The M27 forms a geographical barrier between the site and one or two of the above destinations including the doctors surgery.
5. Protect and conserve natural resources		
5.1 Will development avoid the sterilisation of mineral resources?	0	The site is not located in a Minerals Safeguarding Area or in a Minerals Consultation Area.
5.2 Will it result in the loss of higher grade agricultural land?	0	The site is entirely located in an area of low quality agricultural land.
5.3 Will it use previously developed land?	-	This site consists of greenfield land.
5.4 Will it deliver or support allotments or community farms?	+	There will be no loss of allotments or community farms. The location could be suitable for these but this is unknown.
6. Reduce air, soil, water, light and noise pollution		
6.1 Will the location be affected by significant noise generating uses or Air Quality Management Areas?	-?	The site is almost entirely located within 200m of the M27 motorway.
6.2 Will development increase pollution?	--?	Air quality impact from M27 significant. Separation between sensitive development and roads will be necessary. Road Traffic noise impact from M27 significant. Impact from through traffic on new feeder road. Separation between noise sensitive development and roads will be necessary
7. Plan for the anticipated levels of climate change		
7.1 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure?	0	No loss of existing green infrastructure.
7.2 Is the location at risk from flooding, taking into account of the effects of climate change?	-?	The western edge of the site is subject to a small area of 'less' surface water flood risk.
7.3 Will the development be at risk from coastal change? If so, can the Shoreline Management Plan Objectives be supported?	0	This site is not located near the coast.
8. Minimise Eastleigh's contribution to climate change by reducing the borough's carbon footprint and minimising other greenhouse gas emissions.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		

SA objective/ criterion	Justification	
9. Reduce waste generation and disposal, encourage waste prevention and reuse and achieve the sustainable management of waste.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
10. Protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and geodiversity, improving its quality and range.		
10.1 Could development negatively impact or lead to loss of an internationally or nationally designated site (either alone or in combination)?	-	Badnum Creek, which runs through the site, runs into the Solent and Southampton Water SPA, SAC and Ramsar site. There is potential for in-combination effects as a number of developments already drain into the creek. The EBC ecological appraisal suggests mitigation in the form of a 20m buffer along the top of the bank and naturalised SuDS.
10.2 Could development negatively impact or lead or loss of a locally designated biodiversity site (either alone or in combination)?	-	Badnum Creek, which runs through the site, feeds a number of SINCS and ancient woodland gills have been severely compromised within Phase 1 of development of this site. The EBC ecological appraisal recommends that development of the remaining land parcels conserves and buffers the headwater that remain and the creek itself.
10.3 Will the development adversely affect areas with other nature conservation value, as identified in Biodiversity Action Plans (BAPs)?	--	There are headwaters and a stream on site and hedgerows that border the site that link to a wider woodland network. These could be adversely affected by development.
10.4 Will the development adversely impact the biodiversity network (e.g. Priority Biodiversity Links (PBLs), Priority Biodiversity Areas (PBAs), hedgerows and other corridors for species movement)?	--	The M27 PBL is present within the west of the site and could be lost to development. The EBC ecological appraisal recommends that this corridor should remain connected for biodiversity.
10.5 Will the development adversely affect ancient woodland?	0	Development will not adversely affect ancient woodland.
11. Enhance the Borough's multifunctional green infrastructure networks.		
11.1 Will the development affect TPO trees?	0	Development of the site will not affect TPO trees.
11.2 Can the location be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	-	No footpath or cycle path crosses the site or runs adjacent to its boundary.
11.3 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure? (same score as 7.1)	0	No loss of existing green infrastructure.
12. Protect, enhance and manage the character and appearance of the landscape and townscape, maintaining and strengthening distinctiveness and its special qualities.		
12.1 Will development adversely affect the separation of neighbouring settlements?	--	The site was assessed as having very poor / poor potential for development in relation to avoiding settlement coalescence.
12.2 Will it protect the character of the countryside, coast, towns and/or villages, including views and settings?	0	The landscape within this site was assessed as having low sensitivity to development.
13. Protect and enhance and manage buildings, monuments, features, sites, places, areas and landscapes of archaeological, historical and cultural heritage importance.		
13.1 Will the development protect and enhance listed buildings and their settings, conservation areas, archaeological sites, historic landscapes and other sites of local importance for heritage?	-?	Dodwell Cottage is located at the end of Dodwell lane facing the site. High hedges across the front of the building could potentially work to protect the setting of the heritage asset.

Site 32: Heath House Farm

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
1. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified local needs, including affordability and special needs		
1.1 Will the development provide a significant contribution towards meeting identified affordable housing needs?	++	The site has the capacity to provide 38 dwellings.
1.2 Will it provide other elements of identified housing need e.g. housing for older persons, self-build, support housing?	?	Uncertainty is recorded against all residential site options as information on provision of other elements of housing need is not available on a consistent basis.
2. Safeguard and improve community health, safety and wellbeing		
2.1 Are community facilities (community hall or library) available locally?	+	The site is located within 400m of Norman Rodaway Pavilion.
2.2 Are health facilities available locally?	0	A small northern section of the site is located within 801 to 1200m of Hedge End Medical Centre.
2.3 What effect would the development have on local provision of sports pitches and facilities?	0	Development would not lead to loss of existing sports pitches and facilities.
2.4 Is public open space available locally?	+	The site is located within 300m of Manor Farm Country Park as well Norman Rodaway Sport Ground, and other smaller amenity spaces.
2.5 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network?	-	No footpath or cycle path crosses the site or is adjacent to its boundary.
3. Develop a dynamic and diverse economy		
3.1(a) Is the location close to a major rail station?	--	The site is located further than 1400m from a major railway station.
3.1 (b) Is the location close to a minor rail station?	--	The site is located more than 1200m from a minor railway station.
3.1 (c) Is the location close to a frequent bus route?	--	The site is located further than 800m from a frequent bus route.
3.1 (d) Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route?	--	The site is located further than 800m from a semi-frequent bus route.
3.1 (e) Is the location close to a major employment centre?	-	The site is located further than 1000m from a major employment centre.
3.2 Will the proposed development contribute towards meeting the need for new industrial, office or warehousing floorspace?	-	This site would be developed for residential use, therefore additional employment floorspace would not be provided.
3.3 Will the proposed development result in a net loss of existing employment land, or land which would be suitable for employment purposes?	0	The SLAA does not identify this site as being suitable for employment uses and development would not lead to the loss of any existing employment land.
3.4 Will the proposed development increase the amount of commercial uses and other facilities in town, district or local centres?	0	This site is not located within a town, district or local centre.
4. Reduce road traffic and congestion through improved accessibility to services homes and jobs; reducing the need to travel by car/lorry and improving sustainable travel choice		
4.1 Is the location close to a major rail station? (same score as 3.1a)	--	The site is located further than 1400m from a major railway station.
4.2 Is the location close to a minor rail station? (same score as 3.1b)	--	The site is located more than 1200m from a minor railway station.
4.3 Is the location close to a frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1c)	--	The site is located further than 800m from a frequent bus route.

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
4.4 Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1d)	--	The site is located further than 800m from a semi-frequent bus route.
4.5(a) Will residential development at the location be close to a major employment centre? (same score as 3.1e)	-	The site is located further than 1000m from a major employment centre.
4.5(b) Will employment development at the location be close to a major population centre?	0	Development would be residential only.
4.6 Are health facilities available locally? (same score as 2.2)	0	A small northern section of the site is located within 1200m of Hedge End Medical Centre.
4.7 Are shopping and related services available locally?	--	The site is located further than 800m from a town, district or local centre.
4.8 Is the location close to a Primary school?	++	The northern half of the site is located within 400m of Kings Copse Primary School.
4.9 Is the location close to a Secondary school?	0	The northern half the school is located within 1201 to 1600m of Wildern School.
4.10 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	-	No footpath or cycle path crosses the site or is adjacent to its boundary.
4.11 Are there Geographical barriers between the location and key facilities/ destinations?	+	No geographical barriers exist on the most direct walking routes to the destinations above.
5. Protect and conserve natural resources		
5.1 Will development avoid the sterilisation of mineral resources?	0	The site does not lie within a Mineral Safeguarding Area or a Mineral Consultation Area.
5.2 Will it result in the loss of higher grade agricultural land?	--	The site lies entirely in an area of high quality agricultural land.
5.3 Will it use previously developed land?	-	This site consists of greenfield land.
5.4 Will it deliver or support allotments or community farms?	++?	There will be no loss of allotments or community farms. The location could be suitable for these but this is unknown.
6. Reduce air, soil, water, light and noise pollution		
6.1 Will the location be affected by significant noise generating uses or Air Quality Management Areas?	0	The site is not within 200m of an A-road, motorway or AQMA.
6.2 Will development increase pollution?	--?	Road Traffic noise impact from Heath House Lane (increasing traffic flow with opening of Pylands By Pass / Link road, and Botley By Pass). Separation between noise sensitive development and roads uses will be necessary. Land contamination –adjacent to former landfills.
7. Plan for the anticipated levels of climate change		
7.1 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure?	0	No loss of existing green infrastructure.
7.2 Is the location at risk from flooding, taking into account of the effects of climate change?	-?	The site contains a very small area subject to 'less' surface water flood risk.
7.3 Will the development be at risk from coastal change? If so, can the Shoreline Management Plan Objectives be supported?	0	This site is not located near the coast.
8. Minimise Eastleigh's contribution to climate change by reducing the borough's carbon footprint and minimising other greenhouse gas emissions.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		

SA objective/ criterion	Justification	
9. Reduce waste generation and disposal, encourage waste prevention and reuse and achieve the sustainable management of waste.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
10. Protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and geodiversity, improving its quality and range.		
10.1 Could development negatively impact or lead to loss of an internationally or nationally designated site (either alone or in combination)?	-	The site will drain into Hoe Moor Creek, a tributary of the Hamble River, which runs into Solent and Southampton Water SPA, SAC and Ramsar site. Potential for in-combination effects on water quality. Mitigation is proposed in the form of Naturalised SuDS with three form of filtration to preserve water quality.
10.2 Could development negatively impact or lead or loss of a locally designated biodiversity site (either alone or in combination)?	-	Pilands Copse SINC is located just to the south and west of the site. Potential for in-combination recreational effects with other development. EBC ecological appraisal suggests mitigation in the form of a 20m buffer.
10.3 Will the development adversely affect areas with other nature conservation value, as identified in Biodiversity Action Plans (BAPs)?	-	The site includes extensive woodland and connecting hedgerows which make up the woodland complex. The EBC ecological appraisal recommends these are retained, buffered and enhanced.
10.4 Will the development adversely impact the biodiversity network (e.g. Priority Biodiversity Links (PBLs), Priority Biodiversity Areas (PBAs), hedgerows and other corridors for species movement)?	--	The site is covered by the Hamble Estuary PBA. The EBC ecological appraisal states that important routes need to remain open for wildlife.
10.5 Will the development adversely affect ancient woodland?	-	The site is adjacent to Catland / Fosters / Bottom Copses ancient woodland and Pilands Copse SINC. Potential for adverse effects resulting from urban edge and increased recreational pressure. EBC ecological appraisal suggests mitigation in the form of a 20m buffer and the woodland on site to be assessed for its value to the ancient woodland complex.
11. Enhance the Borough's multifunctional green infrastructure networks.		
11.1 Will the development affect TPO trees?	0	Development of the site will not affect TPO trees.
11.2 Can the location be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	-	No footpath or cycle path crosses the site or is adjacent to its boundary.
11.3 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure? (same score as 7.1)	0	No loss of existing green infrastructure.
12. Protect, enhance and manage the character and appearance of the landscape and townscape, maintaining and strengthening distinctiveness and its special qualities.		
12.1 Will development adversely affect the separation of neighbouring settlements?	0	The site was assessed as having good / very good potential for development in relation to avoiding settlement coalescence.
12.2 Will it protect the character of the countryside, coast, towns and/or villages, including views and settings?	0	The landscape within this site was assessed as having low sensitivity to development.
13. Protect and enhance and manage buildings, monuments, features, sites, places, areas and landscapes of archaeological, historical and cultural heritage importance.		
13.1 Will the development protect and enhance listed buildings and their settings, conservation areas,	0	Development of this site would not affect heritage assets.

SA objective/ criterion	Justification
archaeological sites, historic landscapes and other sites of local importance for heritage?	

Site 33: Land lying south east of Windmill Lane

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
1. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified local needs, including affordability and special needs		
1.1 Will the development provide a significant contribution towards meeting identified affordable housing needs?	++	The site has the capacity to provide 51 dwellings.
1.2 Will it provide other elements of identified housing need e.g. housing for older persons, self-build, support housing?	?	Uncertainty is recorded against all residential site options as information on provision of other elements of housing need is not available on a consistent basis.
2. Safeguard and improve community health, safety and wellbeing		
2.1 Are community facilities (community hall or library) available locally?	0	The site is located 400 to 800m from Lowford Community Library and 400 to 800m from Bursledon Community Centre and Bursledon Village Hall.
2.2 Are health facilities available locally?	+	The site is located 401 to 800m from Bursledon GP Practice.
2.3 What effect would the development have on local provision of sports pitches and facilities?	0	Development would not lead to loss of existing sports pitches and facilities.
2.4 Is public open space available locally?	0	The site is within 300 to 800m of public open space, including Lionheart Way Ecology Park and Manor Farm Country Park.
2.5 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network?	-	There are no footpaths or cycle paths within or adjacent to the site.
3. Develop a dynamic and diverse economy		
3.1(a) Is the location close to a major rail station?	--	The site is more than 1400m from a major railway station.
3.1 (b) Is the location close to a minor rail station?	-	The southern half of the site lies within 401 to 1200m of Bursledon Railway Station.
3.1 (c) Is the location close to a frequent bus route?	++	The majority of the site, to the south is located within 400m of frequent bus route First X4/X5.
3.1 (d) Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route?	--	The site is located more than 800m from a semi-frequent bus route.
3.1 (e) Is the location close to a major employment centre?	-	The site is further than 1000m from a major employment centre.
3.2 Will the proposed development contribute towards meeting the need for new industrial, office or warehousing floorspace?	-	This site would be developed for residential use, therefore additional employment floorspace would not be provided.
3.3 Will the proposed development result in a net loss of existing employment land, or land which would be suitable for employment purposes?	0	The SLAA does not identify this site as being suitable for employment uses and development would not lead to loss of any existing employment land.
3.4 Will the proposed development increase the amount of commercial uses and other facilities in town, district or local centres?	0	The site is not located within a town, district or local centre.
4. Reduce road traffic and congestion through improved accessibility to services homes and jobs; reducing the need to travel by car/lorry and improving sustainable travel choice		
4.1 Is the location close to a major rail station? (same score as 3.1a)	--	The site is more than 1400m from a major railway station.
4.2 Is the location close to a minor rail station? (same score as 3.1b)	-	The southern half of the site lies within 401 to 1200m of Bursledon Railway Station.

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
4.3 Is the location close to a frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1c)	++	The majority of the site, to the south is located within 400m of frequent bus route First X4/X5.
4.4 Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1d)	--	The site is located more than 800m from a semi-frequent bus route.
4.5(a) Will residential development at the location be close to a major employment centre? (same score as 3.1e)	-	The site is further than 1000m from a major employment centre.
4.5(b) Will employment development at the location be close to a major population centre?	0	Development would be residential only.
4.6 Are health facilities available locally? (same score as 2.2)	+	The site is located 401 to 800m from Bursledon GP Practice.
4.7 Are shopping and related services available locally?	0	The site is located within 401 to 600m of a local centre and shopping facilities.
4.8 Is the location close to a Primary school?	0	The southern half of the site is located 601 to 800m of Bursledon Junior School.
4.9 Is the location close to a Secondary school?	--	The site is located further than 2000m from a secondary school.
4.10 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	-	There are no footpaths or cycle paths within or adjacent to the site.
4.11 Are there Geographical barriers between the location and key facilities/ destinations?	+	No geographical barriers exist on the most direct walking routes to the destinations above.
5. Protect and conserve natural resources		
5.1 Will development avoid the sterilisation of mineral resources?	-?	Approximately half of the site is located within a Mineral Consultation Area.
5.2 Will it result in the loss of higher grade agricultural land?	0	The entire site is located within an area of lower quality agricultural land.
5.3 Will it use previously developed land?	-	This site consists of greenfield land.
5.4 Will it deliver or support allotments or community farms?	+	There will be no loss of allotments or community farms. The location could be suitable for these but this is unknown.
6. Reduce air, soil, water, light and noise pollution		
6.1 Will the location be affected by significant noise generating uses or Air Quality Management Areas?	-?	The site is located within 200m of the A27 and the M27.
6.2 Will development increase pollution?	--?	Road Traffic noise impact from M27 is significant, Land contamination partially on former landfill site, Air quality impact from M27 is significant, separation between sensitive development and roads will be necessary. Careful consideration of traffic impacts generated by this development on existing AQMA at Hamble Lane.
7. Plan for the anticipated levels of climate change		
7.1 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure?	0	No loss of existing green infrastructure.
7.2 Is the location at risk from flooding, taking into account of the effects of climate change?	-?	A small area in the site is subject to 'less' surface water flood risk.
7.3 Will the development be at risk from coastal change? If so, can the Shoreline Management Plan Objectives be supported?	0	This site is not located near the coast.

SA objective/ criterion	Justification	
8. Minimise Eastleigh's contribution to climate change by reducing the borough's carbon footprint and minimising other greenhouse gas emissions.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
9. Reduce waste generation and disposal, encourage waste prevention and reuse and achieve the sustainable management of waste.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
10. Protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and geodiversity, improving its quality and range.		
10.1 Could development negatively impact or lead to loss of an internationally or nationally designated site (either alone or in combination)?	-	Badnum Creek and another watercourse run through the site. The water system runs into the Solent & Southampton Water SPA, SAC and Ramsar site. Potential for in-combination effects on water quality. Mitigation is proposed in the EBC ecological appraisal in the form of 20m buffers and use of naturalised SuDS with three forms of filtration.
10.2 Could development negatively impact or lead or loss of a locally designated biodiversity site (either alone or in combination)?	--	The site incorporates Windmill Wood SINC which also includes the headwaters of a small unnamed stream. The site could be buffered but connectivity may still be severely compromised.
10.3 Will the development adversely affect areas with other nature conservation value, as identified in Biodiversity Action Plans (BAPs)?	-	Reptiles and foraging bats are known to use the site.
10.4 Will the development adversely impact the biodiversity network (e.g. Priority Biodiversity Links (PBLs), Priority Biodiversity Areas (PBAs), hedgerows and other corridors for species movement)?	--	The site incorporates the M27 PBL to the north, which the EBC ecological appraisal recommends should remain connected for biodiversity. There are also significant tree belts connecting into Windmill Woods SINC which will need to be retained and buffered.
10.5 Will the development adversely affect ancient woodland?	0	The development will not adversely affect ancient woodland.
11. Enhance the Borough's multifunctional green infrastructure networks.		
11.1 Will the development affect TPO trees?	-?	Yes - TPO 736-E covering all tree species, Bursledon Windmill conservation area.
11.2 Can the location be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	-	There are no footpaths or cycle paths within or adjacent to the site.
11.3 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure? (same score as 7.1)	0	No loss of existing green infrastructure.
12. Protect, enhance and manage the character and appearance of the landscape and townscape, maintaining and strengthening distinctiveness and its special qualities.		
12.1 Will development adversely affect the separation of neighbouring settlements?	-	The site was assessed as having average potential for development in relation to avoiding settlement coalescence.
12.2 Will it protect the character of the countryside, coast, towns and/or villages, including views and settings?	-	The landscape within this site was assessed as having moderate sensitivity to development.
13. Protect and enhance and manage buildings, monuments, features, sites, places, areas and landscapes of archaeological, historical and cultural heritage importance.		

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
13.1 Will the development protect and enhance listed buildings and their settings, conservation areas, archaeological sites, historic landscapes and other sites of local importance for heritage?	--	Development of this site would adversely affect the setting of a listed windmill.

Site 34: Land west of Shop Lane and land east of Shop Lane and south of Botley Rd

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
1. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified local needs, including affordability and special needs		
1.1 Will the development provide a significant contribution towards meeting identified affordable housing needs?	++	The site has capacity to provide 364 dwellings.
1.2 Will it provide other elements of identified housing need e.g. housing for older persons, self-build, support housing?	?	Uncertainty is recorded against all residential site options as information on provision of other elements of housing need is not available on a consistent basis.
2. Safeguard and improve community health, safety and wellbeing		
2.1 Are community facilities (community hall or library) available locally?	-	The site is further than 800m from a community hall or library.
2.2 Are health facilities available locally?	0	The eastern half of the site is located within 801 to 1200m from Bursledon GP Practice.
2.3 What effect would the development have on local provision of sports pitches and facilities?	0	Development would not lead to loss of existing sports pitches and facilities.
2.4 Is public open space available locally?	0	The majority of the site is within 800m of public open space, including the King George IV Recreation Ground, Manor Close amenity space and Lionheart Way Ecology Park.
2.5 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network?	-	No footpath or cycle path crosses the site or is adjacent to its boundary.
3. Develop a dynamic and diverse economy		
3.1(a) Is the location close to a major rail station?	--	The site is located more than 1400m from a major railway station.
3.1 (b) Is the location close to a minor rail station?	--	The site is located more than 1200m from a minor railway station.
3.1 (c) Is the location close to a frequent bus route?	++	The southern half of the site is located within 400m of the frequent First X4/X5 service.
3.1 (d) Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route?	--	The site is further than 800m from a semi-frequent bus route.
3.1 (e) Is the location close to a major employment centre?	-	The site is located more than 1000m from a major employment centre.
3.2 Will the proposed development contribute towards meeting the need for new industrial, office or warehousing floorspace?	-	This site would be developed for residential use, therefore additional employment floorspace would not be provided.
3.3 Will the proposed development result in a net loss of existing employment land, or land which would be suitable for employment purposes?	0	The SLAA does not identify this site as being suitable for employment uses and development would not lead to loss of any existing employment land.
3.4 Will the proposed development increase the amount of commercial uses and other facilities in town, district or local centres?	0	The site is not located within a town, district or local centre.
4. Reduce road traffic and congestion through improved accessibility to services homes and jobs; reducing the need to travel by car/lorry and improving sustainable travel choice		
4.1 Is the location close to a major rail station? (same score as 3.1a)	--	The site is located more than 1400m from a major railway station.
4.2 Is the location close to a minor rail station? (same score as 3.1b)	--	The site is located more than 1200m from a minor railway station.

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
4.3 Is the location close to a frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1c)	++	The southern half of the site is located within 400m of the frequent First X4/X5 service.
4.4 Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1d)	--	The site is further than 800m from a semi-frequent bus route.
4.5(a) Will residential development at the location be close to a major employment centre? (same score as 3.1e)	-	The site is located more than 1000m from a major employment centre.
4.5(b) Will employment development at the location be close to a major population centre?	0	Development would be residential only.
4.6 Are health facilities available locally? (same score as 2.2)	0	The eastern half of the site is located within 1200m from Bursledon GP Practice.
4.7 Are shopping and related services available locally?	--	The site is further than 800m from a town, district or local centre.
4.8 Is the location close to a Primary school?	--	The site is further than 1000m from a primary school
4.9 Is the location close to a Secondary school?	-	The southern third of the site is 1601 to 2000m from Hamble Community Sports College
4.10 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	-	No footpath or cycle path crosses the site or is adjacent to its boundary.
4.11 Are there Geographical barriers between the location and key facilities/ destinations?	+	No geographical barriers exist on the most direct walking routes to the destinations above.
5. Protect and conserve natural resources		
5.1 Will development avoid the sterilisation of mineral resources?	-?	The entire site is located in a Mineral Consultation Area, the majority of the site is located within a Mineral Safeguarding Area.
5.2 Will it result in the loss of higher grade agricultural land?	--	Much of the southern part of the site is located in an area of high quality agricultural land. The northern end of the site is located in an area of medium quality agricultural land.
5.3 Will it use previously developed land?	-	This site consists of greenfield land.
5.4 Will it deliver or support allotments or community farms?	+?	There will be no loss of allotments or community farms. The location could be suitable for these but this is unknown.
6. Reduce air, soil, water, light and noise pollution		
6.1 Will the location be affected by significant noise generating uses or Air Quality Management Areas?	-?	The southern third of the site is located within 200m of the A3025.
6.2 Will development increase pollution?	-?	Noise impact on south spur of site form Portsmouth Road, adjacent to brownfield site.
7. Plan for the anticipated levels of climate change		
7.1 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure?	0	No loss of existing green infrastructure.
7.2 Is the location at risk from flooding, taking into account of the effects of climate change?	-?	Small areas in the site are subject to 'less' surface water flood risk.
7.3 Will the development be at risk from coastal change? If so, can the Shoreline Management Plan Objectives be supported?	0	The site is not near the coast.
8. Minimise Eastleigh's contribution to climate change by reducing the borough's carbon footprint and minimising other greenhouse gas emissions.		

SA objective/ criterion	Justification	
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
9. Reduce waste generation and disposal, encourage waste prevention and reuse and achieve the sustainable management of waste.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
10. Protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and geodiversity, improving its quality and range.		
10.1 Could development negatively impact or lead to loss of an internationally or nationally designated site (either alone or in combination)?	-?	The site may drain into Tickleford Gully which runs along the western boundary of the site and runs into the Southampton & Solent Water SPA and Ramsar site, but this is uncertain. Mitigation is proposed in the EBC ecological appraisal in the form of a 20m buffer and naturalised SuDS with 3 forms of filtration.
10.2 Could development negatively impact or lead or loss of a locally designated biodiversity site (either alone or in combination)?	-	Western Greenway SINC, designated for its woodland runs along the western boundary of the site. A 20m buffer is suggested for protection. Netley Farm closed Landfill site SINC is located just south of the site but is separated from the site by the A3025.
10.3 Will the development adversely affect areas with other nature conservation value, as identified in Biodiversity Action Plans (BAPs)?	-?	Woodland and headwaters associated with Tickleford Gully may be present at the northern extremities of the site. The EBS ecological appraisal suggests mitigation in the form of buffers. Rough grassland is also present on the site.
10.4 Will the development adversely impact the biodiversity network (e.g. Priority Biodiversity Links (PBLs), Priority Biodiversity Areas (PBAs), hedgerows and other corridors for species movement)?	--	Old Netley PBL touches the eastern boundary of the site and could be adversely affected by development.
10.5 Will the development adversely affect ancient woodland?	0	Development will not adversely affect ancient woodland.
11. Enhance the Borough's multifunctional green infrastructure networks.		
11.1 Will the development affect TPO trees?	0	Development of the site will not affect TPO trees.
11.2 Can the location be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	-	No footpath or cycle path crosses the site or is adjacent to its boundary.
11.3 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure? (same score as 7.1)	0	No loss of existing green infrastructure.
12. Protect, enhance and manage the character and appearance of the landscape and townscape, maintaining and strengthening distinctiveness and its special qualities.		
12.1 Will development adversely affect the separation of neighbouring settlements?	--	The site was assessed as having very poor / poor potential for development in relation to avoiding settlement coalescence.
12.2 Will it protect the character of the countryside, coast, towns and/or villages, including views and settings?	0	The landscape within this site was assessed as having low sensitivity to development.
13. Protect and enhance and manage buildings, monuments, features, sites, places, areas and landscapes of archaeological, historical and cultural heritage importance.		
13.1 Will the development protect and enhance listed buildings and their settings, conservation areas, archaeological sites, historic landscapes and other sites of local importance for heritage?	0	Development of this site would not affect heritage assets.

Site 35: Land rear of Plough Inn; open space south of Pound Rd west of Priors Hill Lane

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
1. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified local needs, including affordability and special needs		
1.1 Will the development provide a significant contribution towards meeting identified affordable housing needs?	++	Site has capacity to provide 31 dwellings.
1.2 Will it provide other elements of identified housing need e.g. housing for older persons, self-build, support housing?	?	Uncertainty is recorded against all residential site options as information on provision of other elements of housing need is not available on a consistent basis.
2. Safeguard and improve community health, safety and wellbeing		
2.1 Are community facilities (community hall or library) available locally?	+	The very eastern edge of the site is within 400m of the Pilands Wood Centre. The north east corner of the site is located 400 to 800m from Lowford Community Library.
2.2 Are health facilities available locally?	+	The north eastern quarter of the site is located within 800m from Bursledon GP Practice.
2.3 What effect would the development have on local provision of sports pitches and facilities?	--?	Development of the site would result in the loss of the King George V Recreation Ground. There is uncertainty regarding suitable replacement.
2.4 Is public open space available locally?	--?	Development would result in the loss of the King George V Recreation Ground and Cunningham Gardens. There is uncertainty regarding suitable replacement.
2.5 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network?	-	No footpath or cycle paths cross the site or are adjacent to its boundary.
3. Develop a dynamic and diverse economy		
3.1(a) Is the location close to a major rail station?	--	The site is located further than 1400m from a major railway station.
3.1 (b) Is the location close to a minor rail station?	--	The site is located more than 1200m from a minor railway station.
3.1 (c) Is the location close to a frequent bus route?	++	The site is located within 400m of the frequent First X4/X5 bus route.
3.1 (d) Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route?	--	The site is located further than 800m from a semi-frequent bus route.
3.1 (e) Is the location close to a major employment centre?	-	The site is further than 1000m from a major employment centre.
3.2 Will the proposed development contribute towards meeting the need for new industrial, office or warehousing floorspace?	-	This site would be developed for residential use, therefore additional employment floorspace would not be provided.
3.3 Will the proposed development result in a net loss of existing employment land, or land which would be suitable for employment purposes?	0	The SLAA does not identify the site as being suitable for employment uses and development would not lead to loss of any existing employment land.
3.4 Will the proposed development increase the amount of commercial uses and other facilities in town, district or local centres?	0	The site is not located within a town, district or local centre.
4. Reduce road traffic and congestion through improved accessibility to services homes and jobs; reducing the need to travel by car/lorry and improving sustainable travel choice		
4.1 Is the location close to a major rail station? (same score as 3.1a)	--	The site is located further than 1400m from a major railway station.

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
4.2 Is the location close to a minor rail station? (same score as 3.1b)	--	The site is located more than 1200m from a minor railway station.
4.3 Is the location close to a frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1c)	++	The site is located within 400m of the frequent First X4/X5 bus route.
4.4 Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1d)	--	The site is located further than 800m from a semi-frequent bus route.
4.5(a) Will residential development at the location be close to a major employment centre? (same score as 3.1e)	-	The site is further than 1000m from a major employment centre.
4.5(b) Will employment development at the location be close to a major population centre?	0	Development would be residential only.
4.6 Are health facilities available locally? (same score as 2.2)	+	The north eastern quarter of the site is located within 800m from Bursledon GP Practice.
4.7 Are shopping and related services available locally?	+	The south eastern third of the site is located 201 to 400m from a local centre and shopping facilities.
4.8 Is the location close to a Primary school?	0	The south eastern corner of the site is located 601 to 800m from Bursledon Junior School.
4.9 Is the location close to a Secondary school?	0	The site is located within 1201 to 1600m from Hamble Community Sports College.
4.10 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	-	No footpath or cycle paths cross the site or are adjacent to its boundary.
4.11 Are there Geographical barriers between the location and key facilities/ destinations?	+	No geographical barriers exist on the most direct walking routes to the destinations above.
5. Protect and conserve natural resources		
5.1 Will development avoid the sterilisation of mineral resources?	-?	The majority of the site is located in a Mineral Safeguarding Area and a Mineral Consultation Area.
5.2 Will it result in the loss of higher grade agricultural land?	--	A small section of the site in the western corner is high quality agricultural land. The remainder of the site is medium quality agricultural land.
5.3 Will it use previously developed land?	-	This site consists of greenfield land.
5.4 Will it deliver or support allotments or community farms?	+?	There will be no loss of allotments or community farms. The location could be suitable for these but this is unknown.
6. Reduce air, soil, water, light and noise pollution		
6.1 Will the location be affected by significant noise generating uses or Air Quality Management Areas?	-?	The majority of the site is located within 200m of the A3025.
6.2 Will development increase pollution?	-?	Potential for traffic impacts generated by this development on existing AQMA at Hamble Lane.
7. Plan for the anticipated levels of climate change		
7.1 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure?	0	No loss of existing green infrastructure.
7.2 Is the location at risk from flooding, taking into account of the effects of climate change?	-?	An area in the centre of the site is subject to 'less' surface water flood risk.
7.3 Will the development be at risk from coastal change? If so, can the Shoreline Management Plan Objectives be supported?	0	This site is not near the coast.
8. Minimise Eastleigh's contribution to climate change by reducing the borough's carbon footprint and minimising other greenhouse gas emissions.		

SA objective/ criterion	Justification	
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
9. Reduce waste generation and disposal, encourage waste prevention and reuse and achieve the sustainable management of waste.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
10. Protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and geodiversity, improving its quality and range.		
10.1 Could development negatively impact or lead to loss of an internationally or nationally designated site (either alone or in combination)?	-?	A water course runs through the centre of the site and into the Solent and Southampton Water SPA and Ramsar site. This was not raised in the EBC Ecological Appraisal and so it is uncertain as to whether there is potential for in combination adverse effects on water quality.
10.2 Could development negatively impact or lead or loss of a locally designated biodiversity site (either alone or in combination)?	-	Site is immediately adjacent to Priors Hill Brickworks SINC designated for its heathland and grassland populations. Mitigation is proposed by the EBC ecological appraisal in the form of a 20m buffer.
10.3 Will the development adversely affect areas with other nature conservation value, as identified in Biodiversity Action Plans (BAPs)?	--	Parts of the site appear to contain woodland habitats that reflect the complex found within the SINC. The EBC Ecological Appraisal suggests these areas may need to be retained.
10.4 Will the development adversely impact the biodiversity network (e.g. Priority Biodiversity Links (PBLs), Priority Biodiversity Areas (PBAs), hedgerows and other corridors for species movement)?	0	Development will not adversely impact the biodiversity network.
10.5 Will the development adversely affect ancient woodland?	0	Development will not adversely affect ancient woodland.
11. Enhance the Borough's multifunctional green infrastructure networks.		
11.1 Will the development affect TPO trees?	-?	Yes - TPO 440-E covering all tree species.
11.2 Can the location be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	-	No footpath or cycle paths cross the site or are adjacent to its boundary.
11.3 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure? (same score as 7.1)	0	No loss of existing green infrastructure.
12. Protect, enhance and manage the character and appearance of the landscape and townscape, maintaining and strengthening distinctiveness and its special qualities.		
12.1 Will development adversely affect the separation of neighbouring settlements?	--	The site was assessed as having very poor / poor / average potential for development in relation to avoiding settlement coalescence.
12.2 Will it protect the character of the countryside, coast, towns and/or villages, including views and settings?	0	The landscape within the site was assessed as having low sensitivity to development.
13. Protect and enhance and manage buildings, monuments, features, sites, places, areas and landscapes of archaeological, historical and cultural heritage importance.		
13.1 Will the development protect and enhance listed buildings and their settings, conservation areas, archaeological sites, historic landscapes and other sites of local importance for heritage?	0	Development of this site would not affect heritage assets.

Site 36: Land west of Hamble Lane and land east of Hamble Lane

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
1. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified local needs, including affordability and special needs		
1.1 Will the development provide a significant contribution towards meeting identified affordable housing needs?	++	The site has the capacity to provide 355 dwellings.
1.2 Will it provide other elements of identified housing need e.g. housing for older persons, self-build, support housing?	?	Uncertainty is recorded against all residential site options as information on provision of other elements of housing need is not available on a consistent basis.
2. Safeguard and improve community health, safety and wellbeing		
2.1 Are community facilities (community hall or library) available locally?	+	The northern third of the site is located within 400m of the Pilands Wood Centre and Bursledon Scout and Guide Group.
2.2 Are health facilities available locally?	++	A southern section of the site is located within 400m of blackthorn Health Centre.
2.3 What effect would the development have on local provision of sports pitches and facilities?	0	Development would not lead to loss of existing sports pitches and facilities.
2.4 Is public open space available locally?	+	The site is located within 300m of public open space, including Mallards Moor Green Route.
2.5 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network?	+	An existing footpath crosses the south eastern corner of the site and a cycle path runs along the B3397 through the centre of the site.
3. Develop a dynamic and diverse economy		
3.1(a) Is the location close to a major rail station?	--	The site is further than 1400m from a major railway station.
3.1 (b) Is the location close to a minor rail station?	-	The site is located within 401 to 1200m of Hamble Railway Station and Netley Railway Station.
3.1 (c) Is the location close to a frequent bus route?	+	A small section along the northern edge of the site is located within 600m of the First X4/X5 bus routes. The northern half of the site is located within 800m of this bus route.
3.1 (d) Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route?	+	A small southern section of the site is located within 400m of the semi-frequent First 6 route. The remainder of the site is located within 401 to 800m of this route.
3.1 (e) Is the location close to a major employment centre?	-	The site is further then 100m from a major employment centre.
3.2 Will the proposed development contribute towards meeting the need for new industrial, office or warehousing floorspace?	-	This site would be developed for residential use, therefore additional employment floorspace would not be provided.
3.3 Will the proposed development result in a net loss of existing employment land, or land which would be suitable for employment purposes?	-	There may be some loss of employment land as the Itchen Fruit Company and Berry Farm are located on site.
3.4 Will the proposed development increase the amount of commercial uses and other facilities in town, district or local centres?	0	The site is not located within a town, district or local centre.
4. Reduce road traffic and congestion through improved accessibility to services homes and jobs; reducing the need to travel by car/lorry and improving sustainable travel choice		
4.1 Is the location close to a major rail station?	--	The site is further than 1400m from a major railway

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
(same score as 3.1a)		station.
4.2 Is the location close to a minor rail station? (same score as 3.1b)	-	The site is located within 401 to 1200m of Hamble Railway Station and Netley Railway Station.
4.3 Is the location close to a frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1c)	+	A small section along the northern edge of the site is located within 600m of the First X4/X5 bus routes. The northern half of the site is located within 800m of this bus route.
4.4 Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1d)	+	A small southern section of the site is located within 400m of the semi-frequent First 6 route. The remainder of the site is located within 401 to 800m of this route.
4.5(a) Will residential development at the location be close to a major employment centre? (same score as 3.1e)	-	The site is further then 100m from a major employment centre.
4.5(b) Will employment development at the location be close to a major population centre?	0	Development would be residential only.
4.6 Are health facilities available locally? (same score as 2.2)	++	A southern section of the site is located within 400m of blackthorn Health Centre.
4.7 Are shopping and related services available locally?	+	The northern half of site is within 201 to 400m from a local centre and shopping area.
4.8 Is the location close to a Primary school?	0	The eastern quarter of the site is 601 to 800m of Bursledon Junior School.
4.9 Is the location close to a Secondary school?	++	The majority of the site is located within 800m of Hamble Community Sports College.
4.10 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	+	An existing footpath crosses the south eastern corner of the site and a cycle path runs along the B3397 through the centre of the site.
4.11 Are there Geographical barriers between the location and key facilities/ destinations?	+	No geographical barriers exist on the most direct walking routes to the destinations above.
5. Protect and conserve natural resources		
5.1 Will development avoid the sterilisation of mineral resources?	-?	The site is located in a Mineral Safeguarding Area and a Mineral Consultation Area.
5.2 Will it result in the loss of higher grade agricultural land?	-	The site is located in an area of medium quality agricultural land.
5.3 Will it use previously developed land?	-	This site consists of greenfield land.
5.4 Will it deliver or support allotments or community farms?	+?	There will be no loss of allotments or community farms. The location could be suitable for these but this is unknown.
6. Reduce air, soil, water, light and noise pollution		
6.1 Will the location be affected by significant noise generating uses or Air Quality Management Areas?	0	The site is not located within 200m of an A-road, motorway or AQMA.
6.2 Will development increase pollution?	--?	Noise impacts form Hamble Lane, potential for air quality impacts on Hamble Lane AQMA , adjacent to Mallards Moor landfill site.
7. Plan for the anticipated levels of climate change		
7.1 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure?	0	No loss of existing green infrastructure.
7.2 Is the location at risk from flooding, taking into account of the effects of climate change?	-?	The site is subject to 'less' surface water flood risk.
7.3 Will the development be at risk from coastal	0	This site is not near the coast.

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
change? If so, can the Shoreline Management Plan Objectives be supported?		
8. Minimise Eastleigh's contribution to climate change by reducing the borough's carbon footprint and minimising other greenhouse gas emissions.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
9. Reduce waste generation and disposal, encourage waste prevention and reuse and achieve the sustainable management of waste.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
10. Protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and geodiversity, improving its quality and range.		
10.1 Could development negatively impact or lead to loss of an internationally or nationally designated site (either alone or in combination)?	-	The site runs into the Hungerford Stream which runs into the Southampton & Solent SPA and Ramsar site. Mallards Moor SINC is located on the eastern edge of the site and provides supporting habitat to the designated species of the SPA and Ramsar site and could be adversely affected by development. Mitigation is proposed in the EBC ecological appraisal in the form of sophisticated SuDS.
10.2 Could development negatively impact or lead or loss of a locally designated biodiversity site (either alone or in combination)?	--	Mallards Moor SINC is located along the eastern boundary and to the east of the site. The SINC could be adversely affected through changes in hydrology and recreational pressure. Mitigation is proposed in the EBC ecological appraisal in the form of a significant buffer. Prior Hill Brickworks SINC is located to the west of the site as is Priors Hill Copse SINC. Prior Hill Brickworks is fed by Spear Pond Gully which runs just to the east of the site.
10.3 Will the development adversely affect areas with other nature conservation value, as identified in Biodiversity Action Plans (BAPs)?	--?	The site appears to contain scrub and rough grassland with mature woodland in the north east corner, which could support protected species and operate as part of the woodland complex. The EBC ecological appraisal states that the site will need to be fully investigated for protected species, leading to some uncertainty regarding effects on these.
10.4 Will the development adversely impact the biodiversity network (e.g. Priority Biodiversity Links (PBLs), Priority Biodiversity Areas (PBAs), hedgerows and other corridors for species movement)?	-?	The site appears to contain scrub and rough grassland with more mature woodland in the north east corner which will operate as part of the woodland complex and is likely to support protected species.
10.5 Will the development adversely affect ancient woodland?	-	The site is adjacent to Mallards Moor ancient woodland. Mitigation is proposed in the EBC ecological appraisal in the form of a 20m buffer. Ancient woodland is also to the south of the south west of the site within Priors Hill Copse.
11. Enhance the Borough's multifunctional green infrastructure networks.		
11.1 Will the development affect TPO trees?	0	Development of the site will not affect TPO trees.
11.2 Can the location be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	+	An existing footpath crosses the south eastern corner of the site and a cycle path runs along the B3397 through the centre of the site.
11.3 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure? (same score as 7.1)	0	No loss of existing green infrastructure.
12. Protect, enhance and manage the character and appearance of the landscape and townscape, maintaining and strengthening distinctiveness and its		

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
special qualities.		
12.1 Will development adversely affect the separation of neighbouring settlements?	--	The site was assessed as having very poor / poor potential for development in relation to avoiding settlement coalescence.
12.2 Will it protect the character of the countryside, coast, towns and/or villages, including views and settings?	0	The landscape within this site was assessed as having low sensitivity to development.
13. Protect and enhance and manage buildings, monuments, features, sites, places, areas and landscapes of archaeological, historical and cultural heritage importance.		
13.1 Will the development protect and enhance listed buildings and their settings, conservation areas, archaeological sites, historic landscapes and other sites of local importance for heritage?	0	Development of this site would not adversely affect heritage assets.

Site 37: Land to the east of Shop Lane

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
1. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified local needs, including affordability and special needs		
1.1 Will the development provide a significant contribution towards meeting identified affordable housing needs?	++	The site has the capacity to provide 375 dwellings.
1.2 Will it provide other elements of identified housing need e.g. housing for older persons, self-build, support housing?	?	Uncertainty is recorded against all residential site options as information on provision of other elements of housing need is not available on a consistent basis.
2. Safeguard and improve community health, safety and wellbeing		
2.1 Are community facilities (community hall or library) available locally?	0	Approximately one third of the site, along the eastern edge is within 401 to 800m of Lowford Community Library. The eastern third of the site is also within 401 to 800m of Bursledon Community Centre or The Pilands Wood Centre.
2.2 Are health facilities available locally?	+	The eastern third of the site is located within 401 to 800m of the Bursledon Surgery.
2.3 What effect would the development have on local provision of sports pitches and facilities?	0	Development would not lead to loss of existing sports pitches and facilities.
2.4 Is public open space available locally?	+	The southern third of the site is within 300m of Manor Close amenity space, the remainder of the site is within 800m of a number of amenity spaces and green routes including Lionheart Way Ecology Park and Pilands Wood.
2.5 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network?	0	An existing footpath crosses through the centre of the site and runs adjacent to the eastern edge of the site.
3. Develop a dynamic and diverse economy		
3.1(a) Is the location close to a major rail station?	--	The site is located further than 1400m from a major railway station.
3.1 (b) Is the location close to a minor rail station?	--	The site is located further than 1200m from a minor railway station.
3.1 (c) Is the location close to a frequent bus route?	++	Two thirds of the site is located within 400m of the First X4/X5 frequent bus route. The remainder of the site is within 600m of this route.
3.1 (d) Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route?	--	The site is located further than 800m from a semi-frequent bus route.
3.1 (e) Is the location close to a major employment centre?	-	The site is more than 1000m from a major employment centre.
3.2 Will the proposed development contribute towards meeting the need for new industrial, office or warehousing floorspace?	-	This site would be developed for residential use, therefore additional employment floorspace would not be provided.
3.3 Will the proposed development result in a net loss of existing employment land, or land which would be suitable for employment purposes?	-	The SLAA form indicated that there will be some loss of employment land as a care home and one business unit are located on the south western side of the site.
3.4 Will the proposed development increase the amount of commercial uses and other facilities in town, district or local centres?	0	The site is not located within a town, district or local centre.
4. Reduce road traffic and congestion through improved accessibility to services homes and jobs; reducing the need to travel by car/lorry and improving		

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
sustainable travel choice		
4.1 Is the location close to a major rail station? (same score as 3.1a)	--	The site is located further than 1400m from a major railway station.
4.2 Is the location close to a minor rail station? (same score as 3.1b)	--	The site is located further than 1200m from a minor railway station.
4.3 Is the location close to a frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1c)	++	Two thirds of the site is located within 400m of the First X4/X5 frequent bus route. The remainder of the site is within 600m of this route.
4.4 Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1d)	--	The site is located further than 800m from a semi-frequent bus route.
4.5(a) Will residential development at the location be close to a major employment centre? (same score as 3.1e)	-	The site is more than 1000m from a major employment centre.
4.5(b) Will employment development at the location be close to a major population centre?	0	Development would be residential only.
4.6 Are health facilities available locally? (same score as 2.2)	+	The eastern third of the site is located within 401 to 800m of the Bursledon Surgery.
4.7 Are shopping and related services available locally?	-	The eastern most third of the site is located within 601 to 800m of a shopping area. The eastern half of the site is located within 601 to 800m of a local centre.
4.8 Is the location close to a Primary school?	-	The eastern third of the site is within 801 to 1000m of Bursledon Junior School.
4.9 Is the location close to a Secondary school?	-	The southern two thirds of the site is within 1601 to 2000m of Hamble Community Sports College.
4.10 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	0	An existing footpath crosses through the centre of the site and runs adjacent to the eastern edge of the site.
4.11 Are there Geographical barriers between the location and key facilities/ destinations?	+	There are no geographical barriers on the most direct walking route to any of the destinations above.
5. Protect and conserve natural resources		
5.1 Will development avoid the sterilisation of mineral resources?	-?	The site is in a Mineral Safeguarding Area and a Mineral Consultation Area.
5.2 Will it result in the loss of higher grade agricultural land?	-	The majority of the site is covered by medium quality agricultural land however, the south western corner of the site is covered by high quality agricultural land and the north eastern edge is covered by low quality agricultural land. The score is given as minor negative as the majority of the site is medium quality agricultural land and the area of high quality land is currently built on.
5.3 Will it use previously developed land?	-	This site consists of greenfield land.
5.4 Will it deliver or support allotments or community farms?	+?	There will be no loss of allotments or community farms. The location could be suitable for these but this is unknown.
6. Reduce air, soil, water, light and noise pollution		
6.1 Will the location be affected by significant noise generating uses or Air Quality Management Areas?	-?	The southern half of the site is located within 200m of the A3025.
6.2 Will development increase pollution?	--?	Noise impact on south spur of site form Portsmouth road, adjacent to brownfield site, potential for air quality impacts on Hamble Lane AQMA.
7. Plan for the anticipated levels of climate change		
7.1 Will the development provide additional or	0	No loss of existing green infrastructure.

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
improved green infrastructure?		
7.2 Is the location at risk from flooding, taking into account of the effects of climate change?	0	The site is not located in an area of surface water flood risk and is not located in Flood Zones 2 or 3.
7.3 Will the development be at risk from coastal change? If so, can the Shoreline Management Plan Objectives be supported?	0	This site is not near the coast
8. Minimise Eastleigh's contribution to climate change by reducing the borough's carbon footprint and minimising other greenhouse gas emissions.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
9. Reduce waste generation and disposal, encourage waste prevention and reuse and achieve the sustainable management of waste.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
10. Protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and geodiversity, improving its quality and range.		
10.1 Could development negatively impact or lead to loss of an internationally or nationally designated site (either alone or in combination)?	-	Spear Pond Gully runs along the eastern boundary of this site towards Solent & Southampton Water SPA and Ramsar site. Mitigation is proposed in the form of 20m buffers and naturalised SuDS with 3 forms of filtration.
10.2 Could development negatively impact or lead or loss of a locally designated biodiversity site (either alone or in combination)?	0	Development will not negatively impact or lead to loss of a locally designated biodiversity site.
10.3 Will the development adversely affect areas with other nature conservation value, as identified in Biodiversity Action Plans (BAPs)?	--	Woodland associated with the gully is present on the site.
10.4 Will the development adversely impact the biodiversity network (e.g. Priority Biodiversity Links (PBLs), Priority Biodiversity Areas (PBAs), hedgerows and other corridors for species movement)?	--	Old Netley PBL runs through the east of site following Spear Pond Gully. The EBC ecological appraisal suggests that this corridor should be kept open for biodiversity.
10.5 Will the development adversely affect ancient woodland?	0	Development will not adversely affect ancient woodland.
11. Enhance the Borough's multifunctional green infrastructure networks.		
11.1 Will the development affect TPO trees?	-?	Yes- TPO740-E. Covering all deciduous species with stem diameter greater than 30cm.
11.2 Can the location be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	0	An existing footpath crosses through the centre of the site and runs adjacent to the eastern edge of the site.
11.3 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure? (same score as 7.1)	0	No loss of existing green infrastructure.
12. Protect, enhance and manage the character and appearance of the landscape and townscape, maintaining and strengthening distinctiveness and its special qualities.		
12.1 Will development adversely affect the separation of neighbouring settlements?	--	The site was assessed as having very poor / poor potential for development in relation to avoiding settlement coalescence.
12.2 Will it protect the character of the countryside, coast, towns and/or villages, including views and settings?	0	The landscape within this site was assessed as having low sensitivity to development.

SA objective/ criterion	Justification	
13. Protect and enhance and manage buildings, monuments, features, sites, places, areas and landscapes of archaeological, historical and cultural heritage importance.		
13.1 Will the development protect and enhance listed buildings and their settings, conservation areas, archaeological sites, historic landscapes and other sites of local importance for heritage?	0	Development of this site would not adversely affect heritage assets.

Site 38: Land North of Satchell Lane

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
1. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified local needs, including affordability and special needs		
1.1 Will the development provide a significant contribution towards meeting identified affordable housing needs?	++	The site has capacity to provide 45 dwellings
1.2 Will it provide other elements of identified housing need e.g. housing for older persons, self-build, support housing?	?	Uncertainty is recorded against all residential site options as information on provision of other elements of housing need is not available on a consistent basis.
2. Safeguard and improve community health, safety and wellbeing		
2.1 Are community facilities (community hall or library) available locally?	+	The site is located within 400m of Hype Youth Centre.
2.2 Are health facilities available locally?	++	The site is located within 400m of Blackthorn Health Centre.
2.3 What effect would the development have on local provision of sports pitches and facilities?	0	Development would not lead to loss of existing sports pitches and facilities.
2.4 Is public open space available locally?	+	Approximately one third of the site is within 300m of Mallards Moor green route and the remainder of the site is within 800m of this and other open spaces.
2.5 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network?	0	An existing footpath touches the site at its southern corner.
3. Develop a dynamic and diverse economy		
3.1(a) Is the location close to a major rail station?	--	The site is further than 1400m from a major rail station.
3.1 (b) Is the location close to a minor rail station?	-	Site is located between 401m to 1200m from Hamble Railway Station.
3.1 (c) Is the location close to a frequent bus route?	--	The site is located further than 800m from a frequent bus route.
3.1 (d) Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route?	+	The site is located within 400m of the First 6 semi-frequent bus route.
3.1 (e) Is the location close to a major employment centre?	-	The site is further than 1000m from a major employment centre.
3.2 Will the proposed development contribute towards meeting the need for new industrial, office or warehousing floorspace?	-	This site would be developed for residential use, therefore additional employment floorspace would not be provided.
3.3 Will the proposed development result in a net loss of existing employment land, or land which would be suitable for employment purposes?	0	The SLAA does not identify this site as being suitable for employment uses and development would not lead to loss of any existing employment land.
3.4 Will the proposed development increase the amount of commercial uses and other facilities in town, district or local centres?	0	The site is not located within a town, district or local centre.
4. Reduce road traffic and congestion through improved accessibility to services homes and jobs; reducing the need to travel by car/lorry and improving sustainable travel choice		
4.1 Is the location close to a major rail station? (same score as 3.1a)	--	The site is further than 1400m from a major rail station.
4.2 Is the location close to a minor rail station? (same score as 3.1b)	-	Site is located between 401m to 1200m from Hamble Railway Station.

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
4.3 Is the location close to a frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1c)	--	The site is located further than 800m from a frequent bus route.
4.4 Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1d)	+	The site is located within 400m of the First 6 semi-frequent bus route.
4.5(a) Will residential development at the location be close to a major employment centre? (same score as 3.1e)	-	The site is further than 1000m from a major employment centre.
4.5(b) Will employment development at the location be close to a major population centre?	0	Development would be residential only.
4.6 Are health facilities available locally? (same score as 2.2)	++	The site is located within 400m of Blackthorn Health Centre.
4.7 Are shopping and related services available locally?	--	The site is further than 800m from a town, district or local centre.
4.8 Is the location close to a Primary school?	-	The site is located 801m to 1000m from Hamble Primary School.
4.9 Is the location close to a Secondary school?	++	The site is located within 800m of Hamble Community Sports College.
4.10 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	0	An existing footpath touches the site at its southern most point.
4.11 Are there Geographical barriers between the location and key facilities/ destinations?	0	There is a geographical barrier in the form of the railway line between the site and one of the above destinations (Hamble Primary School).
5. Protect and conserve natural resources		
5.1 Will development avoid the sterilisation of mineral resources?	-?	The site is located in a Mineral Safeguarding Area and a Mineral Consultation Area.
5.2 Will it result in the loss of higher grade agricultural land?	--	The site consists entirely of high quality (grades 1 and 2) agricultural land.
5.3 Will it use previously developed land?	-	This site consists of greenfield land.
5.4 Will it deliver or support allotments or community farms?	+?	There will be no loss of allotments or community farms. The location could be suitable for these but this is unknown.
6. Reduce air, soil, water, light and noise pollution		
6.1 Will the location be affected by significant noise generating uses or Air Quality Management Areas?	0	The site is not within 200m of an A-road, motorway or AQMA
6.2 Will development increase pollution?	--?	Noise impact on south of site from Satchell Lane and commercial uses. Potential for air quality impacts on Hamble Lane AQMA.
7. Plan for the anticipated levels of climate change		
7.1 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure?	0	No loss of existing green infrastructure.
7.2 Is the location at risk from flooding, taking into account of the effects of climate change?	0	The site is not located in an area of surface water flood risk and the site is not located in Flood Zones 2 or 3.
7.3 Will the development be at risk from coastal change? If so, can the Shoreline Management Plan Objectives be supported?	0	The site is not near the coast.
8. Minimise Eastleigh's contribution to climate change by reducing the borough's carbon footprint and minimising other greenhouse gas emissions.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		

SA objective/ criterion	Justification	
9. Reduce waste generation and disposal, encourage waste prevention and reuse and achieve the sustainable management of waste.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
10. Protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and geodiversity, improving its quality and range.		
10.1 Could development negatively impact or lead to loss of an internationally or nationally designated site (either alone or in combination)?	0	Development will not negatively impact or lead to loss of an internationally or nationally designated site.
10.2 Could development negatively impact or lead or loss of a locally designated biodiversity site (either alone or in combination)?	0	Development will not negatively impact or lead to loss of a locally designated biodiversity site.
10.3 Will the development adversely affect areas with other nature conservation value, as identified in Biodiversity Action Plans (BAPs)?	0	Development will not adversely affect areas of other nature conservation value.
10.4 Will the development adversely impact the biodiversity network (e.g. Priority Biodiversity Links (PBLs), Priority Biodiversity Areas (PBAs), hedgerows and other corridors for species movement)?	0	Development will not adversely impact the biodiversity network.
10.5 Will the development adversely affect ancient woodland?	0	Development will not adversely affect ancient woodland.
11. Enhance the Borough's multifunctional green infrastructure networks.		
11.1 Will the development affect TPO trees?	0	Development of the site will not affect TPO trees.
11.2 Can the location be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	0	An existing footpath touches the site at its southern most point.
11.3 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure? (same score as 7.1)	0	No loss of existing green infrastructure.
12. Protect, enhance and manage the character and appearance of the landscape and townscape, maintaining and strengthening distinctiveness and its special qualities.		
12.1 Will development adversely affect the separation of neighbouring settlements?	--	The site was assessed as having very poor / poor potential for development in relation to avoiding settlement coalescence.
12.2 Will it protect the character of the countryside, coast, towns and/or villages, including views and settings?	0	The landscape within this site was assessed as having low sensitivity to development.
13. Protect and enhance and manage buildings, monuments, features, sites, places, areas and landscapes of archaeological, historical and cultural heritage importance.		
13.1 Will the development protect and enhance listed buildings and their settings, conservation areas, archaeological sites, historic landscapes and other sites of local importance for heritage?	0	Development of this site would not adversely affect heritage assets.

Site 39: Land to the North and South of Kings Avenue

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
1. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified local needs, including affordability and special needs		
1.1 Will the development provide a significant contribution towards meeting identified affordable housing needs?	++	The site has the capacity to provide 87 dwellings.
1.2 Will it provide other elements of identified housing need e.g. housing for older persons, self-build, support housing?	?	Uncertainty is recorded against all residential site options as information on provision of other elements of housing need is not available on a consistent basis.
2. Safeguard and improve community health, safety and wellbeing		
2.1 Are community facilities (community hall or library) available locally?	0	The site is within 400m to 800m of a community hall.
2.2 Are health facilities available locally?	-	The site is within 1201m to 1600m from Blackthorn Health Centre.
2.3 What effect would the development have on local provision of sports pitches and facilities?	--	The location of this site results in the loss of sport pitches and facilities – Aerostructures Sports and Social Club.
2.4 Is public open space available locally?	+	The site is located within 300m of existing open space at Mount Pleasant Recreation Ground.
2.5 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network?	-	There are no footpaths or cycle paths within or adjacent to the site.
3. Develop a dynamic and diverse economy		
3.1(a) Is the location close to a major rail station?	--	The site is further than 1400m from a major rail station.
3.1 (b) Is the location close to a minor rail station?	-	The site is between 401m to 1200m from Hamble Railway Station.
3.1 (c) Is the location close to a frequent bus route?	--	The site is further than 800m from a frequent bus route.
3.1 (d) Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route?	+	The site is within 400m of the First 6 semi-frequent bus route.
3.1 (e) Is the location close to a major employment centre?	-	The site is further than 1000m from a major employment centre.
3.2 Will the proposed development contribute towards meeting the need for new industrial, office or warehousing floorspace?	-	This site would be developed for residential use, therefore additional employment floorspace would not be provided.
3.3 Will the proposed development result in a net loss of existing employment land, or land which would be suitable for employment purposes?	-	Development will result in the loss of some employment land as office space is located in the south section of the site.
3.4 Will the proposed development increase the amount of commercial uses and other facilities in town, district or local centres?	0	The site is not located within a town, district or local centre.
4. Reduce road traffic and congestion through improved accessibility to services homes and jobs; reducing the need to travel by car/lorry and improving sustainable travel choice		
4.1 Is the location close to a major rail station? (same score as 3.1a)	--	The site is further than 1400m from a major rail station.
4.2 Is the location close to a minor rail station? (same score as 3.1b)	-	The site is between 401m to 1200m from Hamble Railway Station.

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
4.3 Is the location close to a frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1c)	--	The site is further than 800m from a frequent bus route.
4.4 Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1d)	+	The site is within 400m of the First 6 semi-frequent bus route.
4.5(a) Will residential development at the location be close to a major employment centre? (same score as 3.1e)	-	The site is further than 1000m from a major employment centre.
4.5(b) Will employment development at the location be close to a major population centre?	0	Development would be residential only.
4.6 Are health facilities available locally? (same score as 2.2)	-	The site is within 1201m to 1600m from Blackthorn Health Centre.
4.7 Are shopping and related services available locally?	+	Half of the site is within 200m of Coronation Parade local centre. The remainder of the site is within 400m.
4.8 Is the location close to a Primary school?	+	The site is within 400m of Hamble Primary School
4.9 Is the location close to a Secondary school?	+	The site is 801m to 1200m from The Hamble Secondary School.
4.10 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	-	There are no footpaths or cycle paths within or adjacent to the site.
4.11 Are there Geographical barriers between the location and key facilities/ destinations?	0	Geographical barriers exist on the most direct walking routes to two of the destinations above, in the form the railway line.
5. Protect and conserve natural resources		
5.1 Will development avoid the sterilisation of mineral resources?	0	The site does not lie within a Mineral Safeguarding Area or Mineral Consultation Area.
5.2 Will it result in the loss of higher grade agricultural land?	0	The site does not contain any agricultural land.
5.3 Will it use previously developed land?	-	This site consists of greenfield land.
5.4 Will it deliver or support allotments or community farms?	+?	There will be no loss of allotments or community farms. The location could be suitable for these but this is unknown.
6. Reduce air, soil, water, light and noise pollution		
6.1 Will the location be affected by significant noise generating uses or Air Quality Management Areas?	0	The site is not located within 200m of a railway, A-road or motorway or an AQMA.
6.2 Will development increase pollution?	--?	Industrial noise impact from Hamble Aerostructures, 24 hour operation. Road Traffic noise impact from Hamble Lane, and site access. Noise impact from any co located commercial / business uses also. Separation between noise sensitive development and roads / industrial uses will be necessary. Potential for traffic impacts generated by this development on existing AQMA in Hamble Lane. Impacts from industrial use on sensitive development located more closely to it (IPPC site). Land contamination – adjacent to brownfield.
7. Plan for the anticipated levels of climate change		
7.1 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure?	0	No loss of existing green infrastructure.
7.2 Is the location at risk from flooding, taking into account of the effects of climate change?	-?	A small area on the eastern edge of the site is subject to 'less' surface water flood risk.

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
7.3 Will the development be at risk from coastal change? If so, can the Shoreline Management Plan Objectives be supported?	0	This site is not located near the coast.
8. Minimise Eastleigh's contribution to climate change by reducing the borough's carbon footprint and minimising other greenhouse gas emissions.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
9. Reduce waste generation and disposal, encourage waste prevention and reuse and achieve the sustainable management of waste.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
10. Protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and geodiversity, improving its quality and range.		
10.1 Could development negatively impact or lead to loss of an internationally or nationally designated site (either alone or in combination)?	--?	The site could contain supporting habitat for Brent Geese from the Solent and Southampton Water SPA, although this is uncertain. The EBC ecological appraisal suggests that it may not be possible to mitigate loss of this supporting habitat. If the site drains from the west it could drain into a watercourse that leads to the Solent and the SPA and Ramsar site. Potential mitigation is proposed in the form of naturalised SuDS with 3 forms of filtration.
10.2 Could development negatively impact or lead or loss of a locally designated biodiversity site (either alone or in combination)?	-	The site is located within close proximity to West Wood SINC, part of the Royal Victoria Country Park. Mitigation is proposed in the form of a 20m buffer.
10.3 Will the development adversely affect areas with other nature conservation value, as identified in Biodiversity Action Plans (BAPs)?	0	The site will not impact other areas of nature conservation value.
10.4 Will the development adversely impact the biodiversity network (e.g. Priority Biodiversity Links (PBLs), Priority Biodiversity Areas (PBAs), hedgerows and other corridors for species movement)?	0	Development will not adversely impact the biodiversity network.
10.5 Will the development adversely affect ancient woodland?	-	The site is within close proximity to West Wood ancient woodland, part of the Royal Victoria Country Park. Mitigation is proposed in the form of a 20m buffer.
11. Enhance the Borough's multifunctional green infrastructure networks.		
11.1 Will the development affect TPO trees?	-?	Yes - TPO 35-E covering all tree species.
11.2 Can the location be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	-	There are no footpaths or cycle paths within or adjacent to the site.
11.3 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure? (same score as 7.1)	0	No loss of existing green infrastructure.
12. Protect, enhance and manage the character and appearance of the landscape and townscape, maintaining and strengthening distinctiveness and its special qualities.		
12.1 Will development adversely affect the separation of neighbouring settlements?	0	The site was assessed as having good / very good potential for development in relation to avoiding settlement coalescence.
12.2 Will it protect the character of the countryside, coast, towns and/or villages, including views and settings?	0	The landscape within this site was assessed as having low sensitivity to development.
13. Protect and enhance and manage buildings,		

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
monuments, features, sites, places, areas and landscapes of archaeological, historical and cultural heritage importance.		
13.1 Will the development protect and enhance listed buildings and their settings, conservation areas, archaeological sites, historic landscapes and other sites of local importance for heritage?	-?	Sydney Lodge is a Grade II* listed house by Sir John Soane which is in need of considerable expenditure. Development of the site has the potential for adverse effects on the structure due to vibration.

Site 40: Mercury Yacht Marina; land west of Satchell Lane; land at Hamble Petroleum Storage Depot

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
1. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified local needs, including affordability and special needs		
1.1 Will the development provide a significant contribution towards meeting identified affordable housing needs?	++	The site has the capacity to provide 148 dwellings.
1.2 Will it provide other elements of identified housing need e.g. housing for older persons, self-build, support housing?	?	Uncertainty is recorded against all residential site options as information on provision of other elements of housing need is not available on a consistent basis.
2. Safeguard and improve community health, safety and wellbeing		
2.1 Are community facilities (community hall or library) available locally?	0	The eastern half of the site is located 401 to 800m from Hype Youth Centre.
2.2 Are health facilities available locally?	+	The north western corner of the site is located 401 to 800m from Blackthorn Health Centre.
2.3 What effect would the development have on local provision of sports pitches and facilities?	0	Development of this site would not result in the loss of existing sports pitches or facilities.
2.4 Is public open space available locally?	+	The southern half of the site is located within 300m of public open space including Mercury Marshes.
2.5 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network?	0	An existing footpath runs adjacent to the south western edge of the site.
3. Develop a dynamic and diverse economy		
3.1(a) Is the location close to a major rail station?	--	The site is located further than 1400m from a major railway station.
3.1 (b) Is the location close to a minor rail station?	-	The site is located 401 to 1200m from Hamble Railway Station.
3.1 (c) Is the location close to a frequent bus route?	--	The site is located more than 800m from a frequent bus route.
3.1 (d) Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route?	-	The western edge of the site is located 401 to 800m from the semi-frequent First 6 bus route.
3.1 (e) Is the location close to a major employment centre?	+	The southern corner of the site is located 401 to 1000m from the GE Aviation site.
3.2 Will the proposed development contribute towards meeting the need for new industrial, office or warehousing floorspace?	-	This site would be developed for residential use, therefore additional employment floorspace would not be provided.
3.3 Will the proposed development result in a net loss of existing employment land, or land which would be suitable for employment purposes?	-	The SLAA forms identifies that development could result in the possible loss of commercial boatyard functions and related employment uses.
3.4 Will the proposed development increase the amount of commercial uses and other facilities in town, district or local centres?	0	The site is not located within a town, district or local centre.
4. Reduce road traffic and congestion through improved accessibility to services homes and jobs; reducing the need to travel by car/lorry and improving sustainable travel choice		
4.1 Is the location close to a major rail station? (same score as 3.1a)	--	The site is located further than 1400m from a major railway station.
4.2 Is the location close to a minor rail station? (same score as 3.1b)	-	The site is located 401 to 1200m from Hamble Railway Station.
4.3 Is the location close to a frequent bus route?	--	The site is located more than 800m from a frequent

SA objective/ criterion (same score as 3.1c)		Justification bus route.
4.4 Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1d)	-	The western edge of the site is located 401 to 800m from the semi-frequent First 6 bus route.
4.5(a) Will residential development at the location be close to a major employment centre? (same score as 3.1e)	+	The southern corner of the site is located 401 to 1000m from the GE Aviation site.
4.5(b) Will employment development at the location be close to a major population centre?	0	Development would be residential only.
4.6 Are health facilities available locally? (same score as 2.2)	+	The north western corner of the site is located 401 to 800m from Blackthorn Health Centre.
4.7 Are shopping and related services available locally?	--	The site is located further than 800m from a town, local or district centre.
4.8 Is the location close to a Primary school?	0	The southern corner of the site is located within 601 to 800m from Hamble Primary School.
4.9 Is the location close to a Secondary school?	++	The western half of the site is located within 800m of Hamble Community Sports College.
4.10 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	0	An existing footpath runs adjacent to the south western edge of the site.
4.11 Are there Geographical barriers between the location and key facilities/ destinations?	-	The railway line to the north, west and south west of the site form a geographical barrier between the site and three or more of the above destinations including the primary school, secondary school and doctor's surgery.
5. Protect and conserve natural resources		
5.1 Will development avoid the sterilisation of mineral resources?	-?	The western half of the site is located in a Mineral Safeguarding Area and a Mineral Consultation Area.
5.2 Will it result in the loss of higher grade agricultural land?	0	The majority of the site is located in an area of low quality agricultural land.
5.3 Will it use previously developed land?	-	This site consists of greenfield land.
5.4 Will it deliver or support allotments or community farms?	+?	There will be no loss of allotments or community farms. The location could be suitable for these but this is unknown.
6. Reduce air, soil, water, light and noise pollution		
6.1 Will the location be affected by significant noise generating uses or Air Quality Management Areas?	0	The site is not located within 200m of a railway, A-road or motorway or an AQMA.
6.2 Will development increase pollution?	--?	Potentially significant Brownfield issues to resolve form former military fuel storage depot and boatyards. Some noise impact form Satchell Lane. Potential for air quality impacts on Hamble Lane AQMA.
7. Plan for the anticipated levels of climate change		
7.1 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure?	0	No loss of existing green infrastructure.
7.2 Is the location at risk from flooding, taking into account of the effects of climate change?	--?	The northern corner of the site and the eastern edge are located within Flood Zone 3. The centre of the site is also subject to 'less' surface water flood risk.
7.3 Will the development be at risk from coastal change? If so, can the Shoreline Management Plan Objectives be supported?	--	EBC have confirmed that this site is located in an area of coastal change but the site does not contribute to SMP objectives.

SA objective/ criterion	Justification	
8. Minimise Eastleigh's contribution to climate change by reducing the borough's carbon footprint and minimising other greenhouse gas emissions.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
9. Reduce waste generation and disposal, encourage waste prevention and reuse and achieve the sustainable management of waste.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
10. Protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and geodiversity, improving its quality and range.		
10.1 Could development negatively impact or lead to loss of an internationally or nationally designated site (either alone or in combination)?	--	Part of the eastern boundary of the site is within the Solent and Southampton Water SPA and Ramsar site and the Solent Maritime SAC. Large areas of the site consist of supporting habitat, which would be lost if developed. Development would also adversely affect the hydrology of the designated sites, including disrupting the balance of freshwater and saltwater inputs to the saltmarsh. Development is also likely to disrupt bird species for which the European sites are designated. The EBC ecological appraisal states that it is not possible to mitigate negative impacts arising from drainage of the site into the Solent and implies that suitable mitigation is not possible for the other negative effects identified.
10.2 Could development negatively impact or lead to loss of a locally designated biodiversity site (either alone or in combination)?	--	The site incorporates the Mercury Marina Saltmarsh SINC. The hydrological processes required are likely to be disrupted by development of this site. Recreational disturbance will also have adverse effects, and in combination effects are likely on Badnum Copse SINC, a small part of which is included within the northern edge of the site.
10.3 Will the development adversely affect areas with other nature conservation value, as identified in Biodiversity Action Plans (BAPs)?	--	Development of the site is likely to adversely affect areas of saltmarsh, coastal woodland and other coastal habitats.
10.4 Will the development adversely impact the biodiversity network (e.g. Priority Biodiversity Links (PBLs), Priority Biodiversity Areas (PBAs), hedgerows and other corridors for species movement)?	--	The site is completely covered by the Hamble Estuary PBA, which would be lost to development.
10.5 Will the development adversely affect ancient woodland?	-	The site is adjacent to Badnum Copse SINC which contains ancient woodland. Mitigation is considered in the EBC ecological appraisal in the form of significant buffers.
11. Enhance the Borough's multifunctional green infrastructure networks.		
11.1 Will the development affect TPO trees?	0	Development will not affect TPO trees.
11.2 Can the location be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	0	An existing footpath runs adjacent to the south western edge of the site.
11.3 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure? (same score as 7.1)	0	No loss of existing green infrastructure.
12. Protect, enhance and manage the character and appearance of the landscape and townscape, maintaining and strengthening distinctiveness and its special qualities.		
12.1 Will development adversely affect the separation of neighbouring settlements?	-	The site was assessed as having average potential for development in relation to avoiding settlement coalescence.
12.2 Will it protect the character of the countryside,	--	The landscape within this site was assessed as having

SA objective/ criterion	Justification
coast, towns and/or villages, including views and settings?	high / moderate sensitivity to development.
13. Protect and enhance and manage buildings, monuments, features, sites, places, areas and landscapes of archaeological, historical and cultural heritage importance.	
13.1 Will the development protect and enhance listed buildings and their settings, conservation areas, archaeological sites, historic landscapes and other sites of local importance for heritage?	Development of the river frontage of this site could adversely affect the quietest part of the river. The south western part of the site is made ground from the alluvium dredged to form the marina. The spit into Badnam Creek is within the Bursledon Conservation Area.

Site 41: Land South of Winchester Road, Boorley Green

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
1. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified local needs, including affordability and special needs		
1.1 Will the development provide a significant contribution towards meeting identified affordable housing needs?	++	This site is capable of accommodating 23 dwellings.
1.2 Will it provide other elements of identified housing need e.g. housing for older persons, self-build, support housing?	?	Uncertainty is recorded against all residential site options as information on provision of other elements of housing need is not available on a consistent basis.
2. Safeguard and improve community health, safety and wellbeing		
2.1 Are community facilities (community hall or library) available locally?	-	The site is further than 800m from an existing community hall or library.
2.2 Are health facilities available locally?	0	This site is located between 801m and 1200m of Botley Health Care Centre.
2.3 What effect would the development have on local provision of sports pitches and facilities?	0	Development would not lead to loss of existing sports facilities.
2.4 Is public open space available locally?	+	This site is within 300m of Falcon Way amenity space and within 800m of additional areas of open space.
2.5 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network?	-	There are no footpath or cycle routes crossing or adjacent to this site.
3. Develop a dynamic and diverse economy		
3.1(a) Is the location close to a major rail station?	-	This site is located between 1201m and 1400m of Hedge End rail station.
3.1 (b) Is the location close to a minor rail station?	--	The site is located further than 1200m from a minor rail station.
3.1 (c) Is the location close to a frequent bus route?	--	The site is located further than 800m from a frequent bus route.
3.1 (d) Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route?	--	The site is located further than 800m from a semi-frequent bus route.
3.1 (e) Is the location close to a major employment centre?	-	The site is located over 1000m from a major employment centre.
3.2 Will the proposed development contribute towards meeting the need for new industrial, office or warehousing floorspace?	-	This site would be developed for residential use, therefore additional employment floorspace would not be provided.
3.3 Will the proposed development result in a net loss of existing employment land, or land which would be suitable for employment purposes?	0?	The SLAA recognises this site as being suitable for employment land. However, EBC has advised that this is not a reasonable alternative use for the site.
3.4 Will the proposed development increase the amount of commercial uses and other facilities in town, district or local centres?	0	Development would not lead to loss of commercial uses or other facilities in town, district or local centres.
4. Reduce road traffic and congestion through improved accessibility to services homes and jobs; reducing the need to travel by car/lorry and improving sustainable travel choice		
4.1 Is the location close to a major rail station? (same score as 3.1a)	-	This site is located between 1201m and 1400m of Hedge End rail station.
4.2 Is the location close to a minor rail station? (same score as 3.1b)	--	The site is located further than 1200m from a minor rail station.
4.3 Is the location close to a frequent bus route?	--	The site is located further than 800m from a frequent

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
(same score as 3.1c)		bus route.
4.4 Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1d)	--	The site is located further than 800m from a semi-frequent bus route.
4.5(a) Will residential development at the location be close to a major employment centre? (same score as 3.1e)	-	The site is located over 1000m from a major employment centre.
4.5(b) Will employment development at the location be close to a major population centre?	0	Development would be residential only.
4.6 Are health facilities available locally? (same score as 2.2)	0	This site is located between 801m and 1200m of Botley Health Care Centre.
4.7 Are shopping and related services available locally?	--	The site is over 800m from a town, district or local centre.
4.8 Is the location close to a Primary school?	-	The site is located between 801m and 1000m of Berrywood Primary School and a smaller area of the site is also within 1000m of Botley Church of England Primary School.
4.9 Is the location close to a Secondary school?	0	The site is located between 1201m and 1600m of Wildern School.
4.10 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	-	There are no footpath or cycle routes crossing or adjacent to this site.
4.11 Are there Geographical barriers between the location and key facilities/ destinations?	-	In order to access all services described above, residents would have to cross the railway line.
5. Protect and conserve natural resources		
5.1 Will development avoid the sterilisation of mineral resources?	0	The site is not located within an area safeguarded for minerals extraction.
5.2 Will it result in the loss of higher grade agricultural land?	-	This site consists of medium quality (Grade 3) agricultural land.
5.3 Will it use previously developed land?	+?/-	The site is primarily greenfield land. There are a few existing farm buildings in the north western part of the site but it is unknown whether these will be retained.
5.4 Will it deliver or support allotments or community farms?	+?	There would be no loss of allotments or community farms. The location could be suitable for these but this is unknown.
6. Reduce air, soil, water, light and noise pollution		
6.1 Will the location be affected by significant noise generating uses or Air Quality Management Areas?	-?	The site is adjacent to a railway line and the B3354.
6.2 Will development increase pollution?	-?	Development could exacerbate existing air quality issues in the High Street Botley AQMA.
7. Plan for the anticipated levels of climate change		
7.1 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure?	0	Development of this site will not lead to loss of GI.
7.2 Is the location at risk from flooding, taking into account of the effects of climate change?	--?	The south eastern part of this site lies within an area at intermediate risk of surface water flooding.
7.3 Will the development be at risk from coastal change? If so, can the Shoreline Management Plan Objectives be supported?	0	This is not a coastal site.
8. Minimise Eastleigh's contribution to climate change by reducing the borough's carbon footprint and minimising other greenhouse gas emissions.		

SA objective/ criterion	Justification	
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
9. Reduce waste generation and disposal, encourage waste prevention and reuse and achieve the sustainable management of waste.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
10. Protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and geodiversity, improving its quality and range.		
10.1 Could development negatively impact or lead to loss of an internationally or nationally designated site (either alone or in combination)?	0	Development is not expected to affect internationally or nationally designated nature conservation sites.
10.2 Could development negatively impact or lead or loss of a locally designated biodiversity site (either alone or in combination)?	0	Development is not expected to affect locally designated nature conservation sites.
10.3 Will the development adversely affect areas with other nature conservation value, as identified in Biodiversity Action Plans (BAPs)?	-	The site is recorded as improved grassland. Hedgerow surrounds the site and some removal of this is likely to be required for access.
10.4 Will the development adversely impact the biodiversity network (e.g. Priority Biodiversity Links (PBLs), Priority Biodiversity Areas (PBAs), hedgerows and other corridors for species movement)?	--	A large part of the site is within the Railway PBL.
10.5 Will the development adversely affect ancient woodland?	0	Development will not affect ancient woodland.
11. Enhance the Borough's multifunctional green infrastructure networks.		
11.1 Will the development affect TPO trees?	0	There are no TPO trees on the site.
11.2 Can the location be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	-	There are no footpath or cycle routes crossing or adjacent to this site.
11.3 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure? (same score as 7.1)	0	Development of this site will not lead to loss of GI.
12. Protect, enhance and manage the character and appearance of the landscape and townscape, maintaining and strengthening distinctiveness and its special qualities.		
12.1 Will development adversely affect the separation of neighbouring settlements?	--	Site is assessed as having very poor/poor potential for development in terms of avoiding impacts on settlement coalescence.
12.2 Will it protect the character of the countryside, coast, towns and/or villages, including views and settings?	-	This site is assessed as having moderate-low sensitivity to development.
13. Protect and enhance and manage buildings, monuments, features, sites, places, areas and landscapes of archaeological, historical and cultural heritage importance.		
13.1 Will the development protect and enhance listed buildings and their settings, conservation areas, archaeological sites, historic landscapes and other sites of local importance for heritage?	0	Development of this site will not affect heritage assets. EBC officer input required

Site 42: Land north of Myrtle Cottage, Winchester Road

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
1. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified local needs, including affordability and special needs		
1.1 Will the development provide a significant contribution towards meeting identified affordable housing needs?	++	This site is capable of accommodating 22 dwellings.
1.2 Will it provide other elements of identified housing need e.g. housing for older persons, self-build, support housing?	?	Uncertainty is recorded against all residential site options as information on provision of other elements of housing need is not available on a consistent basis.
2. Safeguard and improve community health, safety and wellbeing		
2.1 Are community facilities (community hall or library) available locally?	-	This site is over 800m from an existing community hall or library.
2.2 Are health facilities available locally?	-	The site is within 1201m and 1600m of St Luke's Surgery.
2.3 What effect would the development have on local provision of sports pitches and facilities?	0	Development would not lead to loss of any sports pitches or facilities.
2.4 Is public open space available locally?	0	The site is within 300m to 800m of Watkin Road green route and approximately 800m from Cheltenham Gardens amenity space.
2.5 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network?	0	A footpath is adjacent to the site but there are not cycle routes within or adjacent to the site.
3. Develop a dynamic and diverse economy		
3.1(a) Is the location close to a major rail station?	+	The site is partly between 401 and 800m of Hedge End railway station.
3.1 (b) Is the location close to a minor rail station?	--	The site is further than 1200m of a minor rail station.
3.1 (c) Is the location close to a frequent bus route?	--	The site is further than 800m from a frequent bus route.
3.1 (d) Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route?	-	The site is within 400 to 800m of the First 8 bus route.
3.1 (e) Is the location close to a major employment centre?	-	The site is further than 1000m to a major employment centre.
3.2 Will the proposed development contribute towards meeting the need for new industrial, office or warehousing floorspace?	-	This site would be developed for residential use only.
3.3 Will the proposed development result in a net loss of existing employment land, or land which would be suitable for employment purposes?	0	The SLAA does not recognise this site as being suitable for employment land.
3.4 Will the proposed development increase the amount of commercial uses and other facilities in town, district or local centres?	0	Development would not lead to loss of commercial uses or other facilities in town, district or local centres.
4. Reduce road traffic and congestion through improved accessibility to services homes and jobs; reducing the need to travel by car/lorry and improving sustainable travel choice		
4.1 Is the location close to a major rail station? (same score as 3.1a)	+	The site is partly between 401 and 800m of Hedge End railway station.
4.2 Is the location close to a minor rail station? (same score as 3.1b)	--	The site is further than 1200m of a minor rail station.
4.3 Is the location close to a frequent bus route?	--	The site is further than 800m from a frequent bus

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
(same score as 3.1c)		route.
4.4 Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1d)	-	The site is within 400 to 800m of the First 8 bus route.
4.5(a) Will residential development at the location be close to a major employment centre? (same score as 3.1e)	-	The site is further than 1000m to a major employment centre.
4.5(b) Will employment development at the location be close to a major population centre?	0	Development would be residential only.
4.6 Are health facilities available locally? (same score as 2.2)	-	The site is within 1201m and 1600m of St Luke's Surgery.
4.7 Are shopping and related services available locally?	--	The site is further than 800m from a town, district or local centre.
4.8 Is the location close to a Primary school?	-	The site is between 801m and 1000m of Berrywood Primary School.
4.9 Is the location close to a Secondary school?	0	The site is within 1201 and 1600m of Wildern School.
4.10 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	0	A footpath is adjacent to the site but there are not cycle routes within or adjacent to the site.
4.11 Are there Geographical barriers between the location and key facilities/ destinations?	-	Nearby services and facilities, including healthcare facilities and schools, are located in Hedge End, which is on the other side of the railway line. Hedge End rail station may be accessible from the site without crossing to the other side of the railway.
5. Protect and conserve natural resources		
5.1 Will development avoid the sterilisation of mineral resources?	0	The site is not in an MSA or MCA.
5.2 Will it result in the loss of higher grade agricultural land?	-	The site consists of medium quality (Grade 3) agricultural land.
5.3 Will it use previously developed land?	++	The site currently consists of residential use and storage of logs by an arboricultural contractor.
5.4 Will it deliver or support allotments or community farms?	+?	There would be no loss of allotments or community farms. The location could be suitable for these but this is unknown.
6. Reduce air, soil, water, light and noise pollution		
6.1 Will the location be affected by significant noise generating uses or Air Quality Management Areas?	-?	The site is not within an AQMA, or within 200m of a railway, motorway or A road. Site is expected to be adversely impacted by traffic noise from the B3354 Botley Road.
6.2 Will development increase pollution?	-?	Development could lead to a great number of journeys along Winchester Road, which leads to Botley High Street AQMA. As such, development could exacerbate air quality issues in the AQMA.
7. Plan for the anticipated levels of climate change		
7.1 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure?	0	Development would not lead to a loss of existing GI.
7.2 Is the location at risk from flooding, taking into account of the effects of climate change?	0	The site is not at risk from surface water flooding or in Flood Zones 2 or 3.
7.3 Will the development be at risk from coastal change? If so, can the Shoreline Management Plan Objectives be supported?	0	This is not a coastal site.

SA objective/ criterion	Justification	
8. Minimise Eastleigh's contribution to climate change by reducing the borough's carbon footprint and minimising other greenhouse gas emissions.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
9. Reduce waste generation and disposal, encourage waste prevention and reuse and achieve the sustainable management of waste.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
10. Protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and geodiversity, improving its quality and range.		
10.1 Could development negatively impact or lead to loss of an internationally or nationally designated site (either alone or in combination)?	0	Development is not expected to affect internationally or nationally designated nature conservation sites.
10.2 Could development negatively impact or lead or loss of a locally designated biodiversity site (either alone or in combination)?	0	Development is not expected to affect locally designated nature conservation sites.
10.3 Will the development adversely affect areas with other nature conservation value, as identified in Biodiversity Action Plans (BAPs)?	-	Reptiles are likely to be present on the site, including grass snake and slow worm. Roosting bats are also likely to be present in the building on the site. There is a possibility that the scrub and hedgerows may be used by dormice. These protected species could be adversely affected by development at the site.
10.4 Will the development adversely impact the biodiversity network (e.g. Priority Biodiversity Links (PBLs), Priority Biodiversity Areas (PBAs), hedgerows and other corridors for species movement)?	-?	There are hedgerows present on the north and west boundaries of the site. The EBC biodiversity assessment has assumed that these will be retained, but there is a possibility that they could be lost or damaged by development.
10.5 Will the development adversely affect ancient woodland?	0	Development will not affect ancient woodland.
11. Enhance the Borough's multifunctional green infrastructure networks.		
11.1 Will the development affect TPO trees?	0	There are no TPOs on or adjacent to the site
11.2 Can the location be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	0	A footpath is adjacent to the site but there are not cycle routes within or adjacent to the site.
11.3 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure? (same score as 7.1)	0	Development would not lead to a loss of existing GI.
12. Protect, enhance and manage the character and appearance of the landscape and townscape, maintaining and strengthening distinctiveness and its special qualities.		
12.1 Will development adversely affect the separation of neighbouring settlements?	0	This site was assessed as having good / very good potential for development in relation to avoiding settlement coalescence.
12.2 Will it protect the character of the countryside, coast, towns and/or villages, including views and settings?	0	The landscape within this site has low sensitivity to development.
13. Protect and enhance and manage buildings, monuments, features, sites, places, areas and landscapes of archaeological, historical and cultural heritage importance.		

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
13.1 Will the development protect and enhance listed buildings and their settings, conservation areas, archaeological sites, historic landscapes and other sites of local importance for heritage?	0	Development of this site will not affect heritage assets.

Site 43: Land North of Bert Betts Way and South of Peewit Hill

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
1. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified local needs, including affordability and special needs		
1.1 Will the development provide a significant contribution towards meeting identified affordable housing needs?	++	This site could accommodate 22 dwellings.
1.2 Will it provide other elements of identified housing need e.g. housing for older persons, self-build, support housing?	?	Uncertainty is recorded against all residential site options as information on provision of other elements of housing need is not available on a consistent basis.
2. Safeguard and improve community health, safety and wellbeing		
2.1 Are community facilities (community hall or library) available locally?	-	The site is further than 800m from an existing community hall or library.
2.2 Are health facilities available locally?	0	Burlesdon GP practice is within 801m and 1200m of the site.
2.3 What effect would the development have on local provision of sports pitches and facilities?	0	Development would not lead to loss of existing sports facilities.
2.4 Is public open space available locally?	-	The site is further than 800m from existing publically accessible open space.
2.5 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network?	-	There are no existing footpaths or cycle routes crossing or adjacent to the site.
3. Develop a dynamic and diverse economy		
3.1(a) Is the location close to a major rail station?	--	The site is further than 1400m from a major rail station.
3.1 (b) Is the location close to a minor rail station?	--	The site is further than 1200m from a minor rail station.
3.1 (c) Is the location close to a frequent bus route?	--	The site is further than 800m from a frequent bus route.
3.1 (d) Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route?	--	The site is further than 800m from a semi-frequent bus route.
3.1 (e) Is the location close to a major employment centre?	-	The site is further than 1000m from a major employment centre.
3.2 Will the proposed development contribute towards meeting the need for new industrial, office or warehousing floorspace?	-	This site would be developed for residential use, therefore additional employment floorspace would not be provided.
3.3 Will the proposed development result in a net loss of existing employment land, or land which would be suitable for employment purposes?	0	The SLAA indicates that this site is not suitable for employment use. No existing employment uses would be lost.
3.4 Will the proposed development increase the amount of commercial uses and other facilities in town, district or local centres?	0	Development would not lead to loss of commercial uses or other facilities in town, district or local centres.
4. Reduce road traffic and congestion through improved accessibility to services homes and jobs; reducing the need to travel by car/lorry and improving sustainable travel choice		
4.1 Is the location close to a major rail station? (same score as 3.1a)	--	The site is further than 1400m from a major rail station.
4.2 Is the location close to a minor rail station? (same score as 3.1b)	--	The site is further than 1200m from a minor rail station.

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
4.3 Is the location close to a frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1c)	--	The site is further than 800m from a frequent bus route.
4.4 Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1d)	--	The site is further than 800m from a semi-frequent bus route.
4.5(a) Will residential development at the location be close to a major employment centre? (same score as 3.1e)	-	The site is further than 1000m from a major employment centre.
4.5(b) Will employment development at the location be close to a major population centre?	0	Development would be residential only.
4.6 Are health facilities available locally? (same score as 2.2)	0	Burlesdon GP practice is within 801m and 1200m of the site.
4.7 Are shopping and related services available locally?	--	The site is further than 800m from a town, district or local centre.
4.8 Is the location close to a Primary school?	--	The site is further than 1000m from a primary school.
4.9 Is the location close to a Secondary school?	--	The site is further than 2000m from a secondary school.
4.10 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	-	There are no existing footpaths or cycle routes crossing or adjacent to the site.
4.11 Are there Geographical barriers between the location and key facilities/ destinations?	0	None of the facilities above are within walking distance of the site.
5. Protect and conserve natural resources		
5.1 Will development avoid the sterilisation of mineral resources?	-?	The site is located within a Mineral Consultation Area.
5.2 Will it result in the loss of higher grade agricultural land?	0	The site consists of low quality agricultural land.
5.3 Will it use previously developed land?	+?/-	The site is mostly greenfield but there are a few existing buildings on the site. It is not known if these will be retained.
5.4 Will it deliver or support allotments or community farms?	+?	There would be no loss of allotments or community farms. The location could be suitable for these but this is unknown.
6. Reduce air, soil, water, light and noise pollution		
6.1 Will the location be affected by significant noise generating uses or Air Quality Management Areas?	-?	This site lies between the M27 junction 8 and the A27.
6.2 Will development increase pollution?	-?	Development could lead to an increase in traffic in the Hamble Lane AQMA.
7. Plan for the anticipated levels of climate change		
7.1 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure?	0	Development would not result in loss of GI.
7.2 Is the location at risk from flooding, taking into account of the effects of climate change?	0	The site is not located in an area of surface water flood risk or within Flood Zones 2 or 3.
7.3 Will the development be at risk from coastal change? If so, can the Shoreline Management Plan Objectives be supported?	0	This is not a coastal site.
8. Minimise Eastleigh's contribution to climate change by reducing the borough's carbon footprint and minimising other greenhouse gas emissions.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		

SA objective/ criterion	Justification	
9. Reduce waste generation and disposal, encourage waste prevention and reuse and achieve the sustainable management of waste.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
10. Protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and geodiversity, improving its quality and range.		
10.1 Could development negatively impact or lead to loss of an internationally or nationally designated site (either alone or in combination)?	0	Development is not expected to impact internationally or nationally designated nature conservation sites.
10.2 Could development negatively impact or lead or loss of a locally designated biodiversity site (either alone or in combination)?	-?	Peewit Hill SINC could be impacted due to an increase in recreational pressure, if it is accessible from the site.
10.3 Will the development adversely affect areas with other nature conservation value, as identified in Biodiversity Action Plans (BAPs)?	-	Site is predominantly woodland, which has been excluded from developable area due to ecology and topography concerns. However, development at the site could still affect species using the woodland. Grazed grassland would be lost to development.
10.4 Will the development adversely impact the biodiversity network (e.g. Priority Biodiversity Links (PBLs), Priority Biodiversity Areas (PBAs), hedgerows and other corridors for species movement)?	0	Development is not expected to affect biodiversity network links.
10.5 Will the development adversely affect ancient woodland?	0	Development will not affect ancient woodland.
11. Enhance the Borough's multifunctional green infrastructure networks.		
11.1 Will the development affect TPO trees?	0	There are no TPO trees on this site.
11.2 Can the location be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	-	There are no existing footpaths or cycle routes crossing or adjacent to the site.
11.3 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure? (same score as 7.1)	0	Development would not result in loss of GI.
12. Protect, enhance and manage the character and appearance of the landscape and townscape, maintaining and strengthening distinctiveness and its special qualities.		
12.1 Will development adversely affect the separation of neighbouring settlements?	-	The site is assessed as having average potential for development with regards to avoiding settlement coalescence.
12.2 Will it protect the character of the countryside, coast, towns and/or villages, including views and settings?	0	This site is assessed as having low sensitivity to development.
13. Protect and enhance and manage buildings, monuments, features, sites, places, areas and landscapes of archaeological, historical and cultural heritage importance.		
13.1 Will the development protect and enhance listed buildings and their settings, conservation areas, archaeological sites, historic landscapes and other sites of local importance for heritage?	0	Development of this site will not affect heritage assets. EBC officer input required

Site 44: Land at Foxholes Farm, Firtree Lane

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
1. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified local needs, including affordability and special needs		
1.1 Will the development provide a significant contribution towards meeting identified affordable housing needs?	++	This site is capable of accommodating 45 dwellings.
1.2 Will it provide other elements of identified housing need e.g. housing for older persons, self-build, support housing?	?	Uncertainty is recorded against all residential site options as information on provision of other elements of housing need is not available on a consistent basis.
2. Safeguard and improve community health, safety and wellbeing		
2.1 Are community facilities (community hall or library) available locally?	0	This site is between 400m and 800m of Horton Health Community Hall.
2.2 Are health facilities available locally?	-	This site is located between 1201 and 1600m from Stokewood Surgery.
2.3 What effect would the development have on local provision of sports pitches and facilities?	0	Development would not lead to loss of existing sports facilities.
2.4 Is public open space available locally?	+	This site is adjacent to Fir Tree Lane amenity space and across the road from a green route at Fir Tree Close. It is also within 300m of additional areas of amenity space.
2.5 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network?	0	There is an existing footpath adjacent to this site, which links to the wider footpath network.
3. Develop a dynamic and diverse economy		
3.1(a) Is the location close to a major rail station?	--	This site is further than 1400m from a major rail station.
3.1 (b) Is the location close to a minor rail station?	--	This site is further than 1200m from a minor rail station.
3.1 (c) Is the location close to a frequent bus route?	--	This site is further than 800m from a frequent bus route.
3.1 (d) Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route?	--	This site is further than 800m from a semi-frequent bus route.
3.1 (e) Is the location close to a major employment centre?	+	Part of this site is between 400m and 1000m from Chalcroft Business Park.
3.2 Will the proposed development contribute towards meeting the need for new industrial, office or warehousing floorspace?	-	This site would be developed for residential use, therefore additional employment floorspace would not be provided.
3.3 Will the proposed development result in a net loss of existing employment land, or land which would be suitable for employment purposes?	0	The SLAA does not recognise this site as being suitable for employment land.
3.4 Will the proposed development increase the amount of commercial uses and other facilities in town, district or local centres?	0	Development would not lead to loss of commercial uses or other facilities in town, district or local centres.
4. Reduce road traffic and congestion through improved accessibility to services homes and jobs; reducing the need to travel by car/lorry and improving sustainable travel choice		
4.1 Is the location close to a major rail station? (same score as 3.1a)	--	This site is further than 1400m from a major rail station.

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
4.2 Is the location close to a minor rail station? (same score as 3.1b)	--	This site is further than 1200m from a minor rail station.
4.3 Is the location close to a frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1c)	--	This site is further than 800m from a frequent bus route.
4.4 Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1d)	--	This site is further than 800m from a semi-frequent bus route.
4.5(a) Will residential development at the location be close to a major employment centre? (same score as 3.1e)	+	Part of this site is between 400m and 1000m from Chalcroft Business Park.
4.5(b) Will employment development at the location be close to a major population centre?	0	Development would be residential only.
4.6 Are health facilities available locally? (same score as 2.2)	-	This site is located between 1201 and 1600m from Stokewood Surgery.
4.7 Are shopping and related services available locally?	--	This site is further than 800m from a town, district or local centre.
4.8 Is the location close to a Primary school?	0	This site is partly within 601 to 800m of Fair Oak Junior School.
4.9 Is the location close to a Secondary school?	+	This site is located 800 to 1200m from Wyvern College.
4.10 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	0	There is an existing footpath adjacent to this site, which links to the wider footpath network.
4.11 Are there Geographical barriers between the location and key facilities/ destinations?	+	There are no geographical barriers on the most direct walking route to any of the destinations above. The nearest secondary schools are on the other side of the railway line, but as these are not considered to be within walking distance they have not been taken into account in terms of geographical barriers.
5. Protect and conserve natural resources		
5.1 Will development avoid the sterilisation of mineral resources?	0	This site is not in an area safeguarded for minerals extraction.
5.2 Will it result in the loss of higher grade agricultural land?	0	This site consists of low quality agricultural land.
5.3 Will it use previously developed land?	+/-	This site includes Foxholes Farm House and curtilage, some of which consists of previously developed land. The site also includes greenfield land.
5.4 Will it deliver or support allotments or community farms?	+?	There would be no loss of allotments or community farms. The location could be suitable for these but this is unknown.
6. Reduce air, soil, water, light and noise pollution		
6.1 Will the location be affected by significant noise generating uses or Air Quality Management Areas?	-?	This site is not within proximity of an AQMA, motorway or A-road. Potential for part of the site nearest Fir Tree Lane to be impacted by traffic noise and noise from agricultural uses.
6.2 Will development increase pollution?	-?	Development could impact on River Itchen SAC 1.6km to the west and ultimately the Solent N2K sites through site run off.
7. Plan for the anticipated levels of climate change		
7.1 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure?	0	Development of this site will not lead to loss of GI.
7.2 Is the location at risk from flooding, taking into account of the effects of climate change?	0	This site is not located within Flood Zones 2 or 3. There is a small area in the northwest part of the site that is subject to 'less' surface water flooding, but

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
		given the very small size of this area, it is considered negligible in the context of the rest of the site.
7.3 Will the development be at risk from coastal change? If so, can the Shoreline Management Plan Objectives be supported?	0	This is not a coastal site.
8. Minimise Eastleigh's contribution to climate change by reducing the borough's carbon footprint and minimising other greenhouse gas emissions.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
9. Reduce waste generation and disposal, encourage waste prevention and reuse and achieve the sustainable management of waste.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
10. Protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and geodiversity, improving its quality and range.		
10.1 Could development negatively impact or lead to loss of an internationally or nationally designated site (either alone or in combination)?	-	Development could impact on River Itchen SAC 1.6km to the west and ultimately the Solent N2K sites through site run off and reduction in freshwater inputs. EBC ecological appraisal suggests measures such as permeable surfacing and SUDS are likely to be needed to ensure no adverse effects.
10.2 Could development negatively impact or lead or loss of a locally designated biodiversity site (either alone or in combination)?	0	Development will not negatively impact or lead to loss of a locally designated biodiversity sites.
10.3 Will the development adversely affect areas with other nature conservation value, as identified in Biodiversity Action Plans (BAPs)?	-	Reptiles are likely to be present and bats may roost in the farm buildings.
10.4 Will the development adversely impact the biodiversity network (e.g. Priority Biodiversity Links (PBLs), Priority Biodiversity Areas (PBAs), hedgerows and other corridors for species movement)?	-?	There are hedgerows present on the boundaries of the site, which may be affected by development.
10.5 Will the development adversely affect ancient woodland?	0	Development will not have an adverse effect on ancient woodland.
11. Enhance the Borough's multifunctional green infrastructure networks.		
11.1 Will the development affect TPO trees?	0	There are no TPOs on or adjacent to the site
11.2 Can the location be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	0	There is an existing footpath adjacent to this site, which links to the wider footpath network.
11.3 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure? (same score as 7.1)	0	Development of this site will not lead to loss of GI.
12. Protect, enhance and manage the character and appearance of the landscape and townscape, maintaining and strengthening distinctiveness and its special qualities.		
12.1 Will development adversely affect the separation of neighbouring settlements?	0	This site was assessed as having good / very good potential for development in relation to avoiding settlement coalescence.
12.2 Will it protect the character of the countryside, coast, towns and/or villages, including views and settings?	0	The landscape within this site has low sensitivity to development.
13. Protect and enhance and manage buildings, monuments, features, sites, places, areas and		

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
landscapes of archaeological, historical and cultural heritage importance.		
13.1 Will the development protect and enhance listed buildings and their settings, conservation areas, archaeological sites, historic landscapes and other sites of local importance for heritage?	0	Development of this site will not affect heritage assets.

Site 45: Home Farm, St Johns Road, Hedge End

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
1. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified local needs, including affordability and special needs		
1.1 Will the development provide a significant contribution towards meeting identified affordable housing needs?	++	This site is capable of accommodating 16 dwellings.
1.2 Will it provide other elements of identified housing need e.g. housing for older persons, self-build, support housing?	?	Uncertainty is recorded against all residential site options as information on provision of other elements of housing need is not available on a consistent basis.
2. Safeguard and improve community health, safety and wellbeing		
2.1 Are community facilities (community hall or library) available locally?	-	This site is further from 800m from an existing community hall or library.
2.2 Are health facilities available locally?	-	The site is located between 12001 and 1600m of Hedge End Medical Centre.
2.3 What effect would the development have on local provision of sports pitches and facilities?	0	Development would not lead to loss of existing sports facilities.
2.4 Is public open space available locally?	+	The site is within 300m of Kanes Hill Allotments.
2.5 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network?	-	There are no existing footpaths or cycleways within or adjacent to the site.
3. Develop a dynamic and diverse economy		
3.1(a) Is the location close to a major rail station?	--	The site is further than 1400m from a major rail station.
3.1 (b) Is the location close to a minor rail station?	--	The site is further than 1200m from a minor rail station.
3.1 (c) Is the location close to a frequent bus route?	--	The site is further than 800m from a frequent bus route.
3.1 (d) Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route?	--	The site is further than 800m from a semi-frequent bus route.
3.1 (e) Is the location close to a major employment centre?	-	The site is over 1000m distance to a major employment centre.
3.2 Will the proposed development contribute towards meeting the need for new industrial, office or warehousing floorspace?	-	This site would be developed for residential use, therefore additional employment floorspace would not be provided.
3.3 Will the proposed development result in a net loss of existing employment land, or land which would be suitable for employment purposes?	0	The SLAA does not recognise this site as being suitable for employment land.
3.4 Will the proposed development increase the amount of commercial uses and other facilities in town, district or local centres?	0	Development would not lead to loss of commercial uses or other facilities in town, district or local centres.

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
4. Reduce road traffic and congestion through improved accessibility to services homes and jobs; reducing the need to travel by car/lorry and improving sustainable travel choice		
4.1 Is the location close to a major rail station? (same score as 3.1a)	--	The site is further than 1400m from a major rail station.
4.2 Is the location close to a minor rail station? (same score as 3.1b)	--	The site is further than 1200m from a minor rail station.
4.3 Is the location close to a frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1c)	--	The site is further than 800m from a frequent bus route.
4.4 Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1d)	--	The site is further than 800m from a semi-frequent bus route.
4.5(a) Will residential development at the location be close to a major employment centre? (same score as 3.1e)	-	The site is over 1000m distance to a major employment centre.
4.5(b) Will employment development at the location be close to a major population centre?	0	This site would be developed for residential use only.
4.6 Are health facilities available locally? (same score as 2.2)	-	The site is located between 12001 and 1600m of Hedge End Medical Centre.
4.7 Are shopping and related services available locally?	-	The east of the site is between 601m and 800m from Hedge End village centre.
4.8 Is the location close to a Primary school?	-?	The northwestern part of this site is between 801 and 1000m of Kanes Hill Primary School, although this is on the other side of the M27.
4.9 Is the location close to a Secondary school?	0	The site is within 1201m and 1600m of Wildern School.
4.10 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	-	There are no existing footpaths or cycleways within or adjacent to the site.
4.11 Are there Geographical barriers between the location and key facilities/ destinations?	0	Residents would be required to cross the M25 to access Kanes Hill Primary School. There are no geographical barriers to the other destinations discussed above.
5. Protect and conserve natural resources		
5.1 Will development avoid the sterilisation of mineral resources?	-?	The site lies within the River Terrace deposits MCA and the northwestern part of the site lies within a sharp sand and gravel resource MSA.
5.2 Will it result in the loss of higher grade agricultural land?	-	The majority of the site consists of lower quality agricultural land (Grades 4 and/or 5), but the eastern part of the site includes an area of medium quality (grade 3) agricultural land.
5.3 Will it use previously developed land?	-	The site currently consists of greenfield land.
5.4 Will it deliver or support allotments or community farms?	+?	There would be no loss of allotments or community farms. The location could be suitable for these but this is unknown.
6. Reduce air, soil, water, light and noise pollution		
6.1 Will the location be affected by significant noise generating uses or Air Quality Management Areas?	-?	The site is within 200m of the M27 motorway, which will result in site partially or wholly being above annual and possibly hourly target levels for NO ₂ .
6.2 Will development increase pollution?	-?	Development at this site is likely to lead to declaration of a new AQMA as a result of additional traffic and associated pollution,

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
7. Plan for the anticipated levels of climate change		
7.1 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure?	0	Development would not lead to a loss of GI.
7.2 Is the location at risk from flooding, taking into account of the effects of climate change?	0	The site is not in an area of surface water flood risk and not in Flood Zones 2 or 3.
7.3 Will the development be at risk from coastal change? If so, can the Shoreline Management Plan Objectives be supported?	0	This is not a coastal site.
8. Minimise Eastleigh's contribution to climate change by reducing the borough's carbon footprint and minimising other greenhouse gas emissions.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
9. Reduce waste generation and disposal, encourage waste prevention and reuse and achieve the sustainable management of waste.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
10. Protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and geodiversity, improving its quality and range.		
10.1 Could development negatively impact or lead to loss of an internationally or nationally designated site (either alone or in combination)?	0	Development is not expected to affect internationally or nationally designated nature conservation sites.
10.2 Could development negatively impact or lead or loss of a locally designated biodiversity site (either alone or in combination)?	0	Development is not expected to affect locally designated nature conservation sites.
10.3 Will the development adversely affect areas with other nature conservation value, as identified in Biodiversity Action Plans (BAPs)?	-	There is a pond present within 30m south of site. As such, the site has potential for impacts on great crested newts, if present. However, the habitat on site is likely to be of low value to GCN compared to surrounding woodland, so mitigation likely to be possible. Development would have potential for disturbance of bats using the woodland from lighting. There is a possibility that acid grassland is present on the site, which is a priority habitat. This could be lost to development.
10.4 Will the development adversely impact the biodiversity network (e.g. Priority Biodiversity Links (PBLs), Priority Biodiversity Areas (PBAs), hedgerows and other corridors for species movement)?	0	The site is adjacent to the M27 corridor PBL, although the EBC biodiversity assessment suggests there will be no or negligible effects on this.
10.5 Will the development adversely affect ancient woodland?	0	Development will not affect ancient woodland.
11. Enhance the Borough's multifunctional green infrastructure networks.		
11.1 Will the development affect TPO trees?	0	There are no TPOs on site. Woodland to the north and east of the site are covered by TPOs (139 W1 and 140 W1).
11.2 Can the location be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	-	There are no existing footpaths or cycleways within or adjacent to the site.
11.3 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure? (same score as 7.1)	0	Development would not lead to a loss of GI.
12. Protect, enhance and manage the character and appearance of the landscape and townscape, maintaining and strengthening distinctiveness and its		

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
special qualities.		
12.1 Will development adversely affect the separation of neighbouring settlements?	0	This site was assessed as having good / very good potential for development in relation to avoiding settlement coalescence.
12.2 Will it protect the character of the countryside, coast, towns and/or villages, including views and settings?	0	The landscape within this site has low sensitivity to development.
13. Protect and enhance and manage buildings, monuments, features, sites, places, areas and landscapes of archaeological, historical and cultural heritage importance.		
13.1 Will the development protect and enhance listed buildings and their settings, conservation areas, archaeological sites, historic landscapes and other sites of local importance for heritage?	0	Development of this site will not affect heritage assets.

Site 46: The Coach House, Netley Firs Road

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
1. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified local needs, including affordability and special needs		
1.1 Will the development provide a significant contribution towards meeting identified affordable housing needs?	++	This site is capable of accommodating 23 dwellings.
1.2 Will it provide other elements of identified housing need e.g. housing for older persons, self-build, support housing?	?	Uncertainty is recorded against all residential site options as information on provision of other elements of housing need is not available on a consistent basis.
2. Safeguard and improve community health, safety and wellbeing		
2.1 Are community facilities (community hall or library) available locally?	0	The southwestern part of this site is located between 400 and 800m of Hedge End Village Hall 2000 centre.
2.2 Are health facilities available locally?	0	The site is located between 801m and 1200m of Hedge End Medical Centre.
2.3 What effect would the development have on local provision of sports pitches and facilities?	0	Development would not lead to loss of existing sports facilities.
2.4 Is public open space available locally?	+	The site is within 300m of Kanes Hill Allotments and within 800m of a range of other open space facilities.
2.5 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network?	0	The site is adjacent to the Eastleigh Cycle Network.
3. Develop a dynamic and diverse economy		
3.1(a) Is the location close to a major rail station?	--	The site is further than 1400m from a major rail station.
3.1 (b) Is the location close to a minor rail station?	--	The site is further than 1200m from a minor rail station.
3.1 (c) Is the location close to a frequent bus route?	--	The site is further than 800m from a frequent bus route.
3.1 (d) Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route?	--	The site is further than 800m from a semi-frequent bus route.
3.1 (e) Is the location close to a major employment centre?	-	Development is further than 1000m from a major employment centre.
3.2 Will the proposed development contribute towards meeting the need for new industrial, office or warehousing floorspace?	-	This site would be developed for residential use, therefore additional employment floorspace would not be provided.
3.3 Will the proposed development result in a net loss of existing employment land, or land which would be suitable for employment purposes?	0	The SLAA suggests that the site is not suitable for employment uses.
3.4 Will the proposed development increase the amount of commercial uses and other facilities in town, district or local centres?	0	Development would not lead to loss of commercial uses or other facilities in town, district or local centres.
4. Reduce road traffic and congestion through improved accessibility to services homes and jobs; reducing the need to travel by car/lorry and improving sustainable travel choice		
4.1 Is the location close to a major rail station? (same score as 3.1a)	--	The site is further than 1400m from a major rail station.
4.2 Is the location close to a minor rail station? (same score as 3.1b)	--	The site is further than 1200m from a minor rail station.
4.3 Is the location close to a frequent bus route?	--	The site is further than 800m from a frequent bus

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
(same score as 3.1c)		route.
4.4 Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1d)	--	The site is further than 800m from a semi-frequent bus route.
4.5(a) Will residential development at the location be close to a major employment centre? (same score as 3.1e)	-	Development is further than 1000m from a major employment centre.
4.5(b) Will employment development at the location be close to a major population centre?	0	Development would be residential only.
4.6 Are health facilities available locally? (same score as 2.2)	0	The site is located between 801m and 1200m of Hedge End Medical Centre.
4.7 Are shopping and related services available locally?	0	The southeastern part of the site is within 401 to 600m of Hedge End centre.
4.8 Is the location close to a Primary school?	+	The site is located within 601 and 800m of Kanes Hill Primary School.
4.9 Is the location close to a Secondary school?	0	The site is within 1201m and 1600m of Wildern School.
4.10 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	0	The site is adjacent to the Eastleigh Cycle Network.
4.11 Are there Geographical barriers between the location and key facilities/ destinations?	0	Residents would have to cross the M27 in order to access Kanes Hill Allotments and Kanes Hill Primary School.
5. Protect and conserve natural resources		
5.1 Will development avoid the sterilisation of mineral resources?	-?	The southern part of the site lies within a Mineral Consultation Area and a Mineral Safeguarding Area.
5.2 Will it result in the loss of higher grade agricultural land?	-	The northern part of the site lies within an area of medium quality agricultural land.
5.3 Will it use previously developed land?	+?/-	The site consists primarily of greenfield land. There are some existing buildings on the site, although it is not known whether these will be retained.
5.4 Will it deliver or support allotments or community farms?	+?	There would be no loss of allotments or community farms. The location could be suitable for these but this is unknown.
6. Reduce air, soil, water, light and noise pollution		
6.1 Will the location be affected by significant noise generating uses or Air Quality Management Areas?	-?	The site is within 200m of the motorway.
6.2 Will development increase pollution?	0	Development is not expected to lead to increases in pollution.
7. Plan for the anticipated levels of climate change		
7.1 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure?	0	No loss of existing green infrastructure.
7.2 Is the location at risk from flooding, taking into account of the effects of climate change?	-?	A small part of the site is at 'less' risk of surface water flooding.
7.3 Will the development be at risk from coastal change? If so, can the Shoreline Management Plan Objectives be supported?	0	This is not a coastal site.
8. Minimise Eastleigh's contribution to climate change by reducing the borough's carbon footprint and minimising other greenhouse gas emissions.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		

SA objective/ criterion	Justification	
9. Reduce waste generation and disposal, encourage waste prevention and reuse and achieve the sustainable management of waste.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
10. Protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and geodiversity, improving its quality and range.		
10.1 Could development negatively impact or lead to loss of an internationally or nationally designated site (either alone or in combination)?	0	Development is not expected to affect internationally or nationally designated nature conservation sites.
10.2 Could development negatively impact or lead or loss of a locally designated biodiversity site (either alone or in combination)?	0	Development is not expected to affect locally designated nature conservation sites.
10.3 Will the development adversely affect areas with other nature conservation value, as identified in Biodiversity Action Plans (BAPs)?	-?	Bats may roost in the Coach House and farm buildings and mature trees. Reptiles may be present in grassland and dormice may also be present. The EBC biodiversity assessment states that direct impacts to lowland deciduous woodland would be avoided but there is potential for loss of species rich grassland.
10.4 Will the development adversely impact the biodiversity network (e.g. Priority Biodiversity Links (PBLs), Priority Biodiversity Areas (PBAs), hedgerows and other corridors for species movement)?	--?	The western part of the site is within the M27 corridor PBL.
10.5 Will the development adversely affect ancient woodland?	0	Development will not affect ancient woodland.
11. Enhance the Borough's multifunctional green infrastructure networks.		
11.1 Will the development affect TPO trees?	-?	The southern and part of the north of the site are covered by group TPOs.
11.2 Can the location be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	0	The site is adjacent to the Eastleigh Cycle Network.
11.3 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure? (same score as 7.1)	0	No loss of existing green infrastructure.
12. Protect, enhance and manage the character and appearance of the landscape and townscape, maintaining and strengthening distinctiveness and its special qualities.		
12.1 Will development adversely affect the separation of neighbouring settlements?	-	This site is assessed as having average potential for development with regards to avoiding settlement coalescence.
12.2 Will it protect the character of the countryside, coast, towns and/or villages, including views and settings?	-	This site is assessed as having moderate-low sensitivity to development.
13. Protect and enhance and manage buildings, monuments, features, sites, places, areas and landscapes of archaeological, historical and cultural heritage importance.		
13.1 Will the development protect and enhance listed buildings and their settings, conservation areas, archaeological sites, historic landscapes and other sites of local importance for heritage?	0	Development of this site will not affect heritage assets. EBC officer input required.

Site 47: Land South of Allington Lane and north of the M27

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
1. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified local needs, including affordability and special needs		
1.1 Will the development provide a significant contribution towards meeting identified affordable housing needs?	++	This site is capable of accommodating 98 dwellings.
1.2 Will it provide other elements of identified housing need e.g. housing for older persons, self-build, support housing?	?	Uncertainty is recorded against all residential site options as information on provision of other elements of housing need is not available on a consistent basis.
2. Safeguard and improve community health, safety and wellbeing		
2.1 Are community facilities (community hall or library) available locally?	0	The south western part of this site is located within 400 to 800m of Townhill Farm District Centre.
2.2 Are health facilities available locally?	+	The southwestern part of this site is located within 401 to 800m of Townhill Surgery.
2.3 What effect would the development have on local provision of sports pitches and facilities?	0	Development would not lead to loss of existing sports facilities.
2.4 Is public open space available locally?	+	The site is within 300m of Itchen Valley Country Park.
2.5 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network?	0	No footpaths or cycleways cross or are adjacent to the site.
3. Develop a dynamic and diverse economy		
3.1(a) Is the location close to a major rail station?	--	The site is further than 1400m from a major rail station.
3.1 (b) Is the location close to a minor rail station?	--	The site is further than 1200m from a minor rail station.
3.1 (c) Is the location close to a frequent bus route?	--	The site is further than 800m from a frequent bus route.
3.1 (d) Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route?	-	The site is within 401 to 800m of the First 8 semi-frequent bus route.
3.1 (e) Is the location close to a major employment centre?	-	The site is further than 1000m from a major employment centre.
3.2 Will the proposed development contribute towards meeting the need for new industrial, office or warehousing floorspace?	-	This site would be developed for residential use, therefore additional employment floorspace would not be provided.
3.3 Will the proposed development result in a net loss of existing employment land, or land which would be suitable for employment purposes?	0	The SLAA indicates this site is not suitable for employment uses.
3.4 Will the proposed development increase the amount of commercial uses and other facilities in town, district or local centres?	0	Development would not lead to loss of commercial uses or other facilities in town, district or local centres.
4. Reduce road traffic and congestion through improved accessibility to services homes and jobs; reducing the need to travel by car/lorry and improving sustainable travel choice		
4.1 Is the location close to a major rail station? (same score as 3.1a)	--	The site is further than 1400m from a major rail station.
4.2 Is the location close to a minor rail station? (same score as 3.1b)	--	The site is further than 1200m from a minor rail station.
4.3 Is the location close to a frequent bus route?	--	The site is further than 800m from a frequent bus

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
(same score as 3.1c)		route.
4.4 Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1d)	-	The site is within 401 to 800m of the First 8 semi-frequent bus route.
4.5(a) Will residential development at the location be close to a major employment centre? (same score as 3.1e)	-	The site is further than 100m from a major employment centre.
4.5(b) Will employment development at the location be close to a major population centre?	0	Development would be residential only.
4.6 Are health facilities available locally? (same score as 2.2)	+	The southwestern part of this site is located within 401 to 800m of Townhill Surgery.
4.7 Are shopping and related services available locally?	-	The south western part of the site is within 601 and 800m of Townhill Centre.
4.8 Is the location close to a Primary school?	--	The site is not within 1000m of a state primary school.
4.9 Is the location close to a Secondary school?	--	The site is further than 2000m from a state secondary school.
4.10 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	0	No footpaths or cycleways cross or are adjacent to the site.
4.11 Are there Geographical barriers between the location and key facilities/ destinations?	-	All of the destinations discussed above are located on the other side of the M27.
5. Protect and conserve natural resources		
5.1 Will development avoid the sterilisation of mineral resources?	-?	The site lies partly within two Mineral Consultation Areas.
5.2 Will it result in the loss of higher grade agricultural land?	0	The site consists of low quality agricultural land.
5.3 Will it use previously developed land?	-	The site consists of greenfield land.
5.4 Will it deliver or support allotments or community farms?	+?	There would be no loss of allotments or community farms. The location could be suitable for these but this is unknown.
6. Reduce air, soil, water, light and noise pollution		
6.1 Will the location be affected by significant noise generating uses or Air Quality Management Areas?	-?	The southern part of the site is within 200m of the M27.
6.2 Will development increase pollution?	-?	The site is 700m east of the River Itchen SAC and SSSI. There is direct connectivity to the SAC/SSSI by surface water ditches and the watercourses around the south and west of the site are tributaries to the River Itchen, therefore development could increase pollution in these waterbodies.
7. Plan for the anticipated levels of climate change		
7.1 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure?	0	Development would not lead to loss of GI.
7.2 Is the location at risk from flooding, taking into account of the effects of climate change?	--?	The site includes very small areas of 'less' and 'intermediate' surface water flood risk.
7.3 Will the development be at risk from coastal change? If so, can the Shoreline Management Plan Objectives be supported?	0	This is not a coastal site.
8. Minimise Eastleigh's contribution to climate change by reducing the borough's carbon footprint and minimising other greenhouse gas emissions.		

SA objective/ criterion	Justification	
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
9. Reduce waste generation and disposal, encourage waste prevention and reuse and achieve the sustainable management of waste.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
10. Protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and geodiversity, improving its quality and range.		
10.1 Could development negatively impact or lead to loss of an internationally or nationally designated site (either alone or in combination)?	-?	The site is 700m east of the River Itchen SAC and SSSI. There is direct connectivity to the SAC/SSSI by surface water ditches and the watercourses around the south and west of the site are tributaries to the River Itchen. Detailed assessment will be needed to ensure there are no indirect or direct impacts on hydrology. The EBC biodiversity assessment states that a 20m buffer from each ditch bank and naturalised SuDS with three forms of filtration would be required as mitigation.
10.2 Could development negatively impact or lead or loss of a locally designated biodiversity site (either alone or in combination)?	-	The south and southwestern corners of the site are directly adjacent to Dummers Copse SINC. The EBC biodiversity assessment has suggested that a 20m buffer will be required from any development. Itchen Valley country park is also within 10m of a small part of the norther boundary.
10.3 Will the development adversely affect areas with other nature conservation value, as identified in Biodiversity Action Plans (BAPs)?	-	There is a risk of impacts on deciduous woodland and floodplain grazing marsh located adjacent to the south and east of the site respectively.
10.4 Will the development adversely impact the biodiversity network (e.g. Priority Biodiversity Links (PBLs), Priority Biodiversity Areas (PBAs), hedgerows and other corridors for species movement)?	-	There is a tree lined boundary on the west of the site that links Dummers Copse with Itchen Valley Country Park SINC woodland to the north of the site. The EBC biodiversity assessment states that this link should be retained and reinforced.
10.5 Will the development adversely affect ancient woodland?	-	The south and southwestern corners of the site are directly adjacent to Dummers Copse ancient woodland.
11. Enhance the Borough's multifunctional green infrastructure networks.		
11.1 Will the development affect TPO trees?	-?	There is a blanket TPO on all trees on the southern boundary of the site.
11.2 Can the location be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	0	No footpaths or cycleways cross or are adjacent to the site.
11.3 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure? (same score as 7.1)	0	Development would not lead to loss of GI.
12. Protect, enhance and manage the character and appearance of the landscape and townscape, maintaining and strengthening distinctiveness and its special qualities.		
12.1 Will development adversely affect the separation of neighbouring settlements?	0	This site is assessed as having good/very good potential for development with regards to avoiding settlement coalescence.
12.2 Will it protect the character of the countryside, coast, towns and/or villages, including views and settings?	-	This site is assessed as having moderate/low sensitivity to development.
13. Protect and enhance and manage buildings, monuments, features, sites, places, areas and		

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
landscapes of archaeological, historical and cultural heritage importance.		
13.1 Will the development protect and enhance listed buildings and their settings, conservation areas, archaeological sites, historic landscapes and other sites of local importance for heritage?	0	Development will not affect heritage assets. EBC officer input required.

Site 48: Land Off The Drove

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
1. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified local needs, including affordability and special needs		
1.1 Will the development provide a significant contribution towards meeting identified affordable housing needs?	+	This site is capable of accommodating 13 dwellings.
1.2 Will it provide other elements of identified housing need e.g. housing for older persons, self-build, support housing?	?	Uncertainty is recorded against all residential site options as information on provision of other elements of housing need is not available on a consistent basis.
2. Safeguard and improve community health, safety and wellbeing		
2.1 Are community facilities (community hall or library) available locally?	0	This site is within 400 and 800m of Moorgreen Youth Club.
2.2 Are health facilities available locally?	+	This site is within 401 and 800m of Moorgreen Hospital.
2.3 What effect would the development have on local provision of sports pitches and facilities?	0	Development would not lead to loss of sports facilities.
2.4 Is public open space available locally?	0	The site is within 300m and 800m of Kanes Hill Allotments and Moorgreen Road Play Area.
2.5 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network?	-	There are no footpaths or cycleways crossing or adjacent to the site.
3. Develop a dynamic and diverse economy		
3.1(a) Is the location close to a major rail station?	--	The site is further than 1400m from a major rail station.
3.1 (b) Is the location close to a minor rail station?	--	The site is further than 1200m from a minor rail station.
3.1 (c) Is the location close to a frequent bus route?	--	The site is further than 800m from a frequent bus route.
3.1 (d) Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route?	-	The site is located between 401m and 800m of the First 8 semi-frequent bus route.
3.1 (e) Is the location close to a major employment centre?	-	The site is further than 1000m from a major employment centre.
3.2 Will the proposed development contribute towards meeting the need for new industrial, office or warehousing floorspace?	-	This site would be developed for residential use, therefore additional employment floorspace would not be provided.
3.3 Will the proposed development result in a net loss of existing employment land, or land which would be suitable for employment purposes?	0	The SLAA suggests that this site is not suitable for employment purposes.
3.4 Will the proposed development increase the amount of commercial uses and other facilities in town, district or local centres?	0	Development would not lead to loss of commercial uses or other facilities in town, district or local centres.
4. Reduce road traffic and congestion through improved accessibility to services homes and jobs; reducing the need to travel by car/lorry and improving sustainable travel choice		
4.1 Is the location close to a major rail station? (same score as 3.1a)	--	The site is further than 1400m from a major rail station.
4.2 Is the location close to a minor rail station? (same score as 3.1b)	--	The site is further than 1200m from a minor rail station.
4.3 Is the location close to a frequent bus route?	--	The site is further than 800m from a frequent bus

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
(same score as 3.1c)		route.
4.4 Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1d)	-	The site is located between 401m and 800m of the First 8 semi-frequent bus route.
4.5(a) Will residential development at the location be close to a major employment centre? (same score as 3.1e)	-	The site is further than 1000m from a major employment centre.
4.5(b) Will employment development at the location be close to a major population centre?	0	Development would be residential only.
4.6 Are health facilities available locally? (same score as 2.2)	+	This site is within 401 and 800m of Moorgreen Hospital.
4.7 Are shopping and related services available locally?	--	The site is further than 800m from the nearest town, district or local centre.
4.8 Is the location close to a Primary school?	++	The site is within 400m of St James Church of England Primary School.
4.9 Is the location close to a Secondary school?	--	The site is further than 2000m from a secondary school.
4.10 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	-	There are no footpaths or cycleways crossing or adjacent to the site.
4.11 Are there Geographical barriers between the location and key facilities/ destinations?	-	St James Church of England Primary School, Moorgreen hospital and the First 8 bus route are all on the other side of the M27.
5. Protect and conserve natural resources		
5.1 Will development avoid the sterilisation of mineral resources?	0	The site is not within an area safeguarded for minerals extraction.
5.2 Will it result in the loss of higher grade agricultural land?	0	The site consists of low grade agricultural land.
5.3 Will it use previously developed land?	-	The site consists of greenfield land.
5.4 Will it deliver or support allotments or community farms?	+?	There would be no loss of allotments or community farms. The location could be suitable for these but this is unknown.
6. Reduce air, soil, water, light and noise pollution		
6.1 Will the location be affected by significant noise generating uses or Air Quality Management Areas?	-?	The site is within 200m of the M27.
6.2 Will development increase pollution?	0	Development is not expected to increase pollution.
7. Plan for the anticipated levels of climate change		
7.1 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure?	0	Development will not lead to loss of existing GI.
7.2 Is the location at risk from flooding, taking into account of the effects of climate change?	0	The site is not at risk of surface water flooding or within Flood Zones 2 or 3.
7.3 Will the development be at risk from coastal change? If so, can the Shoreline Management Plan Objectives be supported?	0	This is not a coastal site.
8. Minimise Eastleigh's contribution to climate change by reducing the borough's carbon footprint and minimising other greenhouse gas emissions.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
9. Reduce waste generation and disposal, encourage waste prevention and reuse and achieve the sustainable management of waste.		

SA objective/ criterion	Justification	
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
10. Protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and geodiversity, improving its quality and range.		
10.1 Could development negatively impact or lead to loss of an internationally or nationally designated site (either alone or in combination)?	0	Development is not expected to impact internationally or nationally designated nature conservation sites.
10.2 Could development negatively impact or lead or loss of a locally designated biodiversity site (either alone or in combination)?	0	Development is not expected to impact locally designated nature conservation sites.
10.3 Will the development adversely affect areas with other nature conservation value, as identified in Biodiversity Action Plans (BAPs)?	-?	Dormice or reptiles may use the scrub on site. There may be bats roosting in the trees. In addition, lowland broadleaved woodland appears to be present along the site boundaries.
10.4 Will the development adversely impact the biodiversity network (e.g. Priority Biodiversity Links (PBLs), Priority Biodiversity Areas (PBAs), hedgerows and other corridors for species movement)?	--	The site is within the M27 PBL.
10.5 Will the development adversely affect ancient woodland?	0	Development will not affect ancient woodland.
11. Enhance the Borough's multifunctional green infrastructure networks.		
11.1 Will the development affect TPO trees?	0	There are no TPO trees on site.
11.2 Can the location be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	-	There are no footpaths or cycleways crossing or adjacent to the site.
11.3 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure? (same score as 7.1)	0	Development will not lead to loss of existing GI.
12. Protect, enhance and manage the character and appearance of the landscape and townscape, maintaining and strengthening distinctiveness and its special qualities.		
12.1 Will development adversely affect the separation of neighbouring settlements?	0	This site is assessed as having good/very good potential for development in terms of avoiding settlement coalescence.
12.2 Will it protect the character of the countryside, coast, towns and/or villages, including views and settings?	0	This site is assessed as having low sensitivity to development.
13. Protect and enhance and manage buildings, monuments, features, sites, places, areas and landscapes of archaeological, historical and cultural heritage importance.		
13.1 Will the development protect and enhance listed buildings and their settings, conservation areas, archaeological sites, historic landscapes and other sites of local importance for heritage?	0	Development will not affect heritage assets. EBC officer input required.

Site 49: Land North of Moorgreen Road

SA objective/ criterion	Justification

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
1. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified local needs, including affordability and special needs		
1.1 Will the development provide a significant contribution towards meeting identified affordable housing needs?	++	This site is capable of accommodating 186 dwellings.
1.2 Will it provide other elements of identified housing need e.g. housing for older persons, self-build, support housing?	?	Uncertainty is recorded against all residential site options as information on provision of other elements of housing need is not available on a consistent basis.
2. Safeguard and improve community health, safety and wellbeing		
2.1 Are community facilities (community hall or library) available locally?	0	The south western part of the site is within 400 to 800m of Moorgreen Youth Club.
2.2 Are health facilities available locally?	+	This site is located between 401 and 800m of Moorgreen Hospital.
2.3 What effect would the development have on local provision of sports pitches and facilities?	0	Development would not lead to loss of sports facilities.
2.4 Is public open space available locally?	+	The site is within 300m of Moorgreen Road Playing Area.
2.5 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network?	0	A footpath crosses the site but no cycleways cross or are adjacent to the site.
3. Develop a dynamic and diverse economy		
3.1(a) Is the location close to a major rail station?	-	The eastern corner of this site is located between 1201 and 1400m of Hedge End rail station.
3.1 (b) Is the location close to a minor rail station?	--	The site is further than 1200m from a minor rail station.
3.1 (c) Is the location close to a frequent bus route?	--	The site is further than 800m from a frequent bus route.
3.1 (d) Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route?	-	The site is located between 401 and 800m of the First 8 semi-frequent bus service.
3.1 (e) Is the location close to a major employment centre?	+	The site is located between 401 and 1000m of Chalcroft Business Park.
3.2 Will the proposed development contribute towards meeting the need for new industrial, office or warehousing floorspace?	-	This site would be developed for residential use, therefore additional employment floorspace would not be provided.
3.3 Will the proposed development result in a net loss of existing employment land, or land which would be suitable for employment purposes?	0	The SLAA indicates that this site is not suitable for employment uses.
3.4 Will the proposed development increase the amount of commercial uses and other facilities in town, district or local centres?	0	Development would not lead to loss of commercial uses or other facilities in town, district or local centres.
4. Reduce road traffic and congestion through improved accessibility to services homes and jobs; reducing the need to travel by car/lorry and improving sustainable travel choice		
4.1 Is the location close to a major rail station? (same score as 3.1a)	-	The eastern corner of this site is located between 1201 and 1400m of Hedge End rail station.
4.2 Is the location close to a minor rail station? (same score as 3.1b)	--	The site is further than 1200m from a minor rail station.
4.3 Is the location close to a frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1c)	--	The site is further than 800m from a frequent bus route.

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
4.4 Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1d)	-	The site is located between 401 and 800m of the First 8 semi-frequent bus service.
4.5(a) Will residential development at the location be close to a major employment centre? (same score as 3.1e)	+	The site is located between 401 and 1000m of Chalcroft Business Park.
4.5(b) Will employment development at the location be close to a major population centre?	0	Development would be residential only.
4.6 Are health facilities available locally? (same score as 2.2)	+	This site is located between 401 and 800m of Moorgreen Hospital.
4.7 Are shopping and related services available locally?	--	The site is further than 800m from a town, district or local centre.
4.8 Is the location close to a Primary school?	++	The south western part of the site is located within 400m of St James Church of England Primary School.
4.9 Is the location close to a Secondary school?	-	The southern part of the site is between 1601m and 2000m of Wildern School.
4.10 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	0	A footpath crosses the site but no cycleways cross or are adjacent to the site.
4.11 Are there Geographical barriers between the location and key facilities/ destinations?	-	Chalcroft Business park is on the other side of the railway line and St James Church of England Primary School and Moorgreen Hospital are located on the other side of the M27.
5. Protect and conserve natural resources		
5.1 Will development avoid the sterilisation of mineral resources?	0	The site is not located in an area safeguarded for minerals extraction.
5.2 Will it result in the loss of higher grade agricultural land?	-	The site consists mostly of medium quality agricultural land.
5.3 Will it use previously developed land?	-	The site consists of greenfield land.
5.4 Will it deliver or support allotments or community farms?	++?	There would be no loss of allotments or community farms. The location could be suitable for these but this is unknown.
6. Reduce air, soil, water, light and noise pollution		
6.1 Will the location be affected by significant noise generating uses or Air Quality Management Areas?	-?	The south western part of the site is located within 200m of the M27.
6.2 Will development increase pollution?	-?	Moorgreen Meadows SSSI is 290m south of the site and is sensitive to air quality impacts. This site may be affected by development due to an increase in traffic on Tollbar Way.
7. Plan for the anticipated levels of climate change		
7.1 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure?	0	Development would not result in a loss of GI.
7.2 Is the location at risk from flooding, taking into account of the effects of climate change?	-?	A small part of the site is at 'less' risk of surface water flooding.
7.3 Will the development be at risk from coastal change? If so, can the Shoreline Management Plan Objectives be supported?	0	This is not a coastal site.
8. Minimise Eastleigh's contribution to climate change by reducing the borough's carbon footprint and minimising other greenhouse gas emissions.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		

SA objective/ criterion	Justification	
9. Reduce waste generation and disposal, encourage waste prevention and reuse and achieve the sustainable management of waste.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
10. Protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and geodiversity, improving its quality and range.		
10.1 Could development negatively impact or lead to loss of an internationally or nationally designated site (either alone or in combination)?	-	Moorgreen Meadows SSSI is 290m south of the site and is sensitive to air quality impacts. This site may be affected by development due to an increase in traffic on Tollbar Way.
10.2 Could development negatively impact or lead or loss of a locally designated biodiversity site (either alone or in combination)?	-	There is potential for increased recreational pressure on Meadow adjacent to Home Covert SINC, which is designated for its semi-improved grassland. A PRoW links the site directly to the northern edge of the SINC.
10.3 Will the development adversely affect areas with other nature conservation value, as identified in Biodiversity Action Plans (BAPs)?	--?	Lowland mixed deciduous woodland is present on the site. Bats may roost and forage along the woodland in the site. Dormice could be present in the woodland and scrub.
10.4 Will the development adversely impact the biodiversity network (e.g. Priority Biodiversity Links (PBLs), Priority Biodiversity Areas (PBAs), hedgerows and other corridors for species movement)?	0	Development is not expected to affect biodiversity network links.
10.5 Will the development adversely affect ancient woodland?	0	Development will not affect ancient woodland.
11. Enhance the Borough's multifunctional green infrastructure networks.		
11.1 Will the development affect TPO trees?	0	There are no TPO trees on site.
11.2 Can the location be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	0	A footpath crosses the site but no cycleways cross or are adjacent to the site.
11.3 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure? (same score as 7.1)	0	Development would not result in a loss of GI.
12. Protect, enhance and manage the character and appearance of the landscape and townscape, maintaining and strengthening distinctiveness and its special qualities.		
12.1 Will development adversely affect the separation of neighbouring settlements?	-	This site is assessed as having average potential for development with regards to avoiding settlement coalescence.
12.2 Will it protect the character of the countryside, coast, towns and/or villages, including views and settings?	-	This site is assessed as having moderate sensitivity to development.
13. Protect and enhance and manage buildings, monuments, features, sites, places, areas and landscapes of archaeological, historical and cultural heritage importance.		
13.1 Will the development protect and enhance listed buildings and their settings, conservation areas, archaeological sites, historic landscapes and other sites of local importance for heritage?	?	Development could affect the setting of or views from listed buildings at Moorgreen farm (to the north of the site), but this is uncertain as no specialist historic environment advice has been received for this site. EBC officer input required.

Appendix 9

Detailed SA matrices for sites allocated in Policy DM25

Land adjacent to 86 Edward Avenue, Bishopstoke

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
1. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified local needs, including affordability and special needs		
1.1 Will the development provide a significant contribution towards meeting identified affordable housing needs?	+	This site is capable of providing 10 dwellings.
1.2 Will it provide other elements of identified housing need e.g. housing for older persons, self-build, support housing?	?	Uncertainty is recorded against all residential site options as information on provision of other elements of housing need is not available on a consistent basis.
2. Safeguard and improve community health, safety and wellbeing		
2.1 Are community facilities (community hall or library) available locally?	0	The site is located within 800m of Bishopstoke Community Centre.
2.2 Are health facilities available locally?	0	The site is between 800m to 1200m from Old Anchor Doctors Surgery.
2.3 What effect would the development have on local provision of sports pitches and facilities?	0	Development would not lead to loss of sports pitches and facilities.
2.4 Is public open space available locally?	+	The site is within 300m of Glebe Meadow and Stoke Park Woods.
2.5 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network?	0	A footpath runs almost adjacent to the sites northern and western boundaries.
3. Develop a dynamic and diverse economy		
3.1(a) Is the location close to a major rail station?	--	The site is further than 1400m from a major rail station.
3.1 (b) Is the location close to a minor rail station?	--	The site is further than 1200m from a minor rail station.
3.1 (c) Is the location close to a frequent bus route?	++	The site is located within 400m of the Bluestar 2 frequent bus route.
3.1 (d) Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route?	--	The site is further than 800m from a semi-frequent bus route.
3.1 (e) Is the location close to a major employment centre?	-	The site is located further than 1000m from a major employment centre.
3.2 Will the proposed development contribute towards meeting the need for new industrial, office or warehousing floorspace?	-	This site would be developed for residential use, therefore additional employment floorspace would not be provided.
3.3 Will the proposed development result in a net loss of existing employment land, or land which would be suitable for employment purposes?	0	The SLAA does not recognise this site as being suitable for employment land.
3.4 Will the proposed development increase the amount of commercial uses and other facilities in town, district or local centres?	0	Development would not lead to loss of commercial uses or other facilities in town, district or local centres.
4. Reduce road traffic and congestion through improved accessibility to services homes and jobs; reducing the need to travel by car/lorry and improving sustainable travel choice		
4.1 Is the location close to a major rail station? (same score as 3.1a)	--	The site is further than 1400m from a major rail station.
4.2 Is the location close to a minor rail station? (same score as 3.1b)	--	The site is further than 1200m from a minor rail station.
4.3 Is the location close to a frequent bus route?	++	The site is located within 400m of the Bluestar 2

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
(same score as 3.1c)		frequent bus route.
4.4 Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1d)	--	The site is further than 800m from a semi-frequent bus route.
4.5(a) Will residential development at the location be close to a major employment centre? (same score as 3.1e)	-	The site is further than 1000m from a major employment centre.
4.5(b) Will employment development at the location be close to a major population centre?	0	Development would be residential only.
4.6 Are health facilities available locally? (same score as 2.2)	0	The site is between 800m to 1200m from Old Anchor Doctors Surgery.
4.7 Are shopping and related services available locally?	--	The site is further than 800m from a town, district or local centre.
4.8 Is the location close to a Primary school?	-	The site is between 801 and 1000m of Stoke Park Junior School.
4.9 Is the location close to a Secondary school?	--	The site is more than 2000m from a secondary school.
4.10 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	0	A footpath runs almost adjacent to the sites northern and western boundaries.
4.11 Are there Geographical barriers between the location and key facilities/ destinations?	+	There are no geographical berries between the site and key facilities.
5. Protect and conserve natural resources		
5.1 Will development avoid the sterilisation of mineral resources?	-	The north east corner of the site is located in a minerals consultation area.
5.2 Will it result in the loss of higher grade agricultural land?	0	The site consists entirely of Grade 4 and 5, low quality agricultural land.
5.3 Will it use previously developed land?	+/-	The majority of the site is undeveloped but contains one existing dwelling.
5.4 Will it deliver or support allotments or community farms?	-	Development of the site will not make a contribution towards allotments or community farms.
6. Reduce air, soil, water, light and noise pollution		
6.1 Will the location be affected by significant noise generating uses or Air Quality Management Areas?	0	The site is not located within an AQMA or 200m of an A-road, Motorway or railway.
6.2 Will development increase pollution?	0	Development is not expected to increase pollution.
7. Plan for the anticipated levels of climate change		
7.1 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure?	0	No loss of existing green infrastructure.
7.2 Is the location at risk from flooding, taking into account of the effects of climate change?	0	The site does not fall within Flood Zones 2 or 3 or an area of surface water flooding.
7.3 Will the development be at risk from coastal change? If so, can the Shoreline Management Plan Objectives be supported?	0	Site is not located near the coast.
8. Minimise Eastleigh's contribution to climate change by reducing the borough's carbon footprint and minimising other greenhouse gas emissions.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
9. Reduce waste generation and disposal, encourage waste prevention and reuse and achieve the sustainable management of waste.		

SA objective/ criterion	Justification	
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
10. Protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and geodiversity, improving its quality and range.		
10.1 Could development negatively impact or lead to loss of an internationally or nationally designated site (either alone or in combination)?	0	Development of the site is unlikely to impact internationally or nationally designated sites.
10.2 Could development negatively impact or lead or loss of a locally designated biodiversity site (either alone or in combination)?	-?	Stoke Park Wood SINC is located close to the site, potential for recreational or urban edge effects.
10.3 Will the development adversely affect areas with other nature conservation value, as identified in Biodiversity Action Plans (BAPs)?	-?	The site contains Lowland Mixed Deciduous Woodland Priority Habitat. The Council have stated that all woodland will be retained however potential for urban edge effects.
10.4 Will the development adversely impact the biodiversity network (e.g. Priority Biodiversity Links (PBLs), Priority Biodiversity Areas (PBAs), hedgerows and other corridors for species movement)?	-?	The site is located adjacent to Stoke Park PBA, potential for recreational or urban edge effects.
10.5 Will the development adversely affect ancient woodland?	-?	The site is located close to Stoke Park Wood. Potential for recreational or urban edge effects.
11. Enhance the Borough's multifunctional green infrastructure networks.		
11.1 Will the development affect TPO trees?	-?	TPO trees across the site, covering all tree species.
11.2 Can the location be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	0	A footpath runs almost adjacent to the sites northern and western boundaries.
11.3 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure? (same score as 7.1)	0	No loss of existing green infrastructure.
12. Protect, enhance and manage the character and appearance of the landscape and townscape, maintaining and strengthening distinctiveness and its special qualities.		
12.1 Will development adversely affect the separation of neighbouring settlements?	0	Development of the site is not expected to adversely affect the separation of neighbouring settlements.
12.2 Will it protect the character of the countryside, coast, towns and/or villages, including views and settings?	0	Development of the site is not expected to adversely affect the character of the countryside, towns or villages.
13. Protect and enhance and manage buildings, monuments, features, sites, places, areas and landscapes of archaeological, historical and cultural heritage importance.		
13.1 Will the development protect and enhance listed buildings and their settings, conservation areas, archaeological sites, historic landscapes and other sites of local importance for heritage?	0	Development of the site is not expected to adversely affect heritage assets.

Rear of Shopping Parade and 75-99 Hiltinbury Road, Chandler's Ford

SA objective/ criterion	Justification

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
1. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified local needs, including affordability and special needs		
1.1 Will the development provide a significant contribution towards meeting identified affordable housing needs?	++	This site is capable of providing 16 dwellings.
1.2 Will it provide other elements of identified housing need e.g. housing for older persons, self-build, support housing?	?	Uncertainty is recorded against all residential site options as information on provision of other elements of housing need is not available on a consistent basis.
2. Safeguard and improve community health, safety and wellbeing		
2.1 Are community facilities (community hall or library) available locally?	+/-?	The site is located within 400m of Hiltingbury Community centre. The site contains the Basement Youth Centre. It is unclear whether this is still open and whether it would be lost to development.
2.2 Are health facilities available locally?	0	The site is between 800m 1200m from Fryern Doctors Surgery.
2.3 What effect would the development have on local provision of sports pitches and facilities?	0	Development would not lead to loss of sports pitches and facilities.
2.4 Is public open space available locally?	+	The site is within 300m of Hiltingbury Recreation Ground and Adamson Road Amenity Space.
2.5 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network?	-	No footpath or cycle path crosses the site or is adjacent to its boundary.
3. Develop a dynamic and diverse economy		
3.1(a) Is the location close to a major rail station?	--	The site is further than 1400m from a major rail station.
3.1 (b) Is the location close to a minor rail station?	--	The site is further than 1200m from a minor rail station.
3.1 (c) Is the location close to a frequent bus route?	--	The site is located further than 800m from a frequent bus route.
3.1 (d) Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route?	+	The site is located within 400m of the Xelabus X6/X7 semi-frequent bus route.
3.1 (e) Is the location close to a major employment centre?	-	The site is located further than 1000m from a major employment centre.
3.2 Will the proposed development contribute towards meeting the need for new industrial, office or warehousing floorspace?	-	This site would be developed for residential use, therefore additional employment floorspace would not be provided.
3.3 Will the proposed development result in a net loss of existing employment land, or land which would be suitable for employment purposes?	-	Development of the site will result in the loss of a builder's yard.
3.4 Will the proposed development increase the amount of commercial uses and other facilities in town, district or local centres?	0	Development would not lead to loss of commercial uses or other facilities in town, district or local centres.
4. Reduce road traffic and congestion through improved accessibility to services homes and jobs; reducing the need to travel by car/lorry and improving sustainable travel choice		
4.1 Is the location close to a major rail station? (same score as 3.1a)	--	The site is further than 1400m from a major rail station.
4.2 Is the location close to a minor rail station? (same score as 3.1b)	--	The site is further than 1200m from a minor rail station.
4.3 Is the location close to a frequent bus route?	--	The site is located within 400m of the Bluestar 2

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
(same score as 3.1c)		frequent bus route.
4.4 Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1d)	+	The site is located within 400m of the Xelabus X6/X7 semi-frequent bus route.
4.5(a) Will residential development at the location be close to a major employment centre? (same score as 3.1e)	-	The site is further than 1000m from a major employment centre.
4.5(b) Will employment development at the location be close to a major population centre?	0	Development would be residential only.
4.6 Are health facilities available locally? (same score as 2.2)	0	The site is between 800m 1200m from Fryern Doctors Surgery.
4.7 Are shopping and related services available locally?	++? /-?	The site is located adjacent to Hiltingbury Road Local Centre however, a very small slither of the site is located within the local centre.
4.8 Is the location close to a Primary school?	++	The site is located adjacent to Hiltingbury Junior School.
4.9 Is the location close to a Secondary school?	0	The site is located 1200 to 1600m from Thornden Secondary School.
4.10 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	-	No footpath or cycle path crosses the site or is adjacent to its boundary.
4.11 Are there Geographical barriers between the location and key facilities/ destinations?	+	There are no geographical berries between the site and key facilities.
5. Protect and conserve natural resources		
5.1 Will development avoid the sterilisation of mineral resources?	0	The site is not located in a Mineral Safeguarding Area or Mineral Consultation Area.
5.2 Will it result in the loss of higher grade agricultural land?	0	The site is not located in an area of agricultural land.
5.3 Will it use previously developed land?	++	The site comprises garages, disused builders yard and a youth centre.
5.4 Will it deliver or support allotments or community farms?	-	Development of the site will not make a contribution towards allotments or community farms.
6. Reduce air, soil, water, light and noise pollution		
6.1 Will the location be affected by significant noise generating uses or Air Quality Management Areas?	0	The site is not located within an AQMA or 200m of an A-road, Motorway or railway.
6.2 Will development increase pollution?	0	Development is not expected to increase pollution.
7. Plan for the anticipated levels of climate change		
7.1 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure?	0	No loss of existing green infrastructure.
7.2 Is the location at risk from flooding, taking into account of the effects of climate change?	0	The site does not fall within Flood Zones 2 or 3 or an area of surface water flooding.
7.3 Will the development be at risk from coastal change? If so, can the Shoreline Management Plan Objectives be supported?	0	Site is not located near the coast.
8. Minimise Eastleigh's contribution to climate change by reducing the borough's carbon footprint and minimising other greenhouse gas emissions.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		

SA objective/ criterion	Justification	
9. Reduce waste generation and disposal, encourage waste prevention and reuse and achieve the sustainable management of waste.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
10. Protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and geodiversity, improving its quality and range.		
10.1 Could development negatively impact or lead to loss of an internationally or nationally designated site (either alone or in combination)?	0	Development of the site is unlikely to impact internationally or nationally designated sites.
10.2 Could development negatively impact or lead or loss of a locally designated biodiversity site (either alone or in combination)?	0	Development of the site is unlikely to impact locally designated sites.
10.3 Will the development adversely affect areas with other nature conservation value, as identified in Biodiversity Action Plans (BAPs)?	0	Development of the site is unlikely to impact areas with other nature conservation value.
10.4 Will the development adversely impact the biodiversity network (e.g. Priority Biodiversity Links (PBLs), Priority Biodiversity Areas (PBAs), hedgerows and other corridors for species movement)?	0	Development of the site is unlikely to impact the biodiversity network.
10.5 Will the development adversely affect ancient woodland?	0	Development of the site is unlikely to impact ancient woodland.
11. Enhance the Borough's multifunctional green infrastructure networks.		
11.1 Will the development affect TPO trees?	-?	There are a number of group and individual TPOs within the site.
11.2 Can the location be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	-	No footpath or cycle path crosses the site or is adjacent to its boundary.
11.3 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure? (same score as 7.1)	0	No loss of existing green infrastructure.
12. Protect, enhance and manage the character and appearance of the landscape and townscape, maintaining and strengthening distinctiveness and its special qualities.		
12.1 Will development adversely affect the separation of neighbouring settlements?	0	Development of the site is not expected to adversely affect the separation of neighbouring settlements.
12.2 Will it protect the character of the countryside, coast, towns and/or villages, including views and settings?	0	Development of the site is not expected to adversely affect the character of the countryside, towns or villages.
13. Protect and enhance and manage buildings, monuments, features, sites, places, areas and landscapes of archaeological, historical and cultural heritage importance.		
13.1 Will the development protect and enhance listed buildings and their settings, conservation areas, archaeological sites, historic landscapes and other sites of local importance for heritage?	0	Development of the site is not expected to adversely affect heritage assets.

Common Road Industrial Estate, Chandler's Ford

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
1. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified local needs, including affordability and special needs		
1.1 Will the development provide a significant contribution towards meeting identified affordable housing needs?	++	This site is capable of providing 30 dwellings.
1.2 Will it provide other elements of identified housing need e.g. housing for older persons, self-build, support housing?	?	Uncertainty is recorded against all residential site options as information on provision of other elements of housing need is not available on a consistent basis.
2. Safeguard and improve community health, safety and wellbeing		
2.1 Are community facilities (community hall or library) available locally?	+	The site is located within 400m of Hiltngbury Community centre.
2.2 Are health facilities available locally?	0	The site is between 800m 1200m from Park Doctors Surgery.
2.3 What effect would the development have on local provision of sports pitches and facilities?	0	Development would not lead to loss of sports pitches and facilities.
2.4 Is public open space available locally?	+	The site is within 300m of Cuckoo Bushes Lane and Ramalley Copse Green space.
2.5 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network?	-	No footpath or cycle path crosses the site or is adjacent to its boundary.
3. Develop a dynamic and diverse economy		
3.1(a) Is the location close to a major rail station?	--	The site is further than 1400m from a major rail station.
3.1 (b) Is the location close to a minor rail station?	-	The site is located within 1200m of Chandler's Ford railway station.
3.1 (c) Is the location close to a frequent bus route?	--	The site is located further than 800m from a frequent bus route.
3.1 (d) Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route?	+	The site is located next to the Xelabus X6/X7 semi-frequent bus route.
3.1 (e) Is the location close to a major employment centre?	+	The southern tip of the site is located 400m to 1000m of Chandler's Ford Industrial Estate.
3.2 Will the proposed development contribute towards meeting the need for new industrial, office or warehousing floorspace?	-	This site would be developed for residential use, therefore additional employment floorspace would not be provided.
3.3 Will the proposed development result in a net loss of existing employment land, or land which would be suitable for employment purposes?	-	Development of the site will result in the loss of a car body repair centre.
3.4 Will the proposed development increase the amount of commercial uses and other facilities in town, district or local centres?	0	Development would not lead to loss of commercial uses or other facilities in town, district or local centres.
4. Reduce road traffic and congestion through improved accessibility to services homes and jobs; reducing the need to travel by car/lorry and improving sustainable travel choice		
4.1 Is the location close to a major rail station? (same score as 3.1a)	--	The site is further than 1400m from a major rail station.
4.2 Is the location close to a minor rail station? (same score as 3.1b)	-	The site is located within 1200m of Chandler's Ford railway station.
4.3 Is the location close to a frequent bus route?	--	The site is located further than 800m from a frequent

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
(same score as 3.1c)		bus route.
4.4 Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1d)	+	The site is located next to the Xelabus X6/X7 semi-frequent bus route.
4.5(a) Will residential development at the location be close to a major employment centre? (same score as 3.1e)	+	The southern tip of the site is located 400m to 1000m of Chandler's Ford Industrial Estate.
4.5(b) Will employment development at the location be close to a major population centre?	0	Development would be residential only.
4.6 Are health facilities available locally? (same score as 2.2)	0	The site is between 800m 1200m from Park Doctors Surgery.
4.7 Are shopping and related services available locally?	-	The site is located 600m to 800m from Hiltingbury Road Local Centre.
4.8 Is the location close to a Primary school?	++	The site is located within 400m of Hiltingbury Junior School.
4.9 Is the location close to a Secondary school?	0	The site is located 1200 to 1600m from Thornden Secondary School.
4.10 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	-	No footpath or cycle path crosses the site or is adjacent to its boundary.
4.11 Are there Geographical barriers between the location and key facilities/ destinations?	0	The railway line is located between the site and Chandler's Ford Industrial Estate major employment centre.
5. Protect and conserve natural resources		
5.1 Will development avoid the sterilisation of mineral resources?	0	The site is not located in a Mineral Safeguarding Area or Mineral Consultation Area.
5.2 Will it result in the loss of higher grade agricultural land?	0	The site is not located in an area of agricultural land.
5.3 Will it use previously developed land?	++	The site comprises various employment uses including a car body repair centre.
5.4 Will it deliver or support allotments or community farms?	-	Development of the site will not make a contribution towards allotments or community farms.
6. Reduce air, soil, water, light and noise pollution		
6.1 Will the location be affected by significant noise generating uses or Air Quality Management Areas?	0	The site is not located within an AQMA or 200m of an A-road, Motorway or railway.
6.2 Will development increase pollution?	0	Development is not expected to increase pollution.
7. Plan for the anticipated levels of climate change		
7.1 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure?	0	No loss of existing green infrastructure.
7.2 Is the location at risk from flooding, taking into account of the effects of climate change?	--	Much of the site falls within Flood Zone 3 and areas of 'less' surface water flood risk.
7.3 Will the development be at risk from coastal change? If so, can the Shoreline Management Plan Objectives be supported?	0	Site is not located near the coast.
8. Minimise Eastleigh's contribution to climate change by reducing the borough's carbon footprint and minimising other greenhouse gas emissions.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		

SA objective/ criterion	Justification	
9. Reduce waste generation and disposal, encourage waste prevention and reuse and achieve the sustainable management of waste.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
10. Protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and geodiversity, improving its quality and range.		
10.1 Could development negatively impact or lead to loss of an internationally or nationally designated site (either alone or in combination)?	-?	A water course flows through the site which eventually flows into the River Itchen SAC, potential for in-combination effects.
10.2 Could development negatively impact or lead or loss of a locally designated biodiversity site (either alone or in combination)?	-?	Cuckoo Bushes Lane SINC and Ramalley Copse SINC are located within 100m of the site. Potential for recreation effects.
10.3 Will the development adversely affect areas with other nature conservation value, as identified in Biodiversity Action Plans (BAPs)?	0	Development of the site is unlikely to impact areas with other nature conservation value.
10.4 Will the development adversely impact the biodiversity network (e.g. Priority Biodiversity Links (PBLs), Priority Biodiversity Areas (PBAs), hedgerows and other corridors for species movement)?	--	The site is located within the Monks Brook PBL.
10.5 Will the development adversely affect ancient woodland?	0	Development of the site is unlikely to impact ancient woodland.
11. Enhance the Borough's multifunctional green infrastructure networks.		
11.1 Will the development affect TPO trees?	-	There are 2 Oaks and 1 Birch.
11.2 Can the location be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	-	No footpath or cycle path crosses the site or is adjacent to its boundary.
11.3 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure? (same score as 7.1)	0	No loss of existing green infrastructure.
12. Protect, enhance and manage the character and appearance of the landscape and townscape, maintaining and strengthening distinctiveness and its special qualities.		
12.1 Will development adversely affect the separation of neighbouring settlements?	0	Development of the site is not expected to adversely affect the separation of neighbouring settlements.
12.2 Will it protect the character of the countryside, coast, towns and/or villages, including views and settings?	0	Development of the site is not expected to adversely affect the character of the countryside, towns or villages.
13. Protect and enhance and manage buildings, monuments, features, sites, places, areas and landscapes of archaeological, historical and cultural heritage importance.		
13.1 Will the development protect and enhance listed buildings and their settings, conservation areas, archaeological sites, historic landscapes and other sites of local importance for heritage?	0	Development of the site is not expected to adversely affect heritage assets.

Land at Toynee Road, Eastleigh

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
1. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified local needs, including affordability and special needs		
1.1 Will the development provide a significant contribution towards meeting identified affordable housing needs?	++	This site is capable of providing 64 dwellings.
1.2 Will it provide other elements of identified housing need e.g. housing for older persons, self-build, support housing?	?	Uncertainty is recorded against all residential site options as information on provision of other elements of housing need is not available on a consistent basis.
2. Safeguard and improve community health, safety and wellbeing		
2.1 Are community facilities (community hall or library) available locally?	0	The site is located within 400m to 800m of Energy Youth Centre, Masonic Centre and a meeting house, though it is not clear if this is still open.
2.2 Are health facilities available locally?	++	Part of the site is within 400m of Eastleigh Health Centre.
2.3 What effect would the development have on local provision of sports pitches and facilities?	0	Development would not lead to loss of sports pitches and facilities.
2.4 Is public open space available locally?	+	The site is within 300m of open space including Whyteways amenity space, Lawn Road recreation ground and allotments.
2.5 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network?	0	A footpath runs just to the east of the site and crosses the railway tracks.
3. Develop a dynamic and diverse economy		
3.1(a) Is the location close to a major rail station?	0	The majority of the site is located within 800m to 1200m of Eastleigh rail station.
3.1 (b) Is the location close to a minor rail station?	--	The site is located further than 1200m from a minor rail station.
3.1 (c) Is the location close to a frequent bus route?	+	The site is located 400m to 600m from the frequent Bluestar 2 route.
3.1 (d) Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route?	+	The site is located within 400m of the Bluestar 5 and Xelabus X6/X7 semi-frequent bus routes.
3.1 (e) Is the location close to a major employment centre?	++	The site is located within 400m of Woodside Avenue and Boyatt Industrial Estates and Eastleigh town centre.
3.2 Will the proposed development contribute towards meeting the need for new industrial, office or warehousing floorspace?	-	This site would be developed for residential use, therefore additional employment floorspace would not be provided.
3.3 Will the proposed development result in a net loss of existing employment land, or land which would be suitable for employment purposes?	-	Development of the site will result in the loss of an area of retail and industrial estate.
3.4 Will the proposed development increase the amount of commercial uses and other facilities in town, district or local centres?	0	Development would not lead to loss of commercial uses or other facilities in town, district or local centres.
4. Reduce road traffic and congestion through improved accessibility to services homes and jobs; reducing the need to travel by car/lorry and improving sustainable travel choice		
4.1 Is the location close to a major rail station? (same score as 3.1a)	0	The majority of the site is located within 800m to 1200m of Eastleigh rail station.
4.2 Is the location close to a minor rail station?	--	The site is located further than 1200m from a minor

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
(same score as 3.1b)		rail station.
4.3 Is the location close to a frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1c)	+	The site is located 400m to 600m from the frequent Bluestar 2 route.
4.4 Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1d)	+	The site is located within 400m of the Bluestar 5 and Xelabus X6/X7 semi-frequent bus routes.
4.5(a) Will residential development at the location be close to a major employment centre? (same score as 3.1e)	++	The site is located within 400m of Woodside Avenue and Boyatt Industrial Estates and Eastleigh town centre.
4.5(b) Will employment development at the location be close to a major population centre?	0	Development would be residential only.
4.6 Are health facilities available locally? (same score as 2.2)	++	Part of the site is within 400m of Eastleigh Health Centre.
4.7 Are shopping and related services available locally?	+	The site is located 200m to 400m from Eastleigh town centre.
4.8 Is the location close to a Primary school?	++	The site is located within 400m of The Crescent County Junior and Infant School.
4.9 Is the location close to a Secondary school?	++	The site is located within 800m of Crestwood College.
4.10 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	0	A footpath runs just to the east of the site and crosses the railway tracks.
4.11 Are there Geographical barriers between the location and key facilities/ destinations?	0	A railway line is located just to the north of the site between the site and the secondary school and an employment centre.
5. Protect and conserve natural resources		
5.1 Will development avoid the sterilisation of mineral resources?	0	The site is not located in a Mineral Safeguarding Area or Mineral Consultation Area.
5.2 Will it result in the loss of higher grade agricultural land?	0	The site is located in an area of low quality agricultural land.
5.3 Will it use previously developed land?	++	The site currently accommodates a building material supplier and a number of small scale businesses.
5.4 Will it deliver or support allotments or community farms?	-	Development of the site will not make a contribution towards allotments or community farms.
6. Reduce air, soil, water, light and noise pollution		
6.1 Will the location be affected by significant noise generating uses or Air Quality Management Areas?	-	The site is located adjacent to a railway line.
6.2 Will development increase pollution?	0	Development is not expected to increase pollution.
7. Plan for the anticipated levels of climate change		
7.1 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure?	0	No loss of existing green infrastructure.
7.2 Is the location at risk from flooding, taking into account of the effects of climate change?	-?	A small section of the site falls within an area of 'less' surface water flood risk.
7.3 Will the development be at risk from coastal change? If so, can the Shoreline Management Plan Objectives be supported?	0	Site is not located near the coast.
8. Minimise Eastleigh's contribution to climate change by reducing the borough's carbon footprint and minimising other greenhouse gas emissions.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		

SA objective/ criterion	Justification	
9. Reduce waste generation and disposal, encourage waste prevention and reuse and achieve the sustainable management of waste.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
10. Protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and geodiversity, improving its quality and range.		
10.1 Could development negatively impact or lead to loss of an internationally or nationally designated site (either alone or in combination)?	0	Development of the site is unlikely to impact internationally or nationally designated sites.
10.2 Could development negatively impact or lead or loss of a locally designated biodiversity site (either alone or in combination)?	0	
10.3 Will the development adversely affect areas with other nature conservation value, as identified in Biodiversity Action Plans (BAPs)?	0	
10.4 Will the development adversely impact the biodiversity network (e.g. Priority Biodiversity Links (PBLs), Priority Biodiversity Areas (PBAs), hedgerows and other corridors for species movement)?	--	The site is located within the Railway PBL.
10.5 Will the development adversely affect ancient woodland?	0	Development of the site is unlikely to impact ancient woodland.
11. Enhance the Borough's multifunctional green infrastructure networks.		
11.1 Will the development affect TPO trees?	0	There are no TPO trees on the site.
11.2 Can the location be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	0	A footpath runs just to the east of the site and crosses the railway tracks.
11.3 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure? (same score as 7.1)	0	No loss of existing green infrastructure.
12. Protect, enhance and manage the character and appearance of the landscape and townscape, maintaining and strengthening distinctiveness and its special qualities.		
12.1 Will development adversely affect the separation of neighbouring settlements?	0	Development of the site is not expected to adversely affect the separation of neighbouring settlements.
12.2 Will it protect the character of the countryside, coast, towns and/or villages, including views and settings?	0	Development of the site is not expected to adversely affect the character of the countryside, towns or villages.
13. Protect and enhance and manage buildings, monuments, features, sites, places, areas and landscapes of archaeological, historical and cultural heritage importance.		
13.1 Will the development protect and enhance listed buildings and their settings, conservation areas, archaeological sites, historic landscapes and other sites of local importance for heritage?	0	Development of the site is not expected to adversely affect heritage assets.

Eastleigh Police Station, Eastleigh

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
1. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified local needs, including affordability and special needs		
1.1 Will the development provide a significant contribution towards meeting identified affordable housing needs?	++	This site is capable of providing 49 dwellings.
1.2 Will it provide other elements of identified housing need e.g. housing for older persons, self-build, support housing?	?	Uncertainty is recorded against all residential site options as information on provision of other elements of housing need is not available on a consistent basis.
2. Safeguard and improve community health, safety and wellbeing		
2.1 Are community facilities (community hall or library) available locally?	+	The site is located within 400m to 800m of Energy Youth Centre and a Masonic Centre.
2.2 Are health facilities available locally?	++	The site is within 400m of Eastleigh Health Centre.
2.3 What effect would the development have on local provision of sports pitches and facilities?	0	Development would not lead to loss of sports pitches and facilities.
2.4 Is public open space available locally?	+	The site is within 300m of open space including Leigh Road Recreation Ground.
2.5 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network?	-	No footpath or cycle path crosses the location or is adjacent to its boundary.
3. Develop a dynamic and diverse economy		
3.1(a) Is the location close to a major rail station?	+	The site is located 400m to 800m from Eastleigh rail station.
3.1 (b) Is the location close to a minor rail station?	--	The site is located further than 1200m from a minor rail station.
3.1 (c) Is the location close to a frequent bus route?	++	The site is located within 400m of the frequent Bluestar 2 route.
3.1 (d) Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route?	+	The site is located adjacent to the Xelabus X6/X7 semi frequent bus route and within 400m of the Bluestar 5 route.
3.1 (e) Is the location close to a major employment centre?	++	The site is located adjacent to Eastleigh town centre.
3.2 Will the proposed development contribute towards meeting the need for new industrial, office or warehousing floorspace?	-	This site would be developed for residential use, therefore additional employment floorspace would not be provided.
3.3 Will the proposed development result in a net loss of existing employment land, or land which would be suitable for employment purposes?	-	Development of the site will result in the loss of Eastleigh Police Station.
3.4 Will the proposed development increase the amount of commercial uses and other facilities in town, district or local centres?	0?	Although the site is located in Eastleigh town centre it currently contains the police station and so will not lead to loss of commercial uses in town, district or local centres.
4. Reduce road traffic and congestion through improved accessibility to services homes and jobs; reducing the need to travel by car/lorry and improving sustainable travel choice		
4.1 Is the location close to a major rail station? (same score as 3.1a)	+	The site is located 400m to 800m from Eastleigh rail station.
4.2 Is the location close to a minor rail station? (same score as 3.1b)	--	The site is located further than 1200m from a minor rail station.

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
4.3 Is the location close to a frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1c)	++	The site is located within 400m of the frequent Bluestar 2 route.
4.4 Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1d)	+	The site is located adjacent to the Xelabus X6/X7 semi frequent bus route and within 400m of the Bluestar 5 route.
4.5(a) Will residential development at the location be close to a major employment centre? (same score as 3.1e)	++	The site is located adjacent to Eastleigh town centre.
4.5(b) Will employment development at the location be close to a major population centre?	0	Development would be residential only.
4.6 Are health facilities available locally? (same score as 2.2)	++	The site is within 400m of Eastleigh Health Centre.
4.7 Are shopping and related services available locally?	++	The site is located in Eastleigh town centre.
4.8 Is the location close to a Primary school?	++	The site is located within 400m of The Crescent County Junior and Infant School.
4.9 Is the location close to a Secondary school?	+	The site is located within 800m to 1200m from Crestwood College and Crestwood Community School.
4.10 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	-	No footpath or cycle path crosses the location or is adjacent to its boundary.
4.11 Are there Geographical barriers between the location and key facilities/ destinations?	0	A railway line is located to the north of the site between the site and a secondary school. The site is on an A-road which lies between the site and a major employment centre and town centre.
5. Protect and conserve natural resources		
5.1 Will development avoid the sterilisation of mineral resources?	0	The site is not located in a Mineral Safeguarding Area or Mineral Consultation Area.
5.2 Will it result in the loss of higher grade agricultural land?	0	The site is not located in an area of agricultural land.
5.3 Will it use previously developed land?	++	The site currently accommodates a police station and a couple of residential dwellings.
5.4 Will it deliver or support allotments or community farms?	-	Development of the site will not make a contribution towards allotments or community farms.
6. Reduce air, soil, water, light and noise pollution		
6.1 Will the location be affected by significant noise generating uses or Air Quality Management Areas?	--?	The site is located adjacent to an A-road and southern part of the site is within the Leigh Road (A335) AQMA.
6.2 Will development increase pollution?	-?	Development may increase traffic in the AQMA.
7. Plan for the anticipated levels of climate change		
7.1 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure?	0	No loss of existing green infrastructure.
7.2 Is the location at risk from flooding, taking into account of the effects of climate change?	-?	The majority of the site falls within an area of 'less' surface water flood risk.
7.3 Will the development be at risk from coastal change? If so, can the Shoreline Management Plan Objectives be supported?	0	Site is not located near the coast.

SA objective/ criterion	Justification	
8. Minimise Eastleigh's contribution to climate change by reducing the borough's carbon footprint and minimising other greenhouse gas emissions.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
9. Reduce waste generation and disposal, encourage waste prevention and reuse and achieve the sustainable management of waste.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
10. Protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and geodiversity, improving its quality and range.		
10.1 Could development negatively impact or lead to loss of an internationally or nationally designated site (either alone or in combination)?	0	Development of the site is unlikely to impact internationally or nationally designated sites.
10.2 Could development negatively impact or lead or loss of a locally designated biodiversity site (either alone or in combination)?	0	Development of the site is unlikely to impact locally designated sites.
10.3 Will the development adversely affect areas with other nature conservation value, as identified in Biodiversity Action Plans (BAPs)?	0	Development of the site is unlikely to impact areas with other nature conservation value.
10.4 Will the development adversely impact the biodiversity network (e.g. Priority Biodiversity Links (PBLs), Priority Biodiversity Areas (PBAs), hedgerows and other corridors for species movement)?	0	Development of the site is unlikely to impact the biodiversity network.
10.5 Will the development adversely affect ancient woodland?	0	Development of the site is unlikely to impact ancient woodland.
11. Enhance the Borough's multifunctional green infrastructure networks.		
11.1 Will the development affect TPO trees?	-?	There are a number of TPO trees on site.
11.2 Can the location be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	-	No footpath or cycle path crosses the location or is adjacent to its boundary.
11.3 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure? (same score as 7.1)	0	No loss of existing green infrastructure.
12. Protect, enhance and manage the character and appearance of the landscape and townscape, maintaining and strengthening distinctiveness and its special qualities.		
12.1 Will development adversely affect the separation of neighbouring settlements?	0	Development of the site is not expected to adversely affect the separation of neighbouring settlements.
12.2 Will it protect the character of the countryside, coast, towns and/or villages, including views and settings?	0	Development of the site is not expected to adversely affect the character of the countryside, towns or villages.
13. Protect and enhance and manage buildings, monuments, features, sites, places, areas and landscapes of archaeological, historical and cultural heritage importance.		
13.1 Will the development protect and enhance listed buildings and their settings, conservation areas, archaeological sites, historic landscapes and other sites of local importance for heritage?	-?	The Police station is listed locally for its importance.

Land at Scotland Close, Fair Oak

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
1. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified local needs, including affordability and special needs		
1.1 Will the development provide a significant contribution towards meeting identified affordable housing needs?	++	This site is capable of providing 90 dwellings.
1.2 Will it provide other elements of identified housing need e.g. housing for older persons, self-build, support housing?	?	Uncertainty is recorded against all residential site options as information on provision of other elements of housing need is not available on a consistent basis.
2. Safeguard and improve community health, safety and wellbeing		
2.1 Are community facilities (community hall or library) available locally?	+	The site is located within 400m to 800m of Acorn Social Club.
2.2 Are health facilities available locally?	-	The site is within 1200 to 1600m of Stokewood Surgery
2.3 What effect would the development have on local provision of sports pitches and facilities?	0	Development would not lead to loss of sports pitches and facilities.
2.4 Is public open space available locally?	+	The site is within 300m of open space including Knowlehill Park and Knowlehill Copse.
2.5 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network?	-	No footpath or cycle path crosses the location or is adjacent to its boundary.
3. Develop a dynamic and diverse economy		
3.1(a) Is the location close to a major rail station?	--	The site is located more than 1400m from a major rail station.
3.1 (b) Is the location close to a minor rail station?	--	The site is located further than 1200m from a minor rail station.
3.1 (c) Is the location close to a frequent bus route?	-	The majority of the site is located within 600m to 800m of the Bluestar 2 frequent bus route.
3.1 (d) Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route?	--	The site is located further than 800m from a semi frequent bus route.
3.1 (e) Is the location close to a major employment centre?	-	The site is located further than 1000m from a major employment centre.
3.2 Will the proposed development contribute towards meeting the need for new industrial, office or warehousing floorspace?	-	This site would be developed for residential use, therefore additional employment floorspace would not be provided.
3.3 Will the proposed development result in a net loss of existing employment land, or land which would be suitable for employment purposes?	0	Development will not result in the loss of employment land.
3.4 Will the proposed development increase the amount of commercial uses and other facilities in town, district or local centres?	0	Development would not lead to loss of commercial uses or other facilities in town, district or local centres.
4. Reduce road traffic and congestion through improved accessibility to services homes and jobs; reducing the need to travel by car/lorry and improving sustainable travel choice		
4.1 Is the location close to a major rail station? (same score as 3.1a)	--	The site is located more than 1400m from a major rail station.
4.2 Is the location close to a minor rail station? (same score as 3.1b)	--	The site is located further than 1200m from a minor rail station.
4.3 Is the location close to a frequent bus route?	-	The majority of the site is located within 600m to

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
(same score as 3.1c)		800m of the Bluestar 2 frequent bus route.
4.4 Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1d)	--	The site is located further than 800m from a semi frequent bus route.
4.5(a) Will residential development at the location be close to a major employment centre? (same score as 3.1e)	-	The site is located further than 1000m from a major employment centre.
4.5(b) Will employment development at the location be close to a major population centre?	0	Development would be residential only.
4.6 Are health facilities available locally? (same score as 2.2)	-	The site is within 1200 to 1600m of Stokewood Surgery
4.7 Are shopping and related services available locally?	-	The site is located within 600m to 800m of Fair Oak District Centre.
4.8 Is the location close to a Primary school?	0	The site is located within 600m to 800m of Fair Oak Junior School.
4.9 Is the location close to a Secondary school?	++	The site is located within 800m of Wyvern College.
4.10 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	-	No footpath or cycle path crosses the location or is adjacent to its boundary.
4.11 Are there Geographical barriers between the location and key facilities/ destinations?	+	There are no geographical barriers between the site and key facilities.
5. Protect and conserve natural resources		
5.1 Will development avoid the sterilisation of mineral resources?	-?	A very small section of the northern edge of the site falls within a mineral consultation area and a small section of the southern edge of the site falls within a minerals safeguarding area.
5.2 Will it result in the loss of higher grade agricultural land?	0	The site falls entirely within an area of low quality agricultural land (grades 4 and 5).
5.3 Will it use previously developed land?	-/+?	The site is not developed however, it was previously used as a tip. Potential for minor positive impacts that may result from remediation of the site if it were developed.
5.4 Will it deliver or support allotments or community farms?	-	Development of the site will not make a contribution towards allotments or community farms.
6. Reduce air, soil, water, light and noise pollution		
6.1 Will the location be affected by significant noise generating uses or Air Quality Management Areas?	0	The site is not located within an AQMA or 200m of an A-road, motorway or railway.
6.2 Will development increase pollution?	0	Development is unlikely to increase pollution.
7. Plan for the anticipated levels of climate change		
7.1 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure?	0	No loss of existing green infrastructure.
7.2 Is the location at risk from flooding, taking into account of the effects of climate change?	-?	Small parts of the site, along the northern edge fall in areas of 'less' surface water flooding.
7.3 Will the development be at risk from coastal change? If so, can the Shoreline Management Plan Objectives be supported?	0	Site is not located near the coast.
8. Minimise Eastleigh's contribution to climate change by reducing the borough's carbon footprint and minimising other greenhouse gas emissions.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		

SA objective/ criterion	Justification	
9. Reduce waste generation and disposal, encourage waste prevention and reuse and achieve the sustainable management of waste.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
10. Protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and geodiversity, improving its quality and range.		
10.1 Could development negatively impact or lead to loss of an internationally or nationally designated site (either alone or in combination)?	-	A watercourse runs through the northern edge of the site, which eventually flows into the River Itchen SAC. Potential for in-combination effects.
10.2 Could development negatively impact or lead or loss of a locally designated biodiversity site (either alone or in combination)?	-	Knowle Lane Open Space SINC is located to the east of the site and Knowlehill Copse SINC is located to the south. Potential for increased urban edge and recreational effects.
10.3 Will the development adversely affect areas with other nature conservation value, as identified in Biodiversity Action Plans (BAPs)?	-?	The site contains Lowland Mixed Deciduous Woodland Priority Habitat. The Council have stated that all woodland will be retained however potential for urban edge effects.
10.4 Will the development adversely impact the biodiversity network (e.g. Priority Biodiversity Links (PBLs), Priority Biodiversity Areas (PBAs), hedgerows and other corridors for species movement)?	0	Development of the site is unlikely to impact the biodiversity network.
10.5 Will the development adversely affect ancient woodland?	-	Knowlehill Copse is located just to the south of the site. Potential for urban edge effects.
11. Enhance the Borough's multifunctional green infrastructure networks.		
11.1 Will the development affect TPO trees?	-?	All trees on the northern boundary are covered by TPOs
11.2 Can the location be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	-	No footpath or cycle path crosses the location or is adjacent to its boundary.
11.3 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure? (same score as 7.1)	0	No loss of existing green infrastructure.
12. Protect, enhance and manage the character and appearance of the landscape and townscape, maintaining and strengthening distinctiveness and its special qualities.		
12.1 Will development adversely affect the separation of neighbouring settlements?	0	Development of the site is not expected to adversely affect the separation of neighbouring settlements.
12.2 Will it protect the character of the countryside, coast, towns and/or villages, including views and settings?	0	Development of the site is not expected to adversely affect the character of the countryside, towns or villages.
13. Protect and enhance and manage buildings, monuments, features, sites, places, areas and landscapes of archaeological, historical and cultural heritage importance.		
13.1 Will the development protect and enhance listed buildings and their settings, conservation areas, archaeological sites, historic landscapes and other sites of local importance for heritage?	0	Development is not expected to affect heritage assets.

Royal British Legion Club, Station Road, Hound

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
1. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified local needs, including affordability and special needs		
1.1 Will the development provide a significant contribution towards meeting identified affordable housing needs?	+	This site is capable of providing 10 dwellings.
1.2 Will it provide other elements of identified housing need e.g. housing for older persons, self-build, support housing?	?	Uncertainty is recorded against all residential site options as information on provision of other elements of housing need is not available on a consistent basis.
2. Safeguard and improve community health, safety and wellbeing		
2.1 Are community facilities (community hall or library) available locally?	0	The site is located within 400m to 800m of Netley Abbey Library and Netley Abbey Parish Hall.
2.2 Are health facilities available locally?	-	The site is within 1200 to 1600m of Blackthorn Health Centre.
2.3 What effect would the development have on local provision of sports pitches and facilities?	0	Development would not lead to loss of sports pitches and facilities.
2.4 Is public open space available locally?	+	The site is within 300m of open space including Royal Victoria County Park, Station Road Recreation Ground and Hound Way.
2.5 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network?	-	No footpath or cycle path crosses the location or is adjacent to its boundary.
3. Develop a dynamic and diverse economy		
3.1(a) Is the location close to a major rail station?	--	The site is located more than 1400m from a major rail station.
3.1 (b) Is the location close to a minor rail station?	+	The site is within 400m from a minor rail station.
3.1 (c) Is the location close to a frequent bus route?	--	The site is located further than 800m from a frequent bus route.
3.1 (d) Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route?	+	The site is located adjacent to the First 6 semi frequent bus route.
3.1 (e) Is the location close to a major employment centre?	-	The site is located further than 1000m from a major employment centre.
3.2 Will the proposed development contribute towards meeting the need for new industrial, office or warehousing floorspace?	-	This site would be developed for residential use, therefore additional employment floorspace would not be provided.
3.3 Will the proposed development result in a net loss of existing employment land, or land which would be suitable for employment purposes?	0	Development will not result in the loss of employment land.
3.4 Will the proposed development increase the amount of commercial uses and other facilities in town, district or local centres?	0	Development would not lead to loss of commercial uses or other facilities in town, district or local centres.
4. Reduce road traffic and congestion through improved accessibility to services homes and jobs; reducing the need to travel by car/lorry and improving sustainable travel choice		
4.1 Is the location close to a major rail station? (same score as 3.1a)	--	The site is located more than 1400m from a major rail station.
4.2 Is the location close to a minor rail station? (same score as 3.1b)	+	The site is within 400m from a minor rail station.

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
4.3 Is the location close to a frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1c)	--	The site is located further than 800m from a frequent bus route.
4.4 Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1d)	+	The site is located adjacent to the First 6 semi frequent bus route.
4.5(a) Will residential development at the location be close to a major employment centre? (same score as 3.1e)	-	The site is located further than 1000m from a major employment centre.
4.5(b) Will employment development at the location be close to a major population centre?	0	Development would be residential only.
4.6 Are health facilities available locally? (same score as 2.2)	-	The site is within 1200 to 1600m of Blackthorn Health Centre.
4.7 Are shopping and related services available locally?	+	The western edge of the site is located within 200m to 400m of Station Road & Victoria Road District Centre, Netley.
4.8 Is the location close to a Primary school?	0	The site is located within 600m to 800m of Victoria Road Junior School and Westwood Road Primary School.
4.9 Is the location close to a Secondary school?	+	The site is located within 800m to 1200m of Satchell Lane Secondary School.
4.10 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	-	No footpath or cycle path crosses the location or is adjacent to its boundary.
4.11 Are there Geographical barriers between the location and key facilities/ destinations?	+	There are no geographical barriers between the site and key facilities.
5. Protect and conserve natural resources		
5.1 Will development avoid the sterilisation of mineral resources?	0	The site is not located in a Mineral Safeguarding Area or Mineral Consultation Area.
5.2 Will it result in the loss of higher grade agricultural land?	0	The site is not located in an area of agricultural land.
5.3 Will it use previously developed land?	++	The site currently accommodates the old Netley Abbey Sports & Social Club building and car park.
5.4 Will it deliver or support allotments or community farms?	-	Development of the site will not make a contribution towards allotments or community farms.
6. Reduce air, soil, water, light and noise pollution		
6.1 Will the location be affected by significant noise generating uses or Air Quality Management Areas?	0	The site is not located within an AQMA or 200m of an A-road, motorway or railway.
6.2 Will development increase pollution?	0	Development is unlikely to increase pollution.
7. Plan for the anticipated levels of climate change		
7.1 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure?	0	No loss of existing green infrastructure.
7.2 Is the location at risk from flooding, taking into account of the effects of climate change?	-?	A small part of the site falls within an area of 'less' surface water flooding.
7.3 Will the development be at risk from coastal change? If so, can the Shoreline Management Plan Objectives be supported?	0	Site is not located near the coast.
8. Minimise Eastleigh's contribution to climate change by reducing the borough's carbon footprint and minimising other greenhouse gas emissions.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		

SA objective/ criterion	Justification	
9. Reduce waste generation and disposal, encourage waste prevention and reuse and achieve the sustainable management of waste.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
10. Protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and geodiversity, improving its quality and range.		
10.1 Could development negatively impact or lead to loss of an internationally or nationally designated site (either alone or in combination)?	0	Development of the site is unlikely to impact internationally or nationally designated sites.
10.2 Could development negatively impact or lead or loss of a locally designated biodiversity site (either alone or in combination)?	0	Development of the site is unlikely to impact locally designated sites.
10.3 Will the development adversely affect areas with other nature conservation value, as identified in Biodiversity Action Plans (BAPs)?	-?	The site contains Lowland Mixed Deciduous Woodland Priority Habitat. The Council have stated that all woodland will be retained however potential for urban edge effects.
10.4 Will the development adversely impact the biodiversity network (e.g. Priority Biodiversity Links (PBLs), Priority Biodiversity Areas (PBAs), hedgerows and other corridors for species movement)?	0	Development of the site is unlikely to impact the biodiversity network.
10.5 Will the development adversely affect ancient woodland?	0	Development of the site is unlikely to impact ancient woodland.
11. Enhance the Borough's multifunctional green infrastructure networks.		
11.1 Will the development affect TPO trees?	?	The trees adjacent to the southern edge of the site are covered by TPOs.
11.2 Can the location be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	-	No footpath or cycle path crosses the location or is adjacent to its boundary.
11.3 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure? (same score as 7.1)	0	No loss of existing green infrastructure.
12. Protect, enhance and manage the character and appearance of the landscape and townscape, maintaining and strengthening distinctiveness and its special qualities.		
12.1 Will development adversely affect the separation of neighbouring settlements?	0	Development of the site is not expected to adversely affect the separation of neighbouring settlements.
12.2 Will it protect the character of the countryside, coast, towns and/or villages, including views and settings?	0	Development of the site is not expected to adversely affect the character of the countryside, towns or villages.
13. Protect and enhance and manage buildings, monuments, features, sites, places, areas and landscapes of archaeological, historical and cultural heritage importance.		
13.1 Will the development protect and enhance listed buildings and their settings, conservation areas, archaeological sites, historic landscapes and other sites of local importance for heritage?	0	Development is not expected to affect heritage assets.

Dumbleton Copse / Pinewood Park, Kanes Hill, West End

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
1. Provide sufficient housing to meet identified local needs, including affordability and special needs		
1.1 Will the development provide a significant contribution towards meeting identified affordable housing needs?	--	This site is capable of providing 6 dwellings.
1.2 Will it provide other elements of identified housing need e.g. housing for older persons, self-build, support housing?	?	Uncertainty is recorded against all residential site options as information on provision of other elements of housing need is not available on a consistent basis.
2. Safeguard and improve community health, safety and wellbeing		
2.1 Are community facilities (community hall or library) available locally?	-	The site is further than 800m from a library or parish hall.
2.2 Are health facilities available locally?	--	The site is further than 1600m from a health facility.
2.3 What effect would the development have on local provision of sports pitches and facilities?	0	Development would not lead to loss of sports pitches and facilities.
2.4 Is public open space available locally?	+	The site is within 300m of open space, including Netley Common and Kanes Hill Allotments.
2.5 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network?	-	No footpath or cycle path crosses the location or is adjacent to its boundary.
3. Develop a dynamic and diverse economy		
3.1(a) Is the location close to a major rail station?	--	The site is located more than 1400m from a major rail station.
3.1 (b) Is the location close to a minor rail station?	--	The site is located further than 1200m from a minor rail station.
3.1 (c) Is the location close to a frequent bus route?	--	The site is located further than 800m from a frequent bus route.
3.1 (d) Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route?	--	The site is located further than 800m from a semi frequent bus route.
3.1 (e) Is the location close to a major employment centre?	-	The site is located further than 1000m from a major employment centre.
3.2 Will the proposed development contribute towards meeting the need for new industrial, office or warehousing floorspace?	-	This site would be developed for residential use, therefore additional employment floorspace would not be provided.
3.3 Will the proposed development result in a net loss of existing employment land, or land which would be suitable for employment purposes?	0	Development will not result in the loss of employment land.
3.4 Will the proposed development increase the amount of commercial uses and other facilities in town, district or local centres?	0	Development would not lead to loss of commercial uses or other facilities in town, district or local centres.
4. Reduce road traffic and congestion through improved accessibility to services homes and jobs; reducing the need to travel by car/lorry and improving sustainable travel choice		
4.1 Is the location close to a major rail station? (same score as 3.1a)	--	The site is located more than 1400m from a major rail station.
4.2 Is the location close to a minor rail station? (same score as 3.1b)	--	The site is located further than 1200m from a minor rail station.

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
4.3 Is the location close to a frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1c)	--	The site is located further than 800m from a frequent bus route.
4.4 Is the location close to a semi-frequent bus route? (same score as 3.1d)	--	The site is located further than 800m from a semi frequent bus route.
4.5(a) Will residential development at the location be close to a major employment centre? (same score as 3.1e)	-	The site is located further than 1000m from a major employment centre.
4.5(b) Will employment development at the location be close to a major population centre?	0	Development would be residential only.
4.6 Are health facilities available locally? (same score as 2.2)	--	The site is further than 1600m from a health facility.
4.7 Are shopping and related services available locally?	--	The site is further than 800m from a town, district or local centre.
4.8 Is the location close to a Primary school?	0	The northern parcel of the site is located within 600m to 800m of Kanes Hill Primary School
4.9 Is the location close to a Secondary school?	-	The site is located between 1601m and 2000m of Wildern Secondary School.
4.10 Can the location readily be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	-	No footpath or cycle path crosses the location or is adjacent to its boundary.
4.11 Are there Geographical barriers between the location and key facilities/ destinations?	0	The M27 is located to the east of the site, forming a barrier to Hedge End. Despite this, the site is located within close proximity to the City of Southampton to the west.
5. Protect and conserve natural resources		
5.1 Will development avoid the sterilisation of mineral resources?	-?	The majority of the site falls within a Mineral Consultation Area.
5.2 Will it result in the loss of higher grade agricultural land?	0	The site falls entirely within an area of low quality agricultural land (grades 4 and 5).
5.3 Will it use previously developed land?	-	The site is not located on previously developed land.
5.4 Will it deliver or support allotments or community farms?	-	Development of the site will not make a contribution towards allotments or community farms.
6. Reduce air, soil, water, light and noise pollution		
6.1 Will the location be affected by significant noise generating uses or Air Quality Management Areas?	-?	The site is located within 200m of an A-road (Kanes Hill).
6.2 Will development increase pollution?	0	Development is unlikely to increase pollution.
7. Plan for the anticipated levels of climate change		
7.1 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure?	+/--	Development of the site will result in the loss of woodland. However, EBC has advised that the purpose of this allocation is to fund management of the copse and bring it back into public use. Therefore, whilst a small area of GI will be lost to development, the remainder will be enhanced.
7.2 Is the location at risk from flooding, taking into account of the effects of climate change?	0	The site does not fall within Flood Zones 2 or 3 or an area of surface water flooding.
7.3 Will the development be at risk from coastal change? If so, can the Shoreline Management Plan Objectives be supported?	0	Site is not located near the coast.

SA objective/ criterion	Justification	
8. Minimise Eastleigh's contribution to climate change by reducing the borough's carbon footprint and minimising other greenhouse gas emissions.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
9. Reduce waste generation and disposal, encourage waste prevention and reuse and achieve the sustainable management of waste.		
This objective is to be used in the appraisal of development management policies.		
10. Protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and geodiversity, improving its quality and range.		
10.1 Could development negatively impact or lead to loss of an internationally or nationally designated site (either alone or in combination)?	0	Development of the site is unlikely to impact internationally or nationally designated sites.
10.2 Could development negatively impact or lead or loss of a locally designated biodiversity site (either alone or in combination)?	+/-	The entire site falls within Dumbleton's Copse SINC and is within 200m of Netley Common LNR. However, EBC has stated that the purpose of this allocation is to fund management of the copse, therefore it is expected to result in enhancement of the remaining woodland.
10.3 Will the development adversely affect areas with other nature conservation value, as identified in Biodiversity Action Plans (BAPs)?	+/-	The site contains Lowland Mixed Deciduous Woodland Priority Habitat. However, EBC has stated that the purpose of this allocation is to fund management of the remaining woodland, therefore it is expected to result in enhancement of the remaining woodland.
10.4 Will the development adversely impact the biodiversity network (e.g. Priority Biodiversity Links (PBLs), Priority Biodiversity Areas (PBAs), hedgerows and other corridors for species movement)?	-?	The site falls within the Netley & Bursledon Commons PBA.
10.5 Will the development adversely affect ancient woodland?	0	Development of the site is unlikely to impact ancient woodland.
11. Enhance the Borough's multifunctional green infrastructure networks.		
11.1 Will the development affect TPO trees?	-?	The trees within the site are covered by a blanket TPO.
11.2 Can the location be connected to the existing cycle and footpath network? (same score as 2.5)	-	No footpath or cycle path crosses the location or is adjacent to its boundary.
11.3 Will the development provide additional or improved green infrastructure? (same score as 7.1)	+/-	Development of the site will result in the loss of woodland. However, EBC has advised that the purpose of this allocation is to fund management of the copse and bring it back into public use. Therefore, whilst a small area of GI will be lost to development, the remainder will be enhanced.
12. Protect, enhance and manage the character and appearance of the landscape and townscape, maintaining and strengthening distinctiveness and its special qualities.		
12.1 Will development adversely affect the separation of neighbouring settlements?	0	Development of the site is not expected to adversely affect the separation of neighbouring settlements.
12.2 Will it protect the character of the countryside, coast, towns and/or villages, including views and settings?	0	Development of the site is not expected to adversely affect the character of the countryside,

SA objective/ criterion		Justification
		towns or villages.
13. Protect and enhance and manage buildings, monuments, features, sites, places, areas and landscapes of archaeological, historical and cultural heritage importance.		
13.1 Will the development protect and enhance listed buildings and their settings, conservation areas, archaeological sites, historic landscapes and other sites of local importance for heritage?	0	Development is not expected to affect heritage assets.

Appendix 10

Assessment of non-spatial policy options

Affordable housing

The site size threshold for providing affordable dwellings

Three reasonable alternative policy options were considered for the site size threshold for providing affordable dwellings, as shown in the SA matrix below. The potential sustainability effects are described below the matrix.

The site size threshold for providing affordable dwellings - policy options:								
A. Follow the principles described in 2011-2029 Local Plan.								
B. Lower threshold to 10 dwellings.								
C. Vary approach across the borough.								
SA Objective	A	B	C					
SA1: Provide sufficient housing to meet identified local needs, including affordability and special needs	++	+/-	+/-					
SA2: Safeguard and improve community health, safety and wellbeing	+	+/-	+/-					
SA3: Develop a dynamic and diverse economy	+	+/-	+/-					
SA4: Reduce road traffic and congestion through improved accessibility to services homes and jobs; reducing the need to travel by car/lorry and improving sustainable travel choice	0	0	0					
SA5: Protect and conserve natural resources	0	0	0					
SA6: Reduce air, soil, water, light and noise pollution	0	0	0					
SA7: Plan for the anticipated levels of climate change	0	0	0					
SA8: Minimise Eastleigh's contribution to climate change by reducing the borough's carbon footprint and minimising other greenhouse gas emissions	0	0	0					
SA9: Reduce waste generation and disposal, encourage waste prevention and reuse and achieve the sustainable management of waste	0	0	0					
SA10: Protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and geodiversity, improving its quality and range	0	0	0					
SA11: Enhance the Borough's multifunctional green infrastructure networks	0	0	0					
SA12: Protect, enhance and manage the character and appearance of the landscape and townscape, maintaining and strengthening distinctiveness and its special qualities	0	0	0					
SA13: Protect and enhance and manage buildings, monuments, features, sites, places, areas and landscapes of archaeological, historical and cultural heritage importance.	0	0	0					

Description of effects in relation to SA objectives

The only significant effects identified for the policy options on supply mechanisms for addressing affordable housing, are in relation to meeting local housing need (SA objective 1: Housing provision). Option A is likely to contribute the most to ensuring that there would be a continued supply of housing to meet the needs of the local population, leading to a significant positive (++) effect. While Options B and C could also have minor positive (+) effects on SA objective 1: Housing provision, minor negative (-) effects are also predicted, because they could reduce supply in areas of higher affordable need. Option B removes the requirement for a proportion of affordable housing to be delivered in smaller developments, Option C allows a variable approach across the Borough, which could mean that no affordable housing is delivered in some areas.

In relation to other social effects, all policy options are predicted to result in minor positive (+) effects on wellbeing through the provision of sufficient housing to meet local needs but also community cohesion (SA objective 2: Community health) by delivering a greater distribution of communities of mixed tenures. However, Options B and C are also predicted to have minor negative (-) effects, because they could result in an undersupply and concentrations of tenures in particular areas.

Where economic effects are predicted (SA objective 3: Economy), option A is predicted to have minor positive (+) effects on the supply of housing to meet local workforce demands. While this is also the case for Options B and C, they might also lead to the under provision of affordable housing located near employment opportunities, leading to minor negative (-) effects.

Due to the narrow focus of these policy options, they are unlikely to affect the remaining SA objectives.

The proportion of affordable dwellings to provide in qualifying developments

Four reasonable alternative policy options were considered for the proportion of affordable dwellings to provide in qualifying developments, as shown in the SA matrix below. The potential sustainability effects are described below the matrix.

The proportion of affordable dwellings to provide in qualifying developments- policy options:								
A. Follow the principles described in 2011-2029 Local Plan.								
B. Increase proportion of homes that will be sought from developers to provide as affordable housing.								
C. Lower proportion of homes that will be sought from developers to provide as affordable housing.								
D. Vary approach across borough.								
SA Objective	A	B	C	D				
SA1: Provide sufficient housing to meet identified local needs, including affordability and special needs	++?	++/-?	--/+?	++?				
SA2: Safeguard and improve community health, safety and wellbeing	+?	+/-	-	+/-				
SA3: Develop a dynamic and diverse economy	0	0	0	0				
SA4: Reduce road traffic and congestion through improved accessibility to services homes and jobs; reducing the need to travel by car/lorry and improving sustainable travel choice	0	0	0	0				
SA5: Protect and conserve natural resources	0	0	0	0				
SA6: Reduce air, soil, water, light and noise pollution	0	0	0	0				
SA7: Plan for the anticipated levels of climate change	0	0	0	0				
SA8: Minimise Eastleigh's contribution to climate change by reducing the borough's carbon footprint and	0	0	0	0				

minimising other greenhouse gas emissions								
SA9: Reduce waste generation and disposal, encourage waste prevention and reuse and achieve the sustainable management of waste	0	0	0	0				
SA10: Protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and geodiversity, improving its quality and range	0	0	0	0				
SA11: Enhance the Borough's multifunctional green infrastructure networks	0	0	0	0				
SA12: Protect, enhance and manage the character and appearance of the landscape and townscape, maintaining and strengthening distinctiveness and its special qualities	0	0	0	0				
SA13: Protect and enhance and manage buildings, monuments, features, sites, places, areas and landscapes of archaeological, historical and cultural heritage importance	0	0	0	0				

Description of effects in relation to SA objectives

The only significant effects identified for the policy options on the proportions of affordable dwellings to provide in qualifying developments, are in relation to meeting local housing need, in particular affordable housing need (SA objective 1: Housing provision). All options would make provision for some affordable housing to be delivered, but Options A and B would seek to provide the most, through setting the highest thresholds, hence a significant positive effect is identified. However, the extent to which the higher thresholds would be deliverable due to the viability of providing increased levels of affordable housing within qualifying developments is uncertain. The Council's preliminary work in December 2015 to update the 2012 Affordable Housing Viability Assessment¹¹⁰ suggests that there is no realistic scope, in viability terms, to consider increasing the overall target above 35% across the borough. Therefore, Option B could also have a minor negative effect in relation to SA objective 1: Housing provision, as the higher threshold it requires may limit the amount of market housing that is able to be delivered. Option C, which seeks to lower the proportion of affordable homes that will be sought from developers, is considered therefore to have a significant negative (--) effect in relation to provision of affordable housing, although it may increase the amount of market housing that is provided, which would still contribute to the overall housing need of the Borough, hence the minor positive (+) effect also identified. Again, this is uncertain as it depends on future housing market circumstances and the viability of developments. Finally, Option D is also considered likely to have a significant positive (++) effect in relation to meeting local housing need because it seeks to vary the affordable housing requirement across the Borough, to take into account differences in land values and therefore should ensure the viability of all housing developments in different locations. This approach is supported in the updated affordable housing viability assessment. This effect is uncertain as it is not clear whether it would provide sufficient affordable housing to meet the identified need.

Option A is predicted to have minor positive (+) effects on community cohesion (SA objective 2: Community health) because it is more likely to deliver mixed tenure communities. Similarly, Options B, and D are also predicted to have minor positive (+) effects on increasing social cohesion, but along with Option C, they are also predicted to have a minor negative (-) effects, because they are more likely to result in undersupply of either affordable or market housing and increased separation of different tenure groups in different areas of the Borough.

Due to the narrow focus of these policy options, they are unlikely to affect the remaining SA objectives.

¹¹⁰ Eastleigh Borough Local Plan 2011-2036: Viability overview, December 2015

Specialised accommodation and providing for first time buyers and self-builders

Three reasonable alternative policy options were considered for the specialised accommodation and providing for first time buyers and self-builders, as shown in the SA matrix below. The potential sustainability effects are described below the matrix.

Provision of accommodation to meet specific needs and to provide for first time buyers and self-builders- policy options:								
A. Allocate specific sites for specialist housing types, such as starter homes, self-build homes, housing for older people and supported housing.								
B. Require larger new development sites to include a range of specialist housing types, such as starter homes, self-build homes, housing for older people and supported housing.								
C. Encourage the development of smaller homes in suitable locations for people to 'downsize' from larger properties.								
SA Objective	A	B	C					
SA1: Provide sufficient housing to meet identified local needs, including affordability and special needs	++	++?	+					
SA2: Safeguard and improve community health, safety and wellbeing	+	+	+					
SA3: Develop a dynamic and diverse economy	+	+	+					
SA4: Reduce road traffic and congestion through improved accessibility to services homes and jobs; reducing the need to travel by car/lorry and improving sustainable travel choice	0	0	0					
SA5: Protect and conserve natural resources	0	0	0					
SA6: Reduce air, soil, water, light and noise pollution	0	0	0					
SA7: Plan for the anticipated levels of climate change	0	0	0					
SA8: Minimise Eastleigh's contribution to climate change by reducing the borough's carbon footprint and minimising other greenhouse gas emissions	0	0	0					
SA9: Reduce waste generation and disposal, encourage waste prevention and reuse and achieve the sustainable management of waste	0	0	0					
SA10: Protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and geodiversity, improving its quality and range	0	0	0					
SA11: Enhance the Borough's multifunctional green infrastructure networks	0	0	0					
SA12: Protect, enhance and manage the character and appearance of the landscape and townscape, maintaining and strengthening distinctiveness and its special qualities	+/-	?	+/-					
SA13: Protect and enhance and manage buildings, monuments, features, sites,	0	0	0					

places, areas and landscapes of archaeological, historical and cultural heritage importance as and landscapes of archaeological, historical and cultural heritage importance								
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Description of effects in relation to SA objectives

The only significant effects identified for the policy options on provision of specialised accommodation are in relation to local housing need (SA objective 1: Housing provision). Option A would ensure that land is allocated for the provision of a range of housing types to meet specialist needs, leading to a significant positive (++) effect. While Option B does not allocate specific sites for specialist housing types, it would require new large developments to include a range of specialist housing types, therefore it is also likely to have a significant positive effect, but this is less certain (++?), as it depends on the amount of larger new developments coming forward. Option C would help to ensure that suitable homes are available for households downsizing, but is limited in its scope as it does not seek to allocate specific land for a wider range of housing needs, leading to only minor positive (+) effects on SA objective 1: Housing provision.

All three options aim to improve the provision of housing to meet local need. Housing provides basic shelter and warmth and therefore all three options would have a minor positive effect on individual wellbeing (SA objective 2: Community health). Options A and B would also help to ensure that a diverse workforce can be accommodated and in doing so, make the Borough more attractive to investors (SA objective 3: Economy), although this effect is uncertain as it depends on the extent to which starter homes and self-build homes are taken up by the working age population. Option C makes provision for 'downsizing', which would help to release larger existing housing which is under-occupied (e.g. by people who have retired). This would have the effect of freeing up larger houses which would be likely to be of more benefit to those of working age; therefore this option is also likely to have a minor positive (+) effect on SA objective 3: Economy, although this also uncertain as it depends on the extent to which larger existing houses are taken up by the working age population.

Options A and C seek to enable housing development in suitable locations. If this is done in conjunction with an assessment of Eastleigh's landscape sensitivity, it could lead to minor positive (+) effects on the landscape (SA objective 12: Landscape and townscape), but if not, new housing development could harm the landscape, leading to minor negative (-) effects. The effect of Option B on this objective is uncertain (?), because it depends on where the new larger developments are proposed.

Due to the narrow focus of these policy options, they are unlikely to affect the remaining SA objectives.

Delivering sites for Travelling Communities

Four reasonable alternative policy options were considered for delivering sites for travelling communities, as shown in the SA matrix below. The potential sustainability effects are described below the matrix.

Options to address the needs of Travelling Communities:								
A. Allocation for sites with extant planning permission and permanent permission of unauthorised sites								
B. Sub-division of pitches								
C. Extension to existing sites								
D. New sites								
SA Objective (number + summary)	A	B	C	D				
SA1: Provide sufficient housing to meet identified local needs, including affordability and special needs	++	++?	++	++				
SA2: Safeguard and improve community health, safety and wellbeing	+	+	+	+				
SA3: Develop a dynamic and diverse economy	+	+	+	+				

SA4: Reduce road traffic and congestion through improved accessibility to services homes and jobs; reducing the need to travel by car/lorry and improving sustainable travel choice	0	0	0	0				
SA5: Protect and conserve natural resources	++?	++?	-?	-?				
SA6: Reduce air, soil, water, light and noise pollution	+	+	-?	+				
SA7: Plan for the anticipated levels of climate change	?	?	?	+				
SA8: Minimise Eastleigh's contribution to climate change by reducing the borough's carbon footprint and minimising other greenhouse gas emissions	0	0	0	0				
SA9: Reduce waste generation and disposal, encourage waste prevention and reuse and achieve the sustainable management of waste	0	0	0	+				
SA10: Protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and geodiversity, improving its quality and range	+/-	+	-?	+/-?				
SA11: Enhance the Borough's multifunctional green infrastructure networks	0	0	0	0				
SA12: Protect, enhance and manage the character and appearance of the landscape and townscape, maintaining and strengthening distinctiveness and its special qualities	++/-	++	+/-?	+/-?				
SA13: Protect and enhance and manage buildings, monuments, features, sites, places, areas and landscapes of archaeological, historical and cultural heritage importance as and landscapes of archaeological, historical and cultural heritage importance	?	?	?	?				

These policy options seek to ensure that travelling communities have a sufficient number of sites to meet their needs. Option C proposes that provision of sites for travelling communities would be met by extending existing sites, while Option D, proposes that suitable land is allocated to meet Traveller needs, and although Option A does not allocate specific sites for travelling communities, it proposes an approach where existing sites with extant planning permission, which has yet to be implemented, and suitable unauthorised sites are allocated. Therefore, Options A, C and D are likely to have a significant positive (++) effect on SA objective 1: Housing provision. Option B would provide opportunities to intensify existing sites to enable further pitches to be created, but it is less certain whether this would fully meet the need required compared to extending sites or providing new sites and therefore only a significant positive but uncertain (++) effect is identified for SA objective 1.

All four options are predicted to have minor positive (+) social and economic effects (SA objectives 2: Community health and 3: Economy), because they would help to ensure delivery of land to meet the housing needs of travelling communities, help improve social inclusion, accessibility to facilities and services, as well as improve accessibility to employment opportunities.

By seeking to focus development within existing sites, Options A and B would reduce the amount of greenfield land being developed, leading to significant positive (++) effects on SA objective 5: Natural resources and SA objective 12: Landscape and townscape. However, Option A is also predicted to have minor negative (-) effects on SA objective 12: Landscape and townscape, because existing unauthorised sites might already be in areas of landscape sensitivity. An indirect minor positive (+) effect of Options A and B, is that they might help to minimise the use of natural resources (SA objective 5) and in doing so protect local habitats and species (SA objective 10). However, the granting of permission for unauthorised sites in Option A, might also lead to minor negative (-) effects on SA objective 10: Biodiversity and geodiversity, due to increased pressure on local habitats and species.

Option D promotes sites being planned from the outset and this could have some minor positive (+) effects on SA objectives 6, 7, 9, 10 and 12 because of the potential to incorporate in planning application proposals strategies for pollution control, flood prevention, waste management, protection of local habitats

and species and the setting within the countryside. These effects are uncertain though because they would be dependent on the details of the proposals coming forward at the planning application stage. The provision of new sites for these communities could involve an increased amount of greenfield land being developed, which could lead to minor negative but uncertain (-?) effects on SA objective 5: Natural resources, and SA objective 10: Biodiversity and geodiversity and SA objective 12: Landscape and townscape.

Option C proposes the extension of existing sites. If extensions are supported on sites where there is low landscape sensitivity, then this would help limit the impact of development on more sensitive areas of the countryside (SA Objective 12: Landscape and townscape), leading to minor positive (+) effects, but this is uncertain (?). As extensions would still increase the amount of greenfield land being developed, there may also be minor negative uncertain (-?) effects on SA objective 12: Landscape and townscape. Related to this, the increase in greenfield land that could be developed through extensions to existing sites could lead to minor negative uncertain (-?) effects in relation to SA Objective 5: Natural resources. There may also be less opportunity to incorporate mitigation strategies for pollution control in extending existing sites and therefore there could be a minor negative but uncertain (-?) effect on SA objective 6: Pollution. The extension of sites might also lead to the loss of habitats and increased pressure on species, therefore this option is predicted to have minor negative but uncertain (-?) effects on SA objective 10: Biodiversity and geodiversity.

Options A, B and C would have uncertain (?) effects on SA objective 7 (Climate change adaptation), as it is unknown whether the existing sites (and their possible extensions under Option C) would be in areas at high risk of flooding. All options would also have uncertain (?) effects on SA objective 13 (Cultural heritage), as it depends on the proximity and any current impacts of existing sites on heritage assets (Options A and B), or the location of new sites (Option D) or extensions (Option C) in relation to any heritage assets.

These policy options are unlikely to affect SA objective 4 (Road traffic/congestion) as the scale of these sites is likely to be small, and SA objective 11 (Green infrastructure) as there is unlikely to be many opportunities to incorporate green infrastructure within these type of sites.

Houses in multiple occupation

No reasonable alternative policy options have been proposed for dealing with the issue of houses in multiple occupation (HMOs) as it has very little evidence to demonstrate that there is a significant issue. It has therefore asked consultees whether there any areas in Eastleigh where HMOs are considered a problem, and if there is there a need to specifically address the issue of managing the provision of HMOs within the Borough. No SA is required for these opinion/information seeking consultation questions.

Densities and building standards

Seven reasonable alternative policy options were considered for densities and building standards, as shown in the SA matrix below. The potential sustainability effects are described below the matrix.

Densities and building standards - policy options:
A. Follow the principles described in 2011-2029 Local Plan.
B. Increase minimum residential densities in areas of high accessibility.
C. Increase minimum densities everywhere.
D. Pursue nationally described internal space standards.
E. Seek higher water efficiency standards than minimum building regulation requirements.
F. Maintain separate requirement for 15% reduction of total predicted emissions from new homes.
G. Review thresholds for seeking BREEAM Communities 'excellent' standard to consider only applying to larger schemes and/or to allow for application on mixed used schemes.
H. Seek to deliver a significant proportion of homes which meet high accessibility standards, and in particular are wheelchair accessible.

SA Objective	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
SA1: Provide sufficient housing to meet identified local needs, including affordability and special needs	+	-	-	0	0	0	+	+
SA2: Safeguard and improve community health, safety and wellbeing	+	-	-	+	0	0	+	+
SA3: Develop a dynamic and diverse economy	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0
SA4: Reduce road traffic and congestion through improved accessibility to services homes and jobs; reducing the need to travel by car/lorry and improving sustainable travel choice	+	+	+/-	0	0	0	0	0
SA5: Protect and conserve natural resources	+++	+++	+++	0	+	0	0	0
SA6: Reduce air, soil, water, light and noise pollution	?	0	0	0	0	+	+	0
SA7: Plan for the anticipated levels of climate change	?	0	0	0	+	+	+	0
SA8: Minimise Eastleigh's contribution to climate change by reducing the borough's carbon footprint and minimising other greenhouse gas emissions	?	0	0	0	0	+++	+	0
SA9: Reduce waste generation and disposal, encourage waste prevention and reuse and achieve the sustainable management of waste	?	0	0	+	0	0	+	0
SA10: Protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and geodiversity, improving its quality and range	+	+	+/-	0	0	0	0	0
SA11: Enhance the Borough's multifunctional green infrastructure networks	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SA12: Protect, enhance and manage the character and appearance of the landscape and townscape, maintaining and strengthening distinctiveness and its special qualities	+++	+++	+/-	0	0	0	0	0
SA13: Protect and enhance and manage buildings, monuments, features, sites, places, areas and landscapes of archaeological, historical and cultural heritage importance as and landscapes of archaeological, historical and cultural heritage importance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Description of effects in relation to SA objectives

While these policy options are primarily about the design and building standards of new development within the Borough, by seeking higher density developments, Options A, B and C would reduce the amount greenfield land being developed, leading to significant positive (++) effects on SA objective 5: Natural resources and SA objective 12: Landscape and townscape. An indirect benefit and therefore minor positive (+) effect of these three options is also the potential to protect local habitats and species (SA objective 10: Biodiversity and geodiversity). However, Option C is also predicted to have minor negative

(-) effects on SA objective 10: Biodiversity and geodiversity and SA objective 12: Landscape and townscape. This is because high density housing might not be suitable in rural locations and could lead to increased pressure on local habits and species and impacts on the landscape outside of urban areas.

Where social and economic benefits were identified for SA objective 1: Housing provision, 2: Community health and 3: Economy, these were generally minor positive (+), because they would either help to ensure delivery of homes to meet a range of households needs (Options A, G and H), help improve social inclusion and accessibility to facilities and services (Options A, G and H) and improve accessibility to employment opportunities (Options A-C). However, there is some uncertainty for Option A as the ability to seek 'Lifetime Homes' as part of new development was recently removed by the government. Options B and C could have minor negative but uncertain (-?) effects as by increasing minimum residential densities they could potentially lead to the under supply of suitable housing for specific groups e.g. larger family homes in urban areas, and increased separation of different tenure groups in different areas of the Borough. Options D, E and F are not predicted to have any effect upon these SA objectives, except that Option D may help to improve living conditions within new residential developments and have an indirect positive effect on SA objective 2: Community health through maintaining national internal space standards. By improving proximity of residential development to facilities, and services and employment opportunities, Options A, B and C should also help ensure people without access to a private vehicle are not disadvantaged, leading to minor positive (+) effects on SA objective 4: Road traffic/congestion. However Option C is also predicted to result in minor negative (-) effects for sustainable transport, because it could lead to the oversupply of new housing development in less accessible areas of the Borough.

Options E, F and G could have some minor positive (+) effects on SA objectives 6: Pollution, 7: Climate change adaptation, 8: Climate change mitigation and 9: Waste, because of their focus on either water efficiency (Option E), reducing greenhouse emissions (Option F), ensuring sufficient storage within residential development (e.g. for recyclables) (Option D) or a combination of these things (Options A and G), which could help ensure that new development minimises the use of natural resources (SA objective 6: Pollution), is adapted to climate change and helps to reduce risk from flooding to people and property (SA objective 7: Climate change adaptation), reduces climate change (SA objective 8: Climate change mitigation) or helps to encourage sustainable waste management (SA objective 9: Waste). Option F would have significant positive (++) effects for SA objective 8: Climate change mitigation because it seeks to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from new homes. Option A may also have benefits for SA objectives 6: Pollution, 7: Climate change adaptation, 8: Climate change mitigation and 9: Waste but this is uncertain (?) because while it would continue the broad principle of ensuring new development meets specific sustainable design standards e.g. code for suitable homes, some of these principles have been replaced or superseded by new national government standards, which may not be as stringent, and it will depend on whether the Council uses its discretion to include higher sustainable design standards for new development than the current government standards.

These eight options are generally 'mix and match' in that only Option A covers all the aspects that a Design and Building Standards policy might cover. A mixture of Options A-H that seek to maximise the inclusion of sustainable design standards while ensuring that they will be deliverable and not compromise the provision of sufficient homes within the borough would be an approach which would offer the most in the way of significant positive effects.

Existing employment sites

Four reasonable alternative policy options were considered for existing employment sites, as shown in the SA matrix below. The potential sustainability effects are described below the matrix.

Existing employment sites- policy options:
A. Follow the principles described in 2011-2029 Local Plan.
B. Use Article 4 directions on sites which are identified as being of specific importance to meet future employment needs.
C. Omit policy in the light of imminent changes to government policy with regard to permitted development rights.
D. Relax policy approach to provide for community/leisure facilities in employment areas.

SA Objective	A	B	C	D				
SA1: Provide sufficient housing to meet identified local needs, including affordability and special needs	0	-?	+	0				
SA2: Safeguard and improve community health, safety and wellbeing	+	0	0	++?				
SA3: Develop a dynamic and diverse economy	++	++	--?	+/-				
SA4: Reduce road traffic and congestion through improved accessibility to services homes and jobs; reducing the need to travel by car/lorry and improving sustainable travel choice	0	0	0	0				
SA5: Protect and conserve natural resources	0	0	0	0				
SA6: Reduce air, soil, water, light and noise pollution	0	0	0	0				
SA7: Plan for the anticipated levels of climate change	0	0	0	0				
SA8: Minimise Eastleigh's contribution to climate change by reducing the borough's carbon footprint and minimising other greenhouse gas emissions	0	0	0	0				
SA9: Reduce waste generation and disposal, encourage waste prevention and reuse and achieve the sustainable management of waste	0	0	0	0				
SA10: Protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and geodiversity, improving its quality and range	0	0	0	0				
SA11: Enhance the Borough's multifunctional green infrastructure networks	0	0	0	0				
SA12: Protect, enhance and manage the character and appearance of the landscape and townscape, maintaining and strengthening distinctiveness and its special qualities	0	0	0	0				
SA13: Protect and enhance and manage buildings, monuments, features, sites, places, areas and landscapes of archaeological, historical and cultural heritage importance as and landscapes of archaeological, historical and cultural heritage importance	0	0	0	0				

Description of effects in relation to SA objectives

The only significant effects identified for the policy options on existing employment are in relation to SA objective 2: Community health and SA objective 3: Economy. Options A and B would help ensure that a range of existing employment sites are retained to meet future economic requirements including access to local centres and major industrial sites, leading to significant positive (++) effects on SA objective 2: Community health. Option C could result in the loss of existing employment sites, leading to significant negative but uncertain (--?) effects on employment opportunities and the local economy. The uncertainty relates to how many proposals to convert existing employment sites to residential uses would actually come forward. While Option D is predicted to have minor positive (+) effects on preventing the loss of existing employment sites, it is also predicted to have minor negative (-) effects on the wider economy, due to loss of economic activity that might otherwise occur in sites which are converted to community and leisure uses. Conversely, Option D could have a significant positive effect on SA objective 2: Community

health because it would improve opportunities for people to participate in cultural, leisure and recreation activities.

The remaining effects predicted in relation to the social objectives (SA objective 1: Housing provision and SA objective 2: Community health), are minor positive (+) for Option C, but minor negative (-) for Option B. Option C would support the conversion of offices and light industrial units for housing and would therefore have a minor positive effect on meeting local housing needs, whereas Option B proposes removing the permitted development right to change offices etc. to residential use. These effects are uncertain because they would depend on how much additional housing is actually delivered (or discouraged) within the Borough. While Option A will help to ensure that people have access to jobs, which can help prevent social exclusion and it would only permit the loss of employment uses where there would be over-riding community benefits hence the minor positive effect on SA objective 2: Community health, it does not support the conversion of employment uses to residential and is therefore unlikely to have any effect on housing.

Due to the narrow focus of these policy options, they are unlikely to affect the remaining SA objectives.

Retail and other town centre uses

Four reasonable alternative policy options were considered for retail and other town centre uses, as shown in the SA matrix below. The potential sustainability effects are described below the matrix.

Retail and other town centre uses - policy options:								
A. Follow the principles described in 2011-2029 Local Plan.								
B. Reduce policy restraint on town centre uses at Hedge End retail park and prepare masterplan to facilitate comprehensive long term redevelopment.								
C. Require commitment from developers to regenerate those local centres affected by large scale development in areas they are promoting.								
D. Relax 2011-2029 approach to provide for more diverse uses in town and local centres e.g. further cultural & leisure activities, artisan activities and residential.								
SA Objective	A	B	C	D				
SA1: Provide sufficient housing to meet identified local needs, including affordability and special needs	0	0	0	+				
SA2: Safeguard and improve community health, safety and wellbeing	+	0	+	++?				
SA3: Develop a dynamic and diverse economy	++/-	++?	++?	++/-				
SA4: Reduce road traffic and congestion through improved accessibility to services homes and jobs; reducing the need to travel by car/lorry and improving sustainable travel choice	+	-	+	+				
SA5: Protect and conserve natural resources	+?	+?	+?	+?				
SA6: Reduce air, soil, water, light and noise pollution	0	0	0	0				
SA7: Plan for the anticipated levels of climate change	0	0	0	0				
SA8: Minimise Eastleigh's contribution to climate change by reducing the borough's carbon footprint and minimising other greenhouse gas emissions	0	0	0	0				
SA9: Reduce waste generation and disposal, encourage waste prevention	0	0	0	0				

and reuse and achieve the sustainable management of waste								
SA10: Protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and geodiversity, improving its quality and range	0	0	0	0				
SA11: Enhance the Borough's multifunctional green infrastructure networks	0	0	0	0				
SA12: Protect, enhance and manage the character and appearance of the landscape and townscape, maintaining and strengthening distinctiveness and its special qualities	+?	+?	+?	+?				
SA13: Protect and enhance and manage buildings, monuments, features, sites, places, areas and landscapes of archaeological, historical and cultural heritage importance as and landscapes of archaeological, historical and cultural heritage importance	+?	+?	+?	+?				

Description of effects in relation to SA objectives

The options for protecting Retail and other town centre uses are likely to have significant positive effects on three of the SA objectives. Option D is likely to have a significant positive (++) effect on access to recreational and leisure facilities (SA objective 2: Community health) as its primary purpose is to encourage more diverse uses of town and local centres, which could include health related facilities like gyms. Options A and C are predicted to have minor positive (+) effects, because they could result in improvements to local centres, which helps improve community wellbeing. Option B, which would enable town centre uses to be located at the Hedge End retail part is unlikely to affect SA objective 2: Community health.

All four options could help to enhance the attractiveness of local centres and increase competition across the district, which would help to encourage new businesses and workforce to the Borough, leading to significant positive (++) effects on SA objective 3: Economy. However, Option A is also predicted to have a minor negative (-) effect, due to restrictions on the expansion or establishment of retail and office development in out-of-centre locations, as this could restrict emerging economies e.g. high technological industries, which may be more suited to out of town locations. Similarly, Option D is also predicted to have minor negative (-) effects, because it would restrict office use in town and local centres.

Option D is predicted to have minor positive (+) effects on the provision of new housing within town centres (SA objective 1: Housing provision), while the other three options are unlikely to have any effect on this objective.

Options A, C and D could help to reduce travel by car and have a minor positive effect on SA objective 4: Road traffic/congestion, by providing retail and town centre uses within the Borough's main town centres and local centres, as opposed to out-of-centre locations. Conversely, Option B could have a minor negative (-) effect due to making the out-of-centre retail development at Hedge End more attractive to other employment uses. All four policy options could lead to efficient use of brownfield sites and vacant buildings, which would reduce the likelihood of development on higher quality agricultural land and potentially protect, reuse and restore historic sites and their settings and protect the wider landscape of the Borough resulting in minor positive (+) effects on SA objectives 5: Natural resources, SA objective 12: Landscape and townscape and SA objective 13: Cultural heritage. However, these effects are uncertain (?) as they will depend on the design of proposals that come forward, which will not be known until the planning application stage.

Due to the narrow focus of these policy options, they are unlikely to affect the remaining SA objectives.

These four options are 'mix and match' because Option B relates to the regeneration of Hedge End retail development only and does not cover town and local centres, whereas Option C only relates to requirements for developers of new large developments in the locations where they occur. A mixture of

Options A-D that seeks to draw out the benefits of each option into one policy would be an approach which would offer the most in the way of significant positive effects.

Environmental quality

Sustainable urban drainage systems

Three reasonable alternative policy options were considered for sustainable urban drainage systems, as shown in the SA matrix below. The potential sustainability effects are described below the matrix.

Sustainable urban drainage systems - policy options:								
A. Use national standards.								
B. Require SUDS to be considered for all new developments.								
C. Develop local standards which ensure SUDS provide multiple benefits including safeguarding water quality.								
SA Objective	A	B	C					
SA1: Provide sufficient housing to meet identified local needs, including affordability and special needs	0	0	0					
SA2: Safeguard and improve community health, safety and wellbeing	+?	+?	+?					
SA3: Develop a dynamic and diverse economy	0	0	0					
SA4: Reduce road traffic and congestion through improved accessibility to services homes and jobs; reducing the need to travel by car/lorry and improving sustainable travel choice	0	0	0					
SA5: Protect and conserve natural resources	0	0	0					
SA6: Reduce air, soil, water, light and noise pollution	+?	+?	+++					
SA7: Plan for the anticipated levels of climate change	+++	++	+					
SA8: Minimise Eastleigh's contribution to climate change by reducing the borough's carbon footprint and minimising other greenhouse gas emissions	0	0	0					
SA9: Reduce waste generation and disposal, encourage waste prevention and reuse and achieve the sustainable management of waste	0	0	0					
SA10: Protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and geodiversity, improving its quality and range	+	+	+					
SA11: Enhance the Borough's multifunctional green infrastructure networks	+	+	+					
SA12: Protect, enhance and manage the character and appearance of the landscape and townscape, maintaining and strengthening distinctiveness and its special qualities	0	0	0					
SA13: Protect and enhance and manage buildings, monuments, features, sites, places, areas and landscapes of archaeological, historical and cultural	0	0	0					

heritage importance as and landscapes of archaeological, historical and cultural heritage importance

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Description of effects in relation to SA objectives

Significant positive effects are identified for the policy options on sustainable drainage systems (SuDS), in relation to SA objective 6: Pollution and SA objective 7: Climate change adaptation. While all three options would be likely to have positive effects on reducing surface water runoff thereby reducing water pollution, Option C would set local standards, specifically referring to safeguarding of water quality, therefore leading to significant positive (++) effects. Options A is less rigorous, in that it will only ensure that certain sized of developments incorporate SuDS, therefore a minor positive (+) effect is predicted. Similarly, all options are likely to increase the level of permeable ground across the Borough, which would reduce the risk of flooding and have a positive effect in relation to SA objective 7: Climate change adaptation. However, Options A and B are predicted to have significant positive (++) effects in (SA objective 7: Climate change adaptation), because they may be more stringent than Option C (setting local standards). The effects of Options A and C are uncertain because it is not known how many developments of 10 or fewer dwellings might be proposed and therefore not have to include SuDS (in line with the national standards), or whether the local standards set in Option C would be as stringent as Option B.

Where social impacts are predicted in relation to SA objective 2: Community health, these are predicted to be minor positive but uncertain (+?) for all three options, because they will help improve water quality for the Borough's residents and reduce the risk of flooding to properties. Increasing the use of SuDS across the Borough is also likely to reduce loss of greenfield land within new developments, retaining and creating habitats and therefore all three options are also predicted to have a minor positive (+) effects on SA objective 10: Biodiversity and geodiversity and SA objective 11: Green infrastructure.

Due to the narrow focus of these policy options, they are unlikely to affect the remaining SA objectives.

Pollution

Just one reasonable alternative policy option was considered for dealing with pollution, as shown in the SA matrix below. The potential sustainability effects are described below the matrix.

Pollution - policy options:								
A. Follow the principles described in 2011-2029 Local Plan.								
The Council has not identified any reasonable non-spatial alternative approaches to this policy.								
SA Objective	A							
SA1: Provide sufficient housing to meet identified local needs, including affordability and special needs	0							
SA2: Safeguard and improve community health, safety and wellbeing	+							
SA3: Develop a dynamic and diverse economy	+?							
SA4: Reduce road traffic and congestion through improved accessibility to services homes and jobs; reducing the need to travel by car/lorry and improving sustainable travel choice	0							
SA5: Protect and conserve natural resources	+?							
SA6: Reduce air, soil, water, light and noise pollution	++							
SA7: Plan for the anticipated levels of climate change	+?							

SA8: Minimise Eastleigh's contribution to climate change by reducing the borough's carbon footprint and minimising other greenhouse gas emissions	+							
SA9: Reduce waste generation and disposal, encourage waste prevention and reuse and achieve the sustainable management of waste	0							
SA10: Protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and geodiversity, improving its quality and range	+?							
SA11: Enhance the Borough's multifunctional green infrastructure networks	0							
SA12: Protect, enhance and manage the character and appearance of the landscape and townscape, maintaining and strengthening distinctiveness and its special qualities	+							
SA13: Protect and enhance and manage buildings, monuments, features, sites, places, areas and landscapes of archaeological, historical and cultural heritage importance as and landscapes of archaeological, historical and cultural heritage importance	0							

Description of effects in relation to SA objectives

The only significant effects identified for this pollution policy option, is in relation to the reduction in pollution (SA objective 6: Pollution). The option seeks to address current and future causes of pollution by restricting development in areas which would cause unacceptable environmental impacts through air, water, noise/vibration or light pollution or land contamination. It also seeks to ensure that effective mitigation is adopted e.g. remediation of contaminated land, leading to significant positive (++) effects on SA objective 6: Pollution.

Where other environmental impacts were identified (SA objective 5: Natural resources, SA objective 7: Climate change adaptation, SA objective 8: Climate change mitigation, SA objective 10: Biodiversity and geodiversity and SA objective 12: Landscape and townscape), these were predicted to be minor positive (+), because the restriction on development would reduce potential harm to the environment, indirectly helping to protect habitats and species, while also improving environmental quality and reducing harmful air pollutants.

This option is also predicted to have indirect minor positive (+) social and economic effects, due to improvements to air quality (SA objective 2: Community health) and environmental quality (SA objective 3: Economy). Many of these minor effects are subject to uncertainty (?).

Due to the narrow focus of this policy option, it is unlikely to affect the remaining SA objectives.

Sports facilities

Two reasonable alternative policy options were considered for sports facilities, as shown in the SA matrix below. The potential sustainability effects are described below the matrix.

Sports facilities - policy options:								
A. Following the principles described in 2011-2029 Local Plan.								
B. Make specific provision for new sporting facilities to meet projected future needs.								
SA Objective	A	B						
SA1: Provide sufficient housing to meet identified local needs, including affordability and special needs	0	0						
SA2: Safeguard and improve community health, safety and wellbeing	++	++						
SA3: Develop a dynamic and diverse economy	+	+						
SA4: Reduce road traffic and congestion through improved accessibility to services homes and jobs; reducing the need to travel by car/lorry and improving sustainable travel choice	0	0						
SA5: Protect and conserve natural resources	0	0						
SA6: Reduce air, soil, water, light and noise pollution	0	0						
SA7: Plan for the anticipated levels of climate change	+	+						
SA8: Minimise Eastleigh's contribution to climate change by reducing the borough's carbon footprint and minimising other greenhouse gas emissions	0	0						
SA9: Reduce waste generation and disposal, encourage waste prevention and reuse and achieve the sustainable management of waste	0	0						
SA10: Protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and geodiversity, improving its quality and range	+/-	+/-						
SA11: Enhance the Borough's multifunctional green infrastructure networks	+	+						
SA12: Protect, enhance and manage the character and appearance of the landscape and townscape, maintaining and strengthening distinctiveness and its special qualities	+	+						
SA13: Protect and enhance and manage buildings, monuments, features, sites, places, areas and landscapes of archaeological, historical and cultural heritage importance as and landscapes of archaeological, historical and cultural heritage importance	0	0						

Description of effects in relation to SA objectives

The primary aim of both policy options is to help ensure that there is a suitable provision of open space and sports facilities to meet local needs, which will encourage active lifestyles leading to significant positive (++) effects upon the health and wellbeing of communities (SA objective 2: Community health).

Both policy options are also predicted to have minor positive (+) effects on encouraging tourism-related development to support sporting events, therefore contributing to a diverse local economy (SA objective 4: Road traffic / congestion). Increasing recreation and open space facilities (likely to be achieved through both policy options) would also have the indirect effect of increasing green infrastructure (SA objective 11: Green infrastructure), where these facilities are outdoors and incorporate unpaved surfaces. This is likely to have a minor positive effect (+) on flood risk mitigation (SA objective 7: Climate change adaptation), by increasing the area of permeable surfaces within the Borough. The provision of additional green space and sporting facilities such as parks and sports fields would also have an indirect minor positive (+) effect on enhancing local landscapes (SA objective 12: Landscape and townscape). However, the effects on SA objective 12: Landscape and townscape, SA objective 11: Green infrastructure and SA objective 12: Landscape and townscape are uncertain for option B, as they will depend on the extent to which open space is provided in addition to sporting facilities, as open space is not referred to in Option B.

Both options are also predicted to have a minor positive effect (+) on local habitats and species (SA objective 10: Biodiversity and geodiversity), because of the protection and increase of green infrastructure for local habitats, but minor negative (-) effects, due to the loss of habitats from development or disturbance from increased footfall.

Due to the narrow focus of these policy options, they are unlikely to affect the remaining SA objectives.

Nature conservation

Just one reasonable alternative policy option was considered for nature conservation, as shown in the SA matrix below. The potential sustainability effects are described below the matrix.

Nature Conservation - policy options:								
A. Follow the principles described in 2011-2029 Local Plan. The Council has not identified any reasonable alternative approaches to this policy.								
SA Objective	A							
SA1: Provide sufficient housing to meet identified local needs, including affordability and special needs	0							
SA2: Safeguard and improve community health, safety and wellbeing	0							
SA3: Develop a dynamic and diverse economy	+/-							
SA4: Reduce road traffic and congestion through improved accessibility to services homes and jobs; reducing the need to travel by car/lorry and improving sustainable travel choice	0							
SA5: Protect and conserve natural resources	+							
SA6: Reduce air, soil, water, light and noise pollution	+							
SA7: Plan for the anticipated levels of climate change	+							
SA8: Minimise Eastleigh's contribution to climate change by reducing the borough's carbon footprint and minimising other greenhouse gas	0							

emissions								
SA9: Reduce waste generation and disposal, encourage waste prevention and reuse and achieve the sustainable management of waste	0							
SA10: Protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and geodiversity, improving its quality and range	++/-							
SA11: Enhance the Borough's multifunctional green infrastructure networks	++							
SA12: Protect, enhance and manage the character and appearance of the landscape and townscape, maintaining and strengthening distinctiveness and its special qualities	+							
SA13: Protect and enhance and manage buildings, monuments, features, sites, places, areas and landscapes of archaeological, historical and cultural heritage importance as and landscapes of archaeological, historical and cultural heritage importance	0							

Description of effects in relation to SA objectives

The primary focus of this policy option is to protect and enhance biodiversity and therefore significant positive (++) effects are predicted in relation to the option's potential contribution to national and local biodiversity targets (SA objective 10: Biodiversity and geodiversity), while also protecting, conserving and enhancing habitats and providing green infrastructure (SA objective 11: Green infrastructure). However, there is no reference to protection of the Borough's geodiversity within the proposed policy approach or anywhere else in the non-spatial policy options, therefore a minor negative (-) effect is also identified in relation to the geodiversity element of SA objective 10: Biodiversity and geodiversity.

Where other environmental effects are predicted (SA objective 5: Natural resources, SA objective 6: Pollution, SA objective 7: Climate change adaptation and SA objective 12: Landscape and townscape), these are likely to be minor positive (+), because the conservation and enhancement of natural habitats and features, protection of nature conservation sites and provision of green infrastructure would all help to maintain and increase the green infrastructure networks within the Borough, in turn helping to protect landscape character, reduce and mitigate pollution impacts, and help prepare the Borough for climatic changes, e.g. through rainwater attenuation.

The option is also predicted to have a mixed effect on the local economy (SA objective 3: Economy); minor positive (+) due to the benefit for tourism and other service industries of protecting the natural environment, but minor negative (-) effects on the wider economy, due to the potential restrictions on economic activity on sites protected for their contribution to conservation.

Due to the narrow focus of this policy option, it is unlikely to affect the remaining SA objectives.

Heritage assets

Just one reasonable alternative policy options was considered for heritage assets, as shown in the SA matrix below. The potential sustainability effects are described below the matrix.

Heritage assets - policy options:
A. Follow the principles described in 2011-2029 Local Plan. The Council has not identified any reasonable alternative approaches to this policy.

SA Objective	A							
SA1: Provide sufficient housing to meet identified local needs, including affordability and special needs	0							
SA2: Safeguard and improve community health, safety and wellbeing	+							
SA3: Develop a dynamic and diverse economy	+							
SA4: Reduce road traffic and congestion through improved accessibility to services homes and jobs; reducing the need to travel by car/lorry and improving sustainable travel choice	0							
SA5: Protect and conserve natural resources	0							
SA6: Reduce air, soil, water, light and noise pollution	0							
SA7: Plan for the anticipated levels of climate change	0							
SA8: Minimise Eastleigh's contribution to climate change by reducing the borough's carbon footprint and minimising other greenhouse gas emissions	0							
SA9: Reduce waste generation and disposal, encourage waste prevention and reuse and achieve the sustainable management of waste	0							
SA10: Protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and geodiversity, improving its quality and range	0							
SA11: Enhance the Borough's multifunctional green infrastructure networks	0							
SA12: Protect, enhance and manage the character and appearance of the landscape and townscape, maintaining and strengthening distinctiveness and its special qualities	+							
13. Cultural heritage	++							

Description of effects in relation to SA objectives

The only significant effect identified for the policy option for heritage asserts, is in relation to the protection, enhancement and management of the historic environment (SA objective 13: Cultural

heritage). The primary focus of this option is to conserve and enhance the Borough's heritage assets and their settings to ensure their longevity and enjoyment by the public, leading to significant positive (++) effects on this SA objective.

This option aims to encourage development that enhances cultural sites, which would result in minor positive (+) effects on the local distinctiveness and special qualities of local communities across the borough (SA objective 12: Landscape and townscape). This is also likely to have indirect minor positive (+) effects on the economy, by improving local amenity and attractiveness to investors (SA objective 3: Economy) and health and wellbeing by widening the access and enjoyment of cultural assets (SA objective 2: Community health).

Due to the narrow focus of this policy option, it is unlikely to affect the remaining SA objectives.

Appendix 11

Reasons for selecting or not selecting options for inclusion in the Local Plan

Table A10.1: Reasons for selecting or not selecting quanta options

	Options	EBC's reasons for selecting preferred approach and not selecting other options
New Development: Housing number	A. Eastleigh Housing Needs study	This housing target is based on Option B, PUSH SHMA, rolled forward to 2036 and taking account of completions since 2011. As completions were below the target of 650 dpa, the annual average target over the plan period has been increased to 729 dpa. This figure is in line with the Government's draft standard methodology for calculating housing need.
	B. PUSH SHMA: Selected option	
	C. Local housing market options	
	D. Sub-regional development	
New Development: Employment floorspace	None identified.	Employment figures are based on the targets agreed in the South Hampshire sub region and the plan exceeds this in order to deliver the sub-regionally important Southampton Airport Economic Gateway site (part of Eastleigh River Side). There are considered to be no alternatives as a lower target would not deliver this strategic site.
New Development: Number of Gypsy and Traveller pitches	None identified.	EBC has confirmed that the number of Gypsy and Traveller pitches allocated in the Local Plan is based on the Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment, which was updated in February 2017. In 2017 the council reconsidered these sites, their suitability and location and decided to continue the approach preferred in the 2016-36 Local Plan, which meets this identified need. The Council did not consider there to be any reasonable alternatives to this. This provision has been assessed via Policy DM33 and the relevant site allocations.

Table A10.2: Reasons for selecting or not selecting non-spatial policy options (as presented in the Issues and Options document, 2015)

	Options	EBC's reasons for selecting preferred approach and not selecting other options
Policy approaches in the countryside	<p>A. Follow the principles described in 2011-2029 Local Plan.</p> <p>B. Actively pursue more positive complementary land uses and management of the countryside e.g. local food production.</p> <p>C. Develop policies which seek to guide and intervene where certain uses, which are generally appropriate in the countryside, should be directed to particular areas.</p>	<p>Approach chosen is to follow principles from previous Local Plan. Urban edge updated to reflect recent development, permissions and proposed allocations. Countryside and gaps considered in separate policies for clarity.</p> <p>Rejected other options as Local Plan sets long term framework and more detailed policies and measures will come forward in other plans and projects.</p>
Provision of gaps in Eastleigh borough	<p>A. Follow the principles described in 2011-2029 Local Plan.</p> <p>B. Combine gap policy with countryside policy to prevent development which would cause settlements to merge.</p> <p>C. Review gaps between all settlements in Eastleigh borough to retain only the minimum land required to maintain their separate identity.</p>	<p>Approach chosen is to follow principles from previous Local Plan of identifying gaps on Policies Map, but based on a revised gap assessment to reflect recent development and permissions and a reappraisal of the extent of land needed for each gap. Countryside and gaps considered in separate policies for clarity.</p> <p>Rejected option B as showing gaps on maps provides clarity for developers.</p>
Approach to coastal issues	<p>A. Follow the principles described in the 2011-2029 Local Plan.</p> <p>The Council has not identified any reasonable alternative approaches to this policy.</p>	<p>Approach chosen is to follow principles from previous Local Plan. No other options identified.</p>
Affordable housing	<p>A. Follow the principles described in 2011-2029 Local Plan.</p> <p>B. Lower threshold to 10</p>	<p>Policy based on Government guidance that affordable housing should only be sought on developments of 11 or more dwellings, policy includes more detail on the nature of the</p>

	Options	EBC's reasons for selecting preferred approach and not selecting other options
	<p>dwellings.</p> <p>C. Vary approach across the borough.</p>	<p>affordable housing.</p> <p>Rejected option to vary approach across the borough due to the Government restrictions preventing affordable housing thresholds lower than 11 dwellings and as the proposed policy can be applied flexibly to respond to housing need and viability.</p>
The proportion of affordable dwellings to provide in qualifying developments	<p>A. Follow the principles described in 2011-2029 Local Plan.</p> <p>B. Increase proportion of homes that will be sought from developers to provide as affordable housing.</p> <p>C. Lower proportion of homes that will be sought from developers to provide as affordable housing.</p> <p>D. Vary approach across borough.</p>	
Specialised accommodation and providing for first time buyers and self-builders	<p>A. Allocate specific sites for specialist housing types, such as starter homes, self-build homes, housing for older people and supported housing.</p> <p>B. Require larger new development sites to include a range of specialist housing types, such as starter homes, self-build homes, housing for older people and supported housing.</p> <p>C. Encourage the development of smaller homes in suitable locations for people to 'downsize' from larger properties.</p>	<p>Approach chosen is to follow principles from previous Local Plan but with additional criteria based policies promoting a mix of housing (including reference to first time buyers) and delivering older peoples housing, policy support for custom and self-build development.</p> <p>Rejected other options to require specialist housing on identified sites to retain flexibility for development.</p>
Delivering sites for Travelling Communities	<p>A. Allocation for sites with extant planning permission and permanent permission of unauthorised sites.</p> <p>B. Sub-division of pitches.</p> <p>C. Extension to existing sites.</p> <p>D. New sites.</p>	<p>Option A progressed and provides sufficient pitches to meet identified needs alongside criteria based policy to assess any new proposals.</p> <p>Other options considered less preferably and not required to meet identified need</p>
Houses in multiple occupation	No reasonable alternative policy options have been proposed for dealing with the issue of houses in	HMOs will be considered using the general housing mix policy due to the small number of HMOs properties. No other options provided.

	Options	EBC's reasons for selecting preferred approach and not selecting other options
	multiple occupation (HMOs) as it has very little evidence to demonstrate that there is a significant issue.	
Densities and building standards	<p>A. Follow the principles described in 2011-2029 Local Plan.</p> <p>B. Increase minimum residential densities in areas of high accessibility.</p> <p>C. Increase minimum densities everywhere.</p> <p>D. Pursue nationally described internal space standards.</p> <p>E. Seek higher water efficiency standards than minimum building regulation requirements.</p> <p>F. Maintain separate requirement for 15% reduction of total predicted emissions from new homes.</p> <p>G. Review thresholds for seeking BREEAM Communities 'excellent' standard to consider only applying to larger schemes and/or to allow for application on mixed used schemes.</p> <p>H. Seek to deliver a significant proportion of homes which meet high accessibility standards, and in particular are wheelchair accessible.</p>	<p>Combination of a number of options including following principles from previous Local Plan on environmental standards, introducing national internal space standards and accessibility standards and also increasing minimum density everywhere (from 35 to 40 dwellings per hectare). Policy will seek higher water standards, recognising this goes beyond minimum building regulations requirements and cannot be a requirement. BREEAM communities will apply to larger developments (150 dwellings/10,000 sqm instead of 100 dwellings/10,000 sqm)</p> <p>Rejected options to maintain additional emissions reduction as this does not accord with national guidance.</p>
Existing employment sites	<p>A. Follow the principles described in 2011-2029 Local Plan.</p> <p>B. Use Article 4 directions on sites which are identified as being of specific importance to meet future employment needs.</p> <p>C. Omit policy in the light of imminent changes to government policy with regard to permitted</p>	<p>Approach chosen is to follow principles from previous Local Plan (while recognising permitted development rights for the change of use of some employment uses).</p> <p>Rejected other options as there is a need to protect employment uses and consider proposals for non-employment uses on a case by case basis.</p>

	Options	EBC's reasons for selecting preferred approach and not selecting other options
	<p>development rights.</p> <p>D. Relax policy approach to provide for community/leisure facilities in employment areas.</p>	
Retail and other town centre uses	<p>A. Follow the principles described in 2011-2029 Local Plan.</p> <p>B. Reduce policy restraint on town centre uses at Hedge End retail park and prepare masterplan to facilitate comprehensive long term redevelopment.</p> <p>C. Require commitment from developers to regenerate those local centres affected by large scale development in areas they are promoting.</p> <p>D. Relax 2011-2029 approach to provide for more diverse uses in town and local centres e.g. further cultural & leisure activities, artisan activities and residential.</p>	<p>Approach chosen is to follow principles from previous Local Plan and relax the policy to remove restrictions on the percentage of non-A1 retail frontage to increase flexibility in centres and in line with changes to permitted development. The largest developments including the SGO, will include new centres.</p> <p>Rejected options to reduce restraint on Hedge End retail park to protect the borough's other centres and as significant new retail development is not required to meet the borough's retail needs.</p>
Infrastructure: Transport	<p>A. Follow the principles described in 2011-2029 Local Plan.</p> <p>B. Make provision for park and ride facilities in Eastleigh Borough to</p> <p>i) Provide access to the City of Southampton?</p> <p>ii) Provide access to Chandler's Ford business areas and the Ford site & Riverside?</p> <p>C. Encouraging improvements to public transport hubs to promote sustainable transport options for onwards journeys.</p> <p>D. In response to poor air quality issues, relieve congestion by providing additional road links at</p>	<p>Approach chosen is to follow principles from previous Local Plan and plan for park and ride facilities. In addition, the plans include a link road to serve the strategic growth option north of Bishopstoke and north east of Fair Oak.</p> <p>Rejected other options as there is limited scope for additional rail stations and more detailed projects can come forward in other plans. Parking standards are to be updated soon.</p>

	Options	EBC's reasons for selecting preferred approach and not selecting other options
	<p>areas specifically affected e.g. Eastleigh town centre.</p> <p>E. Promote new stations on existing routes to serve potential new development and existing communities (e.g. Boyatt Wood & Allbrook).</p> <p>F. Increase parking standards on new development to provide additional parking provision.</p> <p>G. Reduce parking standards on new development.</p>	
Infrastructure: Green open spaces and habitats	<p>A. Follow the principles described in 2011-2029 Local Plan.</p> <p>B. Require developers of large developments to provide large scale green space to accompany their proposals.</p> <p>C. Identify further new large scale green spaces in suitable locations to meet longer term needs for recreation and/or biodiversity.</p> <p>D. Designate Local Green Spaces across borough.</p> <p>E. Enable Local Green Spaces through neighbourhood plans</p>	<p>Approach chosen is to follow principles from previous Local Plan, require large developments such as the SGO to provide large scale green space and deliver a new country park south of Bursledon Road.</p> <p>Rejected other options to designate or enable local green spaces as this designation is designed for small areas of particular importance to local communities instead of strategic green infrastructure.</p>
Environmental quality: Sustainable urban drainage systems	<p>A. Use national standards.</p> <p>B. Require SUDS to be considered for all new developments.</p> <p>C. Develop local standards which ensure SUDS provide multiple benefits including safeguarding water quality.</p>	<p>Policy applies local standards to deliver multiple benefits.</p> <p>Rejected the option to apply national standards due to the importance of water quality in the borough. Policy applies to large sites in accordance with national guidance.</p>
Environmental	A. Follow the principles described in 2011-2029	Approach chosen is to follow principles from previous Local Plan. No other options

	Options	EBC's reasons for selecting preferred approach and not selecting other options
quality: Pollution	<p>Local Plan.</p> <p>The Council has not identified any reasonable non-spatial alternative approaches to this policy.</p>	identified.
Environmental quality: Sports facilities	<p>A. Following the principles described in 2011-2029 Local Plan.</p> <p>B. Make specific provision for new sporting facilities to meet projected future needs.</p>	<p>Approach chosen is to follow principles from previous Local Plan, based on a reduced list of open space standards.</p> <p>Rejected option of making specific provision for new sporting facilities (with the exception of facilities identified in site allocations) as the Local Plan sets out the framework and more detailed policies and measures will come forward in other plans and projects</p>
Environmental quality: Community facilities	<p>A. Follow the principles described in 2011-2029 Local Plan.</p> <p>B. Widen definition to include commercial children's nurseries.</p> <p>C. Continue to focus community facilities within existing settlements.</p> <p>D. Relax policies to enable community facilities outside existing settlements.</p> <p>E. Presumption towards multi-use community facilities rather than single-use design.</p>	<p>Approach chosen is to follow principles from previous Local Plan, continuing focus on facilities within existing settlements and presumption towards multi-use facilities rather than single-use design.</p> <p>Rejected other options to widen the definition of community facilities to include commercial children's centres in order to provide flexibility for businesses. Option of enabling community facilities outside existing settlements is contrary to other policies restricting development in the countryside.</p>
Nature conservation	<p>A. Follow the principles described in 2011-2029 Local Plan.</p> <p>The Council has not identified any reasonable alternative approaches to this policy.</p>	Approach chosen is to follow principles from previous Local Plan with a comprehensive policy and more detail for individual sites. No other options identified.
Heritage assets	<p>A. Follow the principles described in 2011-2029 Local Plan.</p> <p>The Council has not identified any reasonable alternative approaches to this policy.</p>	Approach chosen is to follow principles from previous Local Plan with changes to make policy clearer as these were based on national guidance. No other options identified.

Table A10.3: Reasons for selecting or not selecting Strategic Growth Options

Options	EBC's reasons for selecting preferred approach and not selecting other options
B/C: Selected option	<p>It is considered that in overall terms, on the range of evidence, that the key areas of difference between the SGOs are that SGO B/C has greater merit in meeting transport / accessibility aims than SGOs C, D or E; greater merit in protecting countryside gaps than SGO E; and less merit than SGOs C, D and E in protecting more sensitive (although non-designated) landscapes. The comparative balance between different SGOs with regard to biodiversity is considered to be more mixed. A full Habitats Regulation Assessment has been completed for the proposed Local Plan, which states there will be no adverse effect on the integrity of international sites with mitigation measures incorporated.</p> <p>It is considered that national and/or local policy gives some emphasis to transport/accessibility aims and designated countryside gaps, and less so to undesignated landscapes. On this basis it is considered that the greater benefits SGO B/C bring to meeting transport / accessibility and countryside gap aims outweigh the lesser merit it has in landscape terms.</p>
C	
D plus land immediately to the north east of Fair Oak (a)	
D plus land immediately south of the railway line	
E plus land immediately northeast of Fair Oak (b)	

Table A10.4: Greenfield site options allocated and not allocated

Allocated sites	Sites not allocated
1a & 1b: West of Allbrook / north of Knowle Hill, Allbrook	1: Allbrook Way (larger site)
2: Land east Allbrook Way	5: Land south of Yewtree Cottage, Knowle Lane and land east of Botley Rd and north of Knowle Lane
3: Between 77 Church Road and Recreation Ground	6: Cockpit Farm, Durley Road
4: East of Knowle Lane	9: Firtree Farm
7: West of Durley Road	11: Land and allotments south of Moorgreen Road
8: East of Allington Lane	14: Rickwood Farm, Upper Northam Road
10: Lechlade, Burnetts Lane	16: Land between Woodhouse Lane and Grange Road and land at Grange Road
12: North of Barbe Bake Avenue	17: Land north of Bubb Lane and land north of Hedge End (part)
13: West of Woodhouse Lane	18: Land north of Hedge End (part) and land north of Hedge End Railway Station
15: Land at Sundays Hill and land north of Pewitt Hill Close	22: Land east of Precosa Road
19: Land south of Maddoxford Lane and east of Crows Nest Lane	23: Land west of Cobbett Way; garage of Broad Oak; north of Broad Oak and west of Holmesland Way; and land north of Grange Road
20: Land west of Uplands Farm, Botley	24: Garage at Broad Oak
21: Land east of Kings Copse Avenue and east of Tanhouse Lane	25: Land south of Snakemoor Lane; Land at Denhams Corner and Land at Ford Lake
26: Braxells Farm Winchester Road	27: Land north of Blundell Lane and south of M27
30: Land north of Providence Hill and the Morellos and Forge Mount, Providence Hill	28: Land north of Bridge Road
32: Heath House Farm	29: Land at Providence Hill and Oakhill
33: Land lying south east of Windmill Lane	31: Land south of j8 of M27 south of Peewit Hill west of Dodwell Lane
42: Land /north of Myrtle Cottage, Winchester Road	34: Land west of Shop Lane and land east of Shop Lane and south of Botley Rd
44: Land at Foxholes Farm, Firtree Lane	35: Land rear of Plough Inn; open space south of

Allocated sites	Sites not allocated
	Pound Rd west of Priors Hill Lane
45: Home Farm, St Johns Road, Hedge End	36: Land west of Hamble Lane and land east of Hamble Lane
	37: Land to the east of Shop Lane
	38: Land North of Satchell Lane
	39: Land to the North and South of Kings Avenue
	40: Mercury Yacht Marina; land west of Satchell Lane; land at Hamble Petroleum Storage Depot
	41: Land South of Winchester Road, Boorley Green
	43: Land North of Bert Betts Way and South of Peewit Hill
	46: The Coach House, Netley Firs Road
	47: Land South of Allington Lane and north of the M27
	48: Land Off The Drove
	49: Land North of Moorgreen Road

Reasons for selecting or not selecting greenfield site options

The Greenfield site options considered by EBC are listed above, by whether they were allocated or not. These sites were determined after a long process assessing SLAA sites (214 in total); undertaking a comparative assessment of potentially suitable sites looking at transport, gaps, landscape, biodiversity and other environmental criteria (initially assessing 41 sites) and finally with a development capacity exercise by consultants (initially assessing 23 sites). This looked at detailed site specific issues to determine if it can be developed, the developable area and how many dwellings could be built.

In July 2017, EBC carried out a Development Capacity Assessment of the greenfield site options (available at: <https://www.eastleigh.gov.uk/media/1641/development-capacity-assessment-and-appendices.pdf>). This document considered site options against various factors and then came to a conclusion on whether the site is suitable for residential development and, if it is, how many dwellings it could accommodate.

EBC carried out an initial scoring exercise for these sites, which is presented in Table 4b overall assessment in score order, as part of the evidence base updated in September 2017 (available at: <https://www.eastleigh.gov.uk/planning-and-building/planning-policy-and-implementation/local-plan/emerging-local-plan-2016-2036/supporting-evidence-base>). The final column in the table shows whether sites were taken forward to more detailed development capacity assessment. This reflects the score for countryside gaps as all sites were taken forward apart from those scoring 'poor' or 'poor/average' for countryside gap protection.

In July 2017, EBC published a Site Selection Report to document how greenfield site allocations were identified, assessed and selected or otherwise (available at: <https://www.eastleigh.gov.uk/media/2064/appendix-7a-site-selection-report-july-2017.pdf>). This explains why six of the 23 sites assessed were considered inappropriate for residential development. A further two sites already have planning permission so are listed separately in DM24. It was considered unclear whether or not an additional site (North of Blundell Lane) could be appropriately developed and it hasn't been allocated. The remaining 14 sites are allocated for development.

An additional 10 sites were identified as potential greenfield site allocations in Autumn 2017. EBC produced a site selection report in November 2017 to explain why four of these were proposed for allocation in the Local Plan and others were not (available at: <https://www.eastleigh.gov.uk/media/2063/appendix-7-site-selection-process-report-nov-2017.pdf>). This report includes EBC assessments of each of these sites.

For each site, final decisions as to whether each site will be included in the Local Plan are therefore a reflection on the lack of negative impacts on countryside gap and acceptable impacts / impacts which can be mitigated on the other criteria, taking into account nearby development and site specific factors.